

Plutarch's Citation of Empedocles at *Amatorius* 756D

Hubert Martin, Jr

AT *Amatorius* 756D Plutarch has just begun his defense of Eros and is emphatically asserting the god's antiquity.¹ After expressing allegiance to the ancient and ancestral faith (756B)² and indicating that Eros has long been an object of worship (756C), Plutarch explicitly places him among the most ancient divinities (756D):

ἀλλ' ὅταν Ἐμπεδοκλέους [fr. 17 vv. 20–21] ἀκούσης λέγοντος,
ὦ ἑταῖρε,
καὶ Φιλότης ἐν τοῖσιν ἴση μῆκός τε πλάτος τε,
τὴν σὺ νόῳ δέρκου, μηδ' ὄμμασιν ἦσο τεθηπώς',
ταῦτ' οἴεσθαι χρὴ λέγεσθαι <καὶ> περὶ Ἐρωτος· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν
ὄρατός, ἀλλὰ δοξαστός ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς οὗτος ἐν τοῖς πάνυ παλαιοῖς·
ὧν ἂν περὶ ἐκάστου τεκμήριον ἀπαιτῆς, παντὸς ἀπτόμενος ἱεροῦ

¹ This elaborate defense of Eros begins with 756A and is terminated only by the lacuna of 766D. For the content and organization of the *Amat.* see Richard Volkmann, *Leben, Schriften, und Philosophie des Plutarch von Chaeronea* II (Berlin 1869) 168–72; Rudolf Hirzel, *Der Dialog* II (Leipzig 1895) 230–36; Curtius Hubert, *De Plutarchi Amatorio* (Diss. Berlin 1903); Konrat Ziegler, *RE* 21 (1951) 793–98 s.v. PLUTARCHOS; Robert Flacelière, *Plutarque: Dialogue sur l'Amour* (Paris 1953) 7–10 and 19–33; and Lisette Goessler, *Plutarchs Gedanken über die Ehe* (Diss. Basel 1962) 15–43. Hubert, whose study firmly established that Plutarch is the author of the *Amat.*, furnishes the most detailed treatment of its structure (2–43). For a critique of Goessler's analysis of the dialogue see my review, *AJP* 85 (1964) 444.

² The *Amat.* is one of Plutarch's late works; and this appeal to *πίστις* as well as his classification of Eros throughout the dialogue as a *θεός* rather than a *δαίμων*, though Socrates designates him as the latter in *Pl. Symp.*, are characteristic of the later, religious stage in Plutarch's thought, which succeeded an earlier, more philosophical stage. On this evolution in Plutarch's thought and on the religious tone of the *De Pyth.Orac.*, also a late work, and of the *Amat.*, as against the skeptical one of the earlier *De Def.Or.*, see the various treatments by Flacelière: "Plutarque et la Pythie," *REG* 56 (1943) 72–111; *Dialogue sur l'Amour* (*supra* n.1) 11–12 and 25–27; *Plutarque: Dialogue sur les Oracles de la Pythie* (Paris 1962) 16–19; and *Sagesse de Plutarque* (Paris 1964) 18–21. The *Amat.* is cautiously dated to "after 96" by C. P. Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* 56 (1966) 66 and 72.

καὶ παντὶ βωμῶ σοφιστικὴν ἐπάγων πείραν, οὐδέν' ἀσυκοφάντη-
τον οὐδ' ἀβασάνιστον ἀπολείψεις.³

So Curtius Hubert's Teubner text (*Moralia* IV [Leipzig 1938]), which incorporates Wilamowitz's conjectured καί in the clause immediately after the Empedocles quotation.⁴ And although the texts of Robert Flacelière (*Plutarque: Dialogue sur l'Amour* [Paris 1953]) and W. C. Helmbold (*Moralia* IX [LCL, Harvard 1961]) omit the conjecture,⁵ in both cases the accompanying translation takes it into account, Helmbold's with "also" ("you must suppose that his verses apply also to Eros") and Flacelière's with "aussi" ("il faut te rendre compte que ces vers s'appliquent aussi à l'Amour").⁶ There is absolutely no manuscript support for the conjecture; and its only *raison d'être*, whether it actually appears in the Greek text or is expressed only through trans-

³ The "comrade" to whom Plutarch addresses this remark is Pemptides, who at 756A posed the question to which Plutarch's discourse on Eros' divinity is an answer. For the text of Emp. fr.17 see H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*⁶ I (Dublin and Zürich 1951) 315–18; G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge 1957) 326–28; and C. J. de Vogel, *Greek Philosophy: A Collection of Texts* I (Leiden 1963) 54–55. The translations of Ettore Bignone (*Empedocle* [Turin 1916] 403–09) and Kathleen Freeman (*Ancilla to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers* [Oxford 1948] 53–54) are based, respectively, on Diels³ and Diels-Kranz⁵, though Bignone introduces his own textual revisions (see his remark on p. ix). Recent and well worth consulting is the translation of fr.17 with an accompanying philological commentary by W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* II (Cambridge 1965) 152–55. To date, only the first of Jean Bollack's three volumes on Empedocles has appeared (*Empédocle I: Introduction à l'ancienne physique* [Paris 1965]). Bollack indicates (see 331) that the second will offer a complete Empedocles bibliography.

⁴ Wilamowitz apparently never published a justification of this conjecture, which is not mentioned in the discussion of the text of the *Amat.* in his *Kleine Schriften* IV (Berlin 1962) 206–07 (= "Lesefrüchte," *Hermes* 40 [1905] 152–53). The conjecture must have been either imparted to Hubert in conversation or else gleaned from the margin of Wilamowitz's copy of the *Amat.* (see Hubert's Praefatio to vol. IV of the Teubner *Mor.*, p. xxiii).

⁵ The Greek texts of Hubert, Flacelière and Helmbold are otherwise in agreement, except that Helmbold follows Diels-Kranz (*supra* n.3), Kirk and Raven (*supra* n.3), and de Vogel (*supra* n.3) in printing δέρκευ in Plutarch's Empedocles quotation, in place of Hubert's and Flacelière's δέρκου. I have been unable to consult the *Amat.* commentary in A. W. Winkelmann's *Plutarchi Opera Moralia Selecta* I (Turici 1836).

⁶ The interpretation of Bollack (*supra* n.3) 167 n.1 also presumes a καί, as does the translation of Moses Hadas (*On Love, the Family, and the Good Life: Selected Essays of Plutarch* [New York 1957] 25): "It is to Love, my friend [not merely Friendship], that you should suppose the familiar lines of Empedocles to refer." (The brackets are Hadas'.) Wilhelm Sieveking's *Plutarch, über Liebe und Ehe* (Munich 1941), which includes an *Amat.* translation highly regarded by Flacelière (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.1] 38), I have been unable to consult. Of the reviewers of Flacelière's and Helmbold's editions of the *Amat.*, only D. A. Russell, in his review of the latter (*CR* 12 [1962] 308), has remarked the influence of Wilamowitz's unprinted <καί> on the accompanying translation.

lation, must be to prevent Plutarch from identifying Eros with Empedocles' *φιλότης*.

My initial purpose in this study will be to establish the likelihood of such an identification and, therefore, the necessity—since the burden of proof here rests on the emender—of rejecting the conjecture.⁷ I will then attempt to demonstrate that in citing Empedocles and making the identification Plutarch was definably influenced by Aristotle's discussion of Empedocles at *Metaphysics* 1.4, 984b32–985a7 and that the immediate source of at least the quotation, which was partly misinterpreted by Plutarch, was his own notebooks (*hypomnēmata*). (That Plutarch, and not some obscure or unknown intermediary, made his own collection of the earlier material he incorporates into a given work I accept as a secure and viable base for Plutarchan source criticism.)⁸ To my knowledge Plutarch's debt to the *Metaphysics* passage has gone essentially undetected, and its nature remains unexplored.⁹

But first a preliminary point. Plutarch's *παλαιοίς* in the passage quoted above, no matter what the antecedent of *τοῖσιν* in the first line of his Empedocles citation, is grammatically masculine and refers to the gods. This is initially indicated by the reference to Eros' position among the gods (*ἐν θεοίς*), which ends 756c and precedes directly the quoted passage, and is firmly established by the reference, which immediately succeeds *παλαιοίς*, to demanding "proof for each of them" (the antecedent of *ᾧν* must be *παλαιοίς*) and attacking every shrine and every altar. Corroboration is furnished by Plutarch's use of the goddess

⁷ The only reviewer of Hubert's edition to question the conjecture was L. Castiglioni, *Gnomon* 17 (1941) 254, who classified it as superfluous on the grounds that for Plutarch Eros and Empedocles' *φιλότης* are the same. Castiglioni's treatment of the involved passage, however, is very brief, and he adduces no supporting evidence.

⁸ As do Flacelière, in notices to each biography in the Budé edition (1957—); Carl Theander, "Plutarch und die Geschichte," *BLund* (1950–51) 1–86; and Philip A. Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods: An Analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1965) esp. 126–38, where concluding surveys of the vast number of *MV* sources are offered. Cf. my article, "The Character of Plutarch's Themistocles," *TAPA* 92 (1961) 326 and n.2. For a survival of the now antiquated explanation of Plutarch's relation to his sources through one intermediary, see Ida Calabi Limentani, ed. *Plutarchi Vita Aristidis* (Firenze 1964) xiv–xvii (discussion of the influence of Herodotus and Thucydides on the *Aristides*) and my review of this edition, *AJP* 88 (1967) 117. Limentani's introduction and commentary, however, are generally of high quality, and she cogently explains (p. xvii) the influence of *Gorgias* 519a and 526a–b on *Aristides* 25.9.

⁹ Harold Cherniss vaguely and briefly hinted at such a debt in a note to *Mor.* 926f–927a in his Loeb ed. of the *De Fac.* (XII [1957] 84–85 n.c). Arthur Fairbanks, "On Plutarch's Quotations from the Early Greek Philosophers," *TAPA* 28 (1897) 75–87, lists (86) the Empedocles quotation at *Amat.* 756d but nowhere discusses it.

Aphrodite to illustrate his point that it is impossible to exercise discrimination when assailing “them” (756D [at end]–757A), for “if then we deprive Eros of his customary honors, not even those of Aphrodite remain firm” (756F). Moreover, Plutarch concludes the illustration with the summarizing statement that almost none of the other *θεοί* has escaped such foolish slander (757A).

Plutarch's Identification of Eros with Φιλότης

That Plutarch regarded Eros as a traditional deity who belonged in the same category as Aphrodite and the other traditional *θεοί* is in evidence both within the context of the Empedocles citation (756A–758c: from Pemptides' question about Eros' godhead through Plutarch's assertion that Eros is the companion of the Muses, the Graces and Aphrodite) as well as throughout the demonstration of Eros divinity (756A–766D). For example, shortly before the citation Plutarch asks a question in which he places Zeus, Athena and Eros in a single group (756c); and soon after the citation Eros is paired first with Aphrodite (756D–757A), then with Ares (757A–B), and finally by implication is put into the same category as Aphrodite, Hermes, the Muses, Athena and Ares (757B–C). Later, he is placed on a par with Apollo, Dionysus and the Muses (758E–759D) and compared in detail with Aphrodite and Ares (759D–762E). That Plutarch, however, did not hesitate to identify at least Aphrodite with a pre-Socratic *αἰτία* (or *ἀρχή*) is shown in proximity to the Empedocles citation at *Amatorius* 756E–F, where Parmenides' procreative *δαίμων* is designated as Aphrodite.

Plutarch there writes:

διὸ Παρμενίδης (fr. 13) μὲν ἀποφαίνει τὸν Ἔρωτα τῶν Ἀφροδίτης ἔργων πρεσβύτατον ἐν τῇ Κοσμογονίᾳ γράφων
ἑπρώτιστον μὲν Ἔρωτα θεῶν μητίσατο πάντων'.¹⁰

He thus takes Parmenides' *θεῶν πάντων* in the sense of “of all the other gods” and treats Aphrodite as the subject of *μητίσατο*. Simplicius, however, who among his comments to Aristotle's *Physics* 1.2, 184b15 has furnished the most reliable and informative of the ancient citations of

¹⁰ I follow Flacelière's ed. (*supra* n.1), as against Hubert's Teubner and Helmbold's Loeb edd., in capitalizing *Κοσμογονία*. For the Parmenides line (fr.13) see Diels-Kranz (*supra* n.3) I.243; Mario Untersteiner, *Parmenide: Testimonianze e frammenti* (Florence 1958) 160–63; and Leonardo Tarán, *Parmenides* (Princeton 1965) 167–68.

this verse, reveals that not Aphrodite but Parmenides' procreative δαίμων is the subject of *μητίσατο*. After introducing a Parmenides quotation, which terminates with a line referring to the δαίμων ἢ πάντα κυβερνᾶ, Simplicius immediately adds (p.39, lines 12–19):

ταύτην [the *daimōn*] καὶ θεῶν αἰτίαν εἶναί φησι [Parmenides] λέγων
 πρῶτιστον μὲν Ἔρωτα θεῶν μητίσατο πάντων
 καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.¹¹

Nowhere among the extant fragments does Parmenides designate the δαίμων as Aphrodite.¹² If Plutarch identified a Parmenidean αἰτία with Aphrodite, why should he not also identify an Empedoclean one (φιλότης) with Eros? It will presently be shown that the difference in gender between φιλότης and Eros is not a significant factor.

In the *Amatorius* passage just discussed (756E–F) Plutarch has with care and precision revised the treatment that he found of the Parmenides verse (fr.13) in Plato's *Symposium* (178B) and Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (1.4, 984b23–30). In the process he has eliminated his sources' vagueness as to the subject of Parmenides' *μητίσατο* by indicating that it is Aphrodite and has recognized Aristotle's mistake of classifying Parmenides' Eros instead of his procreative δαίμων (= Aphrodite for Plutarch) as the αἰτία.¹³ It is reasonable, therefore, to conclude that Plutarch's designation of the δαίμων as Aphrodite is deliberate rather than accidental, especially since it occurs also at *De Facie* 926F–927A, where Empedocles' φιλότης, Parmenides' Aphrodite and Hesiod's Eros are classified as only different designations for the creative force in nature. (This classification will soon be discussed in more detail, but it should be indicated now that the speaker is

¹¹ Hermann Diels (ed.), *Simplicii in Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor priores commentaria* (Comm. in Arist. Graeca IX [Berlin 1882]). Cf. p.34 lines 14–16. That it is correct to regard the δαίμων as the subject of *μητίσατο* has been pointed out by, e.g., Karl Reinhardt, *Parmenides* (Bonn 1916) 17–18; Eduard Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* I.1 (Leipzig 1919) 705 and n.3; Untersteiner (*supra* n.10) lxix–lxx; and Tarán (*supra* n.10) 249–50 and n.56.

¹² Untersteiner (*supra* n.10) lxviii–lxix lists as her “personificazioni” Δίκη, Θέμις, Ἀληθείη, Ἀνάγκη, Μοῖρα and Πειθώ. See, however, Otto Gilbert, “Die δαίμων des Parmenides,” *Archiv GeschPhilos* 20 (1907) 37.

¹³ On these points and for a full examination of Plutarch's debt to the *Symp.* and the *Metaph.* at *Amat.* 756E–F, see my forthcoming article in *AJP*, “*Amatorius* 756E–F: Plutarch's Citation of Parmenides and Hesiod.” In adorning his argument by citing Parm. fr.13 and Hes. *Theog.* 116–22, Plutarch is following both Plato's *Phaedrus* (*Symp.* 178B) and Arist. *Metaph.* 1.4, 984b23–30, each of whom had cited these same verses.

Plutarch's brother Lamprias, who, as both narrator and chief interlocutor of the *De Facie* and a champion of the Academic against the Stoic viewpoint in this dialogue, is a likely representative of Plutarchan ideas and modes of expression.)¹⁴ It is significant that shortly before his reference to *φιλότης*, Aphrodite and Eros, Lamprias virtually—and deliberately—equates a pre-Socratic *αἰτία*, Empedocles' *νεῖκος*, with the Titans and Giants (926D–E):

So look out and reflect, good sir, lest . . . you contrive a dissolution of the cosmos and bring upon things the 'Strife' (*νεῖκος*) of Empedocles—or rather lest you arouse against nature the ancient Titans and Giants and long to look upon that legendary and dreadful disorder and discord . . .¹⁵

It is noteworthy, moreover, that Plutarch prefers, at least in the *Amatorius*, to regard Hesiod's Eros rather than Parmenides' *δαίμων* (= Aphrodite) as the creative *αἰτία* in nature, for he writes at 756F:

But Hesiod, in my opinion, was more scientific [than Parmenides] when he depicted Eros as the first-born of them all, in order to make him indispensable for the generation of all things.¹⁶

(Though Plutarch is, in fact, here comparing Hesiod's with Parmenides' classification of Eros, implicit in the comparison is a preference for regarding Eros instead of Aphrodite as the creative *αἰτία*.)¹⁷

¹⁴ On Lamprias' role in the *De Fac.* see Cherniss' Introd. to his Loeb ed. (*Mor.* XII [LCL 1957] 3–5, 14–18) and *cf. infra* n.30. For Lamprias' Academic, anti-Stoic attitude see *De Fac.* 922F and 923F–928D *passim*.

¹⁵ Transl. Cherniss (*supra* n.14) 82–83.

¹⁶ Transl. Helmbold (*Mor.* IX [LCL 1961] 351). Plutarch's Hesiod reference must be to *Theog.* 116–22. *Cf.* Hubert's ed. of *Amat.* 756F (*Mor.* IV [Teubner, Leipzig 1938] 356); Flacelière, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 129 n.48; and Helmbold, *op.cit.* 351 n.f. Outside of *Theog.* 116–22 the only reference to the god Eros among Hesiod's works and fragments is at *Theog.* 201, where it is briefly mentioned that he accompanied Aphrodite. The *ἔρως* of *Theog.* 910 is not a proper noun.

Plutarch does not contradict himself with regard to Eros' origin when he later (*Amat.* 765D–E) credits Alcaeus with having grasped the truth when he designated Zephyrus and Iris as Eros' parents. (The Alcaeus fragment quoted by Plutarch is 13B [Bergk], 8 [Diehl], or Z3 [Lobel–Page]; *cf.* Denys Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* [Oxford 1955] 269–72.) A comparison of the Hesiod reference (*Amat.* 756F) with the exegesis of the Alcaeus quotation (*Amat.* 765E–F) reveals that for Plutarch each poet grasped a different kind of truth about the function and activities of Eros.

¹⁷ The *Amat.*, or *'Ἐρωτικός*, is a tribute to the god Eros. Throughout the dialogue Eros is carefully distinguished from Aphrodite (752A–B, 759E–F, 764D, 768E–769A), and for Plutarch

Nevertheless, Plutarch did identify the Parmenidean *δαίμων* with Aphrodite; and, had he agreed with Parmenides rather than Hesiod, he would undoubtedly have stated his preference for classifying Aphrodite instead of Eros as the creative agent and, in turn, identified Aphrodite rather than Eros with Empedocles' *φιλότης*. This last point (as well as Plutarch's interest in the function assigned to *φιλότης*, Aphrodite and Eros by the pre-Socratics rather than in their respective genders) becomes absolutely clear at *De Facie* 926F–927A, where Empedocles' *φιλότης*, Parmenides' Aphrodite and Hesiod's Eros are classified as only individual versions or definitions of *τὸ ἱμερτόν*, the single, creative force that brought order out of chaos in nature.¹⁸ Both the identification of either Aphrodite or Eros with *φιλότης* and Plutarch's indifference to Eros' masculinity are implicit in this classification; and it is not surprising to find Eros explicitly equated with *φιλότης* in the *Amatorius*, since this dialogue is devoted to a glorification of Eros at the expense of Aphrodite. Indeed, since Plutarch appeals to Empedocles for the purpose of giving authority to his own assertion of the god's antiquity, the citation is contextually meaningless unless it fulfills this purpose, which is possible only if Eros is identical with *φιλότης*.

Finally, Plutarch's explanatory statement, introduced by a causal *γάρ*, that although Eros is not visible (*δραστός*), we are to conceive of him (*δοξαστός ἡμῶν*) as among the earliest deities, is consistent with a preceding identification: it relates chiasmatically to the second line of the Empedocles couplet and may be viewed as simultaneously an exegesis of the couplet and a vindication of identifying Eros with *φιλότης*. Wilamowitz's *καί* is, therefore, gratuitous, and all traces of it should be removed from the text, translation and interpretation of *Amatorius* 756D. The clause immediately following the Empedocles quotation (*ταῦτ' . . . Ἐρωτος*) may be translated quite literally: "you must realize that this is spoken about Eros."

his position and function are far more exalted than hers. He is the god of love (757C–E, 759), both pederastic and heterosexual (758B, 759A, 766E–767B), who leads the lover and beloved to *φιλία* and *ἀρετή* (757D–758D) and teaches the lover to understand divine beauty (764E–766B). Aphrodite's patronage is limited by Plutarch to carnal desire and *ἡδονή* (756E, 759E, 769A–B), and she is anathema to pederasty (768E).

¹⁸ After some unnecessary hesitation Bollack, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 167 n.1, gives a correct explanation of this passage: "Il semble pourtant que *Philotès* évoque . . . le poème d'Empédocle, *Aphrodite*, la cosmogonie de Parménide, et *Éros*, la *Théogonie*."

Aristotle's Metaphysics and Plutarch's Hypomnēmata

Since his debt in the *Amatorius* to the discussion of Empedocles at *Metaphysics* 1.4, 984b32–985a7 has gone essentially undetected, it should be stressed at this point that Plutarch's general knowledge of Aristotle is not subject to doubt¹⁹ and that the *Metaphysics* itself has a substantial entry in Helmbold and O'Neils' *Plutarch's Quotations* (APA Monograph 19 [Baltimore 1959]). Their lists indicate (see p.10) that Plutarch was influenced by *Metaphysics* 1.3, 983b23ff in the *Quaestiones Convivales* (6, 687A) and *De Primo Frigido* (954E), and by 1.5, 986a15ff in the *Quaestiones Romanae* (270A), *De Iside et Osiride* (370E), *De E apud Delphos* (388A) and *De Defectu Oraculorum* (428F). Plutarch, therefore, shows acquaintance with at least parts of the *Metaphysics* shortly before and after the passage under consideration.

There is an impressive preliminary sign, moreover, that *Metaphysics* 1.4 influenced the composition of *Amatorius* 756D: both Aristotle and Plutarch, in proximity to and direct connection with their references to Empedocles, cite the same set of verses by Parmenides and Hesiod (at 984b23–30 and 756E–F respectively). Aristotle does so in the midst of his account of early attempts to define an efficient cause; and the citation, which he introduces into his remarks about the Parmenidean-Hesiodic Eros, is followed almost immediately by an analysis of Empedocles' contribution to the problem of efficient causation, the concept of *φιλία* and *νείκος* (984b32–985a7). At *Amatorius* 756C–F (*τί οὖν . . . μετέσχη γενέσεως*), however, Plutarch is arguing that Eros is a primal deity, and both the Empedocles and the Parmenides-Hesiod citations give authority to this argument. Although Aristotle and Plutarch refer to these three philosopher-poets for different purposes, and although Aristotle does not introduce a quotation from Empedocles while Plutarch does, it is significant that Plutarch's Empedocles

¹⁹ See Ziegler (*supra* n.1) 922; Helmbold and O'Neil (*supra* n.16) 8–12; G. Verbeke, "Plutarch and the Development of Aristotle," *Aristotle and Plato in the Mid-fourth Century* (= *St. Gr. et Lat. Gothob.* 11 [1960]) 236–47; and S. G. Etheridge, *Plutarch's De Virtute Morali: A Study in Extra-Peripatetic Aristotelianism* (Diss. Harvard 1961), summarized in *HSCP* 66 (1962) 252–54. Werner Jaeger, "Ἀπαρχαί," *Hermes* 64 (1929) 22, and Aristotle: *Fundamentals of the History of His Development*, transl. Richard Robinson (Oxford 1948) 36–7, stressed that Plutarch perceived a doctrinal evolution in Aristotle's thought, and Verbeke set forth in detail a similar thesis. For two specific examples of the influence of Aristotle on the *Mor.* see H. L. Tracy, "Aristotle on Aesthetic Pleasure," *CP* 41 (1946) 43–46. Even the skeptical Volkmann, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) II.20, felt compelled to admit: "Natürlich hat er [Plutarch] die Philosophie des Aristoteles gekannt und aristotelische Schriften gelesen."

quotation is from a fragment in which the latter is setting forth his concept of *φιλότης* and *νεῖκος*—the very concept discussed by Aristotle in the *Metaphysics* passage—and that Empedocles gives an explicit description of *νεῖκος* in the verse (19) directly preceding those quoted by Plutarch.

It is also significant that when, two generations after Plutarch, Sextus Empiricus summarized expressly Aristotle's remarks about Parmenides, Hesiod and Empedocles within *Metaphysics* 1.4, 984b23–985a32 (*Adv. Physicos* 1 [= *Adv. Dogmaticos* 3 or *Adv. Mathematicos* 9] 7–10) and augmented his summary with an illustrative quotation from Empedocles (10), he chose fr.17.18–20. In other words, the last of the three verses quoted by Sextus is the first in Plutarch's Empedocles quotation. And it is certain that Sextus related his illustrative quotation directly to the *Metaphysics* passage under consideration, for he cites Aristotle by name as his source (7) and summarizes him closely.

Since it is demonstrable that Plutarch's citation of Parmenides and Hesiod at *Amatorius* 756E–F was notably and significantly influenced by Aristotle's citation of the same pair and, indeed, of the same verses,²⁰ and since Aristotle's discussion of Empedocles follows close upon his citation, Plutarch's indebtedness to the *Metaphysics* with respect to his citation of Empedocles seems inevitable and must be raised from the level of speculation to that of probability. If, moreover, a plausible explanation of the manner and extent of the postulated borrowing can be offered, probability in turn approaches certainty. Such an explanation, I believe, can be offered.

Aristotle claims (*Metaphysics* 1.4, 984b23–30) that Hesiod and Parmenides were among the first to recognize a type of efficient cause;²¹ for both treated Eros as an *ἀρχή* in things, as a kinetic and synactic *αἰτία*. A Parmenides verse (fr.13) and a portion of *Theogony* 116–22 are quoted

²⁰ See my article (*supra* n.13). There are within Plutarch's reference to Parmenides and Hesiod (*Amat.* 756E–F) certain elements that are derived simultaneously from *Metaph.* 1.4, 984b23–30 and Pl. *Symp.* 178A7–c3. The *Metaph.* alone, however, is responsible for other elements: notably, Plutarch's placing of Parmenides before Hesiod and his classification of Hesiod's Eros as the generative force in nature.

²¹ The *τὸ τοιοῦτον* of *Metaph.* 1.4, 984b23–24 refers only to a notion of efficient causality, as is indicated by Harold Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy* (Baltimore 1935) 222, and especially Tarán (*supra* n.10) 286 n.17. For a somewhat broader interpretation of this phrase see H. Bonitz, *Aristotelis Metaphysica* II (Bonn 1849) 72, and W. D. Ross, *Aristotle's Metaphysics* I (Oxford 1924) 136.

in support of this claim.²² It is presently immaterial that Aristotle has mistakenly classified Parmenides' Eros rather than his procreative *δαίμων* (= Aphrodite for Plutarch) as the *αἰτία* and that Plutarch has conscientiously avoided this mistake.²³ (At *Amatorius* 756E–F he has assigned Hesiod's Eros a greater degree of antiquity than Parmenides', classified only the former as an *αἰτία*, and specified that Aphrodite is the subject of Parmenides' *μητίσατο*; and at *De Facie* 926F–927A he has classified Empedocles' *φιλότης*, Parmenides' Aphrodite [not his Eros] and Hesiod's Eros as no more than various designations for τὸ ἱμερτόν, the creative force that produced order in nature.) The point is that Aristotle classifies the Hesiodic–Parmenidean Eros as an efficient cause and then (984b32–985a7, cf. 985a29–31) goes on to explain that Empedocles realized that there was in nature the bad as well as the good and, therefore, recognized an efficient cause of each, *φιλία* of the latter and *νεῖκος* of the former.²⁴ It could readily be assumed, both because of the conceptual similarity of Eros and *φιλία* and because of the statement directly following the discussion of the earlier Eros and introducing the analysis of Empedocles' *φιλία-νεῖκος* concept (“But since it was obvious that there is also in nature the antithesis of τὰ ἀγαθὰ...”), that what in effect Empedocles did, according to Aristotle, was to leave the Hesiodic–Parmenidean Eros under the guise of *φιλία* as the cause of the good and to postulate *νεῖκος* as the cause of the bad. In other words, it is reasonable to conclude that

²² For the problem of Eros' rôle in the *Theog.* see *supra* n.16; Paul Mazon's introduction to his Budé ed. of Hesiod (Paris 1928) 27; Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos* (Heidelberg 1934) 109–13 and 124–26; Kurt von Fritz et al., *Hésiode et son influence* (= *Entretiens Hardt* 7 [1960]) 48–50 and 58; and M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 195–96 (comments to v.120).

²³ Cherniss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.21) 227 n.43, and Tarán, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) 285–86, are, in my opinion, properly critical of Aristotle's exegesis of his Parmenides–Hesiod citation. West, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 195–96, however, is sympathetic.

²⁴ I am not concerned here with the correctness of Aristotle's interpretation of Empedocles, only with the effect on Plutarch of what he says about Empedocles' *φιλία-νεῖκος* concept at *Metaph.* 1.4, 984b32–985a7. For Aristotle's overall treatment of this concept see, e.g. Bonitz (*supra* n.21) II.73; Bignone (*supra* n.3) 204; Cherniss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.21) 188–93 and 230–34; Kirk and Raven (*supra* n.3) 330–31 nn.1–2; Guthrie (*supra* n.3) II.171 n.2, 215–16, 275 n.1; F. Solmsen, “Love and Strife in Empedocles' Cosmology,” *Phronesis* 10 (1965) 130–32; and D. O'Brien, “Empedocles' Cosmic Cycle,” *CQ* n.s.17 (1967) 29–40 *passim*. The most recent comprehensive study of Aristotle's treatment of Empedocles is that of Bollack (*supra* n.3) 8–9, 11–93, 97–99, 102–06. But see also Gustav Adolf Seeck, “Empedocles B17,9–13 (=26,8–12), B8, B100 bei Aristoteles,” *Hermes* 95 (1967) 28–53, who by means of three selected examples discusses the basic problems of Aristotle's interpretation.

Aristotle virtually identified the earlier Eros and Empedocles' *φιλία*.²⁵

This, I would suggest, is just what Plutarch concluded, and I would offer the following explanation of the manner and extent of his debt to *Metaphysics* 1.4, 984b23–985a7. Plutarch studied this passage and decided to make use of material he found there when he composed *Amatorius* 756c–f. (It is difficult to determine whether he worked directly from a copy of the *Metaphysics* or from notes taken at an earlier reading. In the last paragraph of this section evidence will be presented to support the latter point of view.) Typically, however, he freely modified what he borrowed and molded it to suit his own ideas and purposes.²⁶ His most obvious borrowing was the Parmenides–Hesiod citation, and I have elsewhere (*supra* n.13) explained in detail his thorough revision of this citation in the areas of style, exegesis and purpose before he introduced it into the *Amatorius*. Noteworthy for present interests is a stylistic revision: Plutarch did not hesitate to substitute a brief but interpretive prose summary (“‘But Hesiod, in my opinion, was more scientific when he depicted Eros as the firstborn of them all . . . ,” 756f)²⁷ for Aristotle’s *Theogony* quotation. Conversely, in the case of his Empedocles reference Plutarch has substituted a quotation for a prose summary. Also, he has separated Empedocles from Parmenides–Hesiod and reversed Aristotle’s order of reference. Contextually, Plutarch has employed the Empedocles reference for different purposes; for Aristotle is writing a history of the concept of efficient causation, while Plutarch is striving to establish both the fact

²⁵ As does Cherniss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.21) 222, in his exegesis of *Metaph.* 1.4, 984b23–985a10: “Some notion of an efficient cause might be attributed to Hesiod and Parmenides, for they both give an important place to Love in their cosmogonies as if they saw the need of a principle which sets in motion and combines things. This suggestion is meant only to serve as an introduction to Empedocles’ treatment of causality, for he made ‘Love’ an efficient cause but, since there is evil and disorder as well as good and order in the world, he introduced as a separate cause of the former a second force called ‘Strife.’” Cf. Aristotle’s classification at *Metaph.* 1.4, 984b29–31 of the Parmenidean–Hesiodic Eros as an *αἰτία—ἥτις κινήσει καὶ συνάξει τὰ πράγματα*—with his later remark about Empedocles’ *φιλία—αἰτία γούν ἐστὶν αὐτῆ τοῦ ἐν εἶναι πᾶσιν* (*Metaph.* 3.4, 1001a14–15).

²⁶ For other examples of Plutarch’s creative and independent use of his sources see Flacelière, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 25–27; Cherniss’ *Introd.* to the *De Fac.* (*supra* n.9) 23–26; my article (*supra* n.8); and Stadter (*supra* n.8) 138–40. Such independence even caused Hirzel, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) II.233–36, to doubt the Plutarchan authorship of the *Amat.*

²⁷ Transl. Helmbold, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.16). The gender of *πάντων* (‘of them all’) is uncertain. It is masculine if it refers to the preceding Parmenides quotation, neuter if it looks ahead to the following purpose clause.

and the antiquity of Eros' godhead. And when Plutarch equates Eros with *φιλότης* and adds his exegetical defense of the equation (*ταῦτ' ... παλαιοῖς*), he generalizes the Eros of the *Metaphysics* passage by disassociating him from Parmenides and Hesiod. Yet the fact remains that the equation can reasonably be attributed to Plutarch's interpretation of that same passage.

The attribution becomes even more compelling when one considers the secondary problems that it helps to solve. First, Empedocles' *ἐν τοῖσιν* (v.20) refers only to the four elements just mentioned ("fire and water and earth and the immense height of air," v.18), while Plutarch's restatement of this phrase (*ἐν τοῖς πάνυ παλαιοῖς*) refers to the traditional *θεοί*. Plutarch has thus misinterpreted the Empedoclean phrase because he was unaware of its immediately preceding context. And even if the misinterpretation is regarded as only apparent and justified on the grounds that Empedocles elsewhere personifies the roots as deities (frgg.6, 96 and 98), the case against Plutarch's consultation of the verses directly before his quotation remains just as strong; for the roots are *not* personified in v.18, nor, for that matter, throughout fr.17.²⁸ Also, by identifying Eros with *φιλότης* Plutarch indicates that he was either ignorant of or chose to disregard both the couplet's succeeding context, where Empedocles says that men have named *φιλότης* Aphrodite and Gethosyne (v.24), and Empedocles' clear identification of *φιλότης* with Aphrodite at other places (frgg.22 and 71; cf. frgg.73 and 98). Choice rather than ignorance is a possibility, since Plutarch has at *De Facie* 926F–927A equated Empedocles' *φιλότης*, Parmenides' Aphrodite and Hesiod's Eros each with *τὸ ἡμερτόν* and thereby virtually eliminated any conceptual distinction among the three. Ignorance, however, at least of immediate context if not of Empedocles' identifications in other passages, seems likely, because that is the sure explanation of Plutarch's misinterpretation of *ἐν τοῖσιν*.²⁹

²⁸ Rabinowitz recognized Plutarch's error and accused him "of gross misrepresentation (or extreme irony)." See Helmbold (*supra* n.16) 349 n.a, who quotes Rabinowitz. I would suggest instead (see *infra*) inadvertent misrepresentation. On the problem of Empedocles' mythological designations for the four roots see, e.g., Bignone (*supra* n.3) 542–44; Kirk and Raven (*supra* n.3) 324 n.1; and Guthrie (*supra* n.3) II.141–46. Guthrie conveniently summarizes (144–46) both ancient and modern opinions.

²⁹ Plutarch also misinterpreted Empedocles at *Mor.* 952B, where he claims that the poet-philosopher always (*ἐκάστοτε*) designated *τὸ πῦρ* as *νεῖκος οὐλόμενον* and *τὸ ὑγρόν* as *σχεδύνη φιλότης*; see Diels–Kranz (*supra* n.3) I.318 (note to 31B19), and Helmbold, ed. *De Prim.Frig.* (*Mor.* XII [LCL 1957]) 266–67 n.b. If 31B 27 is correctly handled by Diels–Kranz I.323–24 (cf.

(There is no evidence that Empedocles ever personified ἔρως, let alone identified Eros with φιλότης.) Yet the problem of the misinterpretation, as well as that of the non-Empedoclean identification, are resolved if we postulate the influence of the *Metaphysics* to account for the identification and an *out-of-context* quotation gleaned from Plutarch's notebooks to explain the misinterpretation. It is certainly plausible that Plutarch would associate fr.17.20–21 of Empedocles with *Metaphysics* 1.4, 984b32–985a7; for, as we have already seen, another ancient writer, Sextus Empiricus, made a similar association not long after Plutarch.

There is, moreover, substantial evidence that Plutarch composed from such notebooks and in the manner suggested. In the introduction to *De Tranquillitate Animi*, he explains that he hastily composed the following essay on εὐθυμία from his *hypomnēmata* on the subject (464E–F). And at *De Cohibenda Ira* 457D–E, a revealing statement is made by Fundanus, who is Plutarch's spokesman in this dialogue and may reasonably be supposed to reflect its author's own thoughts and practices.³⁰ Fundanus indicates that it is his practice—and, therefore, also Plutarch's—to collect τὰ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τυράννων as well as τὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων. What follows shows that τὰ in each instance encompasses both 'sayings of' and 'anecdotes about'. In the former category belong the quotations of Empedocles in the same dialogue (464B), at *De Tranquillitate Animi* 474B, and, it might be added, at *Amatorius* 756D.

Freeman [*supra* n.3] 56), Plutarch has mistakenly assigned the Empedoclean lines quoted at *De Fac.* 926E to the description of the reign of νεῖκος. For a vindication of Plutarch, however, see Bignone (*supra* n.3) 220–22, 421–22 (nn. to frgg. 26a and 27) and 599–605; and Cherniss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.9) 82–83 n.c. The depth and extent of Plutarch's knowledge of Empedocles is difficult to assess. Despite the sure and possible misinterpretations remarked here, Plutarch wrote an *Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα* in ten books (not extant, no. 43 in the Lamprias Catalogue) and quotes Empedocles abundantly (see Ziegler [*supra* n.1] 696–702 and 767). Also, Plutarch presents a reasonable and occasionally subtle analysis of Empedocles' thought in the *Adv. Col.* (*Mor.* 1107D–1127E), as has been indicated by Rolf Westman, *Plutarch gegen Kolotes* (= *Acta Philos. Fenn.* 7 [1955]) 243–48. Helmbold and O'Neil's compilation (*supra* n.16), though attesting Plutarch's extensive use of Empedocles, projects a distorted image of its frequency, since the non-Plutarchan *De Plac.Philos.* (*Mor.* 874D–911C) is catalogued along with the authentic corpus.

³⁰ On Fundanus' rôle and his reference to collections see Ziegler (*supra* n.1) 772–74 and D. A. Russell, "On Reading Plutarch's *Moralia*," *G&R* 15 (1968) 140–46, esp. 143; and cf. Flacelière's conclusion that Theon, the name of the chief interlocutor in the *De Pyth.Orac.*, is a pseudonym for Plutarch himself (*Dialogue sur les Oracles de la Pythie* [*supra* n.2] 13–14). This is not to claim, however, that Fundanus loses all his individuality in the *De Coh.Ira* (see Hirzel [*supra* n.1] II.169 and n.1; and Russell, *op.cit.* 141 and 145).

Hypomnēmata also offer a ready explanation for the occurrence in different works of the same quotation, as in the case of Empedocles fr.76.3 (*Quaestiones Convivales* 618B and *De Facie* 927F) and fr.101.1 (*Quaestiones Naturales* 917E and *De Curiositate* 520F) and of Euripides fr.663 (*Quaestiones Convivales* 622c and *Amatorius* 762B).³¹ As an *immediate* source for the citations and exegeses within *Amatorius* 756C–F I would, therefore, recommend one or more of the rubrics in Plutarch's *hypomnēmata*.³² Certainly the Empedocles quotation of 756D was taken from them, and the influence of the *Metaphysics* on Plutarch's interpretation of this quotation may well have been exerted through the same medium.

The *Amatorius* passage, then, offers further evidence of the free and independent manner in which Plutarch handles his sources and evidence, moreover, of the significant importance of his *hypomnēmata* in studies of Plutarchan source criticism.³³

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL

January, 1969

³¹ I suggest that the Empedocles quotations in the following *Mor.* passages were taken without regard to context from Plutarch's *hypomnēmata*: 93B, 95A–B, 171C, 418C, 433B, 464B, 607E, 685F, 756E, 777C, 820F, 830F, 920C, 998C, 1006F, 1103F.

³² Hubert, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 5–6, suggests that the references to Eros at 756C–F were inserted into a compositional unit (756A–757C) that Plutarch found in a source or had previously written himself. This suggestion is at once too simple and fails to consider the possibility of *hypomnēmata*. To my knowledge Plutarch's *hypomnēmata* are the subject of only incidental references in modern works, e.g., Stadter (*supra* n.8) 138 and R. H. Barrow, *Plutarch and His Times* (Bloomington and London 1967) 109–10 and 152–53.

³³ I wish to express my thanks to Edward N. O'Neil for graciously sending me photographic copies of a number of pertinent entries from his forthcoming Plutarch indices, one to the Loeb edition of the *Mor.* and the other of the entire Plutarchan corpus.