## THE CURRICULUM VITAE OF DURIS OF SAMOS

Duris of Samos is significant enough, among lost Hellenistic historians, for a paragraph or two to be devoted to him in most works on the history or literature of the period. For the last two centuries such paragraphs have been saying among other things that Duris went to Athens and studied under Theophrastus. But Athenaeus 128a, the source cited for this statement, does not support it unless a doubtful conjecture is admitted to the text.

To historians¹ Duris' putative student years are no more than a chronological peg on which to hang his literary and political life. To literary critics they assume more importance, for Duris appears to have been at the centre of a conflict between the 'tragic' and the more critical kinds of historical writing.² The received opinion that Duris studied under Theophrastus has therefore led to a long and inconclusive debate as to whether his writing is in accordance with the Peripatetic teaching that he must have received³ or in conflict with it.⁴ Those who argue the former can go on to attempt a reconstruction of Theophrastus' lest *On History*.

The two really detailed modern studies of Duris, which naturally make much of his studies, are on opposing sides in the debate. Louis Okin, a chapter from whose thesis<sup>5</sup> is available in print, emphasises the agreements between Duris and the Peripatetics: 'Duris probably shared the feelings of his fellow students of the Lyceum and was anxious to expose Philoxenus' credulity.' Robert Kebric, on the other hand, observes that Duris does not in his surviving fragments display consistent agreement with the teachings of Aristotle and Theophrastus, or with the views of their students. Kebric deals boldly with very limited evidence to provide a historical background. The footnotes attached to the following quotations (from pp. 5–6 and 31 of Kebric's *In the Shadow of Macedon*) are mine. 'Athenaeus reveals that both [Duris] and Lynceus went to Athens to study under Theophrastus, but the circumstances and the date of their arrival have remained obscure... While Duris is silent, corroborating testimony from Lynceus demonstrates beyond doubt his presence in Athens only after 307 B.C.: he mentions his attendance at a banquet given by Antigonus to celebrate the festival

- <sup>1</sup> E.g. J. P. Barron, 'The Tyranny of Duris of Samos', *CR* n.s. 12 (1962), 189–92: 'Together with his brother Lynceus... Duris studied under Theophrastus... Master of the Academy (*sic*) for thirty-five years from 322/1.'
- <sup>2</sup> Duris is ranged on the tragic side by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, On Composition 4.30; so is Polybius, and that takes some explaining. Polybius himself (2.56) had attacked emotive historiography, though without naming Duris. The surviving fragments of Duris might be characterised as 'romantic' or 'melodramatic' rather than 'tragic'; certainly they are anything but critical.
- <sup>3</sup> E.g. C. O. Brink, 'Tragic History and Aristotle's School', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 186 (1960), 14–19: 'Duris, who had sat under Theophrastus and who had written about subjects that were popular in the Peripatos...' The debate is summarised by Albin Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*<sup>2</sup> (Eng. trans., London, 1966), p. 765.
- <sup>4</sup> E.g. F. W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley and London, 1972), p. 35. See also his important 'History and Tragedy', *Historia* 9 (1960), 216–34.
  - <sup>5</sup> L. Okin, Studies on Duris of Samos (Ann Arbor, 1974), the microfilm of a UCLA thesis.
- <sup>6</sup> L. Okin, 'A Hellenistic Historian Looks at Mythology', *Panhellenica* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1980), pp. 97, 105. The question at issue is what occasioned Philoxenus' poem *Cyclops*, or *Galatea*. Unluckily for Okin's argument, Duris' opinion (*Scholia on Theocritus* 6 argumentum) appears to have differed entirely from that held by one who certainly did study at the Lyceum, Phaenias of Eresus (*Epitome of Athenaeus* 6f–7a).
- <sup>7</sup> R. B. Kebric, *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos* (Wiesbaden, 1977). See also his 'A Note on Duris in Athens', *Classical Philology* 69 (1974), 286-7.
- <sup>8</sup> Besides Athenaeus 128a Kebric here cites *Suda* s.v.  $\Lambda \nu \gamma \kappa \epsilon \psi s$  and Athenaeus 100e, but these two texts link only Lynceus and Theophrastus, saying nothing of Duris.

of Aphrodite and the dinner which Lamia, the mistress of Demetrius, had given for her young paramour – both instances reaffirm Samian–Antigonid propinquity.<sup>9</sup> ... Presuming the brothers came to Athens together – it is likely given the conditions (and Athenaeus always speaks as though they were together)<sup>10</sup> – 304/2 is a good approximation of their arrival date ... [Duris] was not the mindless disciple he is often made out to be.'

Okin and Kebric exemplify the range of nineteenth- and twentieth-century views. No statement to the effect that Duris was a pupil of Theophrastus is likely to be found from earlier centuries, for it was only at the beginning of the nineteenth that Korais first suggested the emendation of  $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \dot{\eta} s$  to  $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \dot{\eta} s$  at Athenaeus 128a.<sup>11</sup> In the Marcianus manuscript (MS. A, the only full text) and in pre-nineteenth-century editions, book IV of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists* opens as follows.

Ίππόλοχος ὁ Μακεδών, ἐταῖρε Τιμόκρατες, τοῖς χρόνοις μὲν γέγνε κατὰ Λυγκέα καὶ Δοῦριν τοὺς Σαμίους, Θεοφράστου δὲ τοῦ Ἐρεσίου μαθητής, συνθήκας δ' εἶχε ταύτας πρὸς τὸν Λυγκέα...

Hippolochus the Macedonian, friend Timocrates, was of the time of Lynceus and Duris the Samians, and a pupil of Theophrastus of Eresus, and he had this agreement with Lynceus...;12

Athenaeus then describes the exchange of letters between Lynceus and Hippolochus. Elsewhere he tells us that the two Samians were brothers and that *Lynceus* was a pupil of Theophrastus.<sup>13</sup>

Korais's emendation, if adopted, has a strong effect on the syntax of this sentence.  $\Theta\epsilon o\phi\rho\acute{a}\sigma\tau o\upsilon$   $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$   $\tau o\mathring{\upsilon}$  ' $E\rho\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}o\upsilon$   $\mu$ . becomes a phrase balancing  $\tau o\grave{\upsilon}s$   $\Sigma a\mu\acute{\iota}o\upsilon s$  ('... the Samians and pupils of Theophrastus of Eresus...') instead of a clause (in which  $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma o\upsilon \epsilon$  has to be understood) balancing  $\tau o\^{\iota}s$   $\chi\rho\acute{o}\upsilon \iota s$   $\mu\grave{\epsilon}\upsilon \ldots \Sigma a\mu\acute{\iota}o\upsilon s$ . The emended sentence is no neater. Contextually the emendation makes the phrase less relevant: it

- <sup>9</sup> None of the fragments of Duris is overtly autobiographical. Several of those of Lynceus are, but none mentions his brother. It is an inference (a probable one) from Athenaeus 128a-b, not an assertion by Lynceus, that he was himself present at the two dinners mentioned here. Lynceus may well have spent a long time in Athens: he was the author of *Reminiscences of Menander* and of other gossipy sketches of Athenian society. Therefore the date of these dinners tells us little about the date at which he arrived, still less Duris.
- Twice Athenaeus mentions Duris and Lynceus in the same sentence. One is at 128a, quoted below. The other is at 337d:  $\Lambda \nu \gamma \kappa \epsilon \dot{\nu} s$  δ' δ  $\Sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \iota \sigma s$  δ Θεοφράστου μèν μαθητής  $\Delta \iota \dot{\nu} \rho \iota \dot{\nu} \delta \sigma s$  δ δ δ δ δ δ δ δ δ δ δ τοῦ τὰς ἱστορίας γράψαντος καὶ τυραννήσαντος τῆς πατρίδος, 'Lynceus of Samos, pupil of Theophrastus and brother of Duris (who wrote histories and was tyrant of his country)...' This says nothing about whether Duris and Lynceus were together, and noticeably fails to confirm that Duris studied under Theophrastus.
- <sup>11</sup> A. Korais, manuscript note quoted by J. Schweighäuser, *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, ii (Strasbourg, 1802), pp. 386-7.
- 12 Athenaeus 128a (Marcianus 447 fo. 29 verso). In the Epitome of Athenaeus (MSS. C, E and Hoeschl.) the sentence is roughly abridged:  $I\pi\pi\delta\lambda\alpha\chi\sigma$  δ Μακεδών τοις χρόνοις γέγονε κατὰ Λυγγέα καὶ Δοῦριν τοὺς Σαμίους Θεοφράστου δὲ τοῦ Ἐρεσίου μαθητής· συνθήκας εἶχε ταύτας... S. P. Peppink in Athenaei Dipnosophistarum epitome (Leiden, 1937–9), distracted by what was by his time the received text of the Deipnosophists, prints  $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha'$ ς.
- 13 Athenaeus 337d, quoted above, note 10. The similar statement in Suda s.v. Λυγκεύς is probably not independent of Athenaeus. As to their relationship Athenaeus cites no authority, but seems to have had access to Lynceus' letters and memoirs and to some of the works of Duris, so there is no good reason to doubt his statement. As to Lynceus' studies Athenaeus had the evidence of Hippolochus' letter to Lynceus: σὺ δὲ μόνον ἐν ᾿Αθήναις μένων εὐδαιμονίζεις τὰς Θεοφράστου θέσεις ἀκούων, 'You simply stay in Athens and find your pleasure in the lectures of Theophrastus ...' (Athenaeus 130d). For a translation of Hippolochus' letter with a commentary see A. Dalby, 'The Wedding Feast of Caranus the Macedonian', Petits propos culinaires 29 (July 1988), 37–45.

no longer refers to Hippolochus, Athenaeus' subject at this point, but to his two contemporaries, who are really in this sentence to assist in the identifying and dating of Hippolochus (Lynceus as the recipient of the letter that is about to be quoted; Duris as Lynceus' better-known brother). Textually the  $\mu a\theta \eta \tau \dot{\eta} s$  of the manuscript is *lectio* slightly *difficilior*, since it agrees with a singular noun quite a long way back in the sentence.

Athenaeus is not famous for relevance, and it is not impossible for a *conjectura facilior* to be right. But by adopting Korais's conjecture into their texts (Gulick's, now the most often used, does not indicate that it is a conjecture) nineteenth- and twentieth-century editors<sup>14</sup> have had a strong effect on historiography. They no longer make Athenaeus say that the otherwise unknown Hippolochus was a pupil of Theophrastus. Instead they make him say that Lynceus and Duris were. As regards Lynceus, if anybody cares about him,<sup>15</sup> there is the evidence of Hippolochus' letter (cited above, note 13) to confirm that Lynceus listened to Theophrastus' lectures; but as regards Duris, a historian of some significance, there is no other evidence on the point.

In the present state of our knowledge, then, although we cannot deny outright that Duris of Samos might have been a student at the Lyceum, we must recognise that no ancient author is known to have asserted it. There is thus no need for surprise that Duris' own writings, though influenced by Peripatetics among others, do not demonstrate him unequivocally to have been a disciple of the Peripatetic school.

London House for Overseas Graduates

ANDREW DALBY

- <sup>14</sup> Athenaei Deipnosophistarum libri XV, ed. G. Dindorf (Leipzig, 1827); Athenaei Deipnosophistae, ed. A. Meineke (Leipzig, 1858-9); Athenaei Naucratitae Deipnosophistarum libros XV, ed. G. Kaibel (Leipzig, 1887-90); Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists, ed. and tr. C. B. Gulick (London etc., 1927-41).
- 15 According to G. Ferrero, 'Tra poetica ed istorica: Duride di Samo', Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni (1963), pp. 68–100, 'sembra quasi che i due fratelli costituiscano una sorta di inseparabili Dioscuri della cultura samia dell'epoca'; Robert Kebric, In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos (Wiesbaden, 1977), p. 20 asserts 'the fact that Duris and Lynceus led the island's cultural rejuvenation'. There is room for a study of Lynceus that stays closer to the evidence. The numerous, brief fragments of his works, all preserved by Athenaeus, have never been collected and printed separately.

## TWO ATTRIBUTIONS

## I. De mundo

The short treatise *On the Cosmos*,<sup>1</sup> which most scholars believe to be not by Aristotle, has confidently been attributed to Aristotle by G. Reale and A. P. Bos.<sup>2</sup> I do not wish to enter into their arguments for this attribution, because I believe it can be proved to be untenable.

In the theological section of *De mundo* ch. 6, the author argues that the supreme deity rules the world and keeps it together. He compares its function to that of the

- <sup>1</sup> I use the ed. and transl. by D. J. Furley, *Pseudo-Aristotle De Mundo*, Loeb Cl. Libr. Vol. 400 (London and Cambridge, MA, 1965 and later repr.), pp. 331ff.
- <sup>2</sup> Aristotele: Trattato sul cosmo per Alessandro, ed., Italian transl., introd. and comm. by G. Reale, Filosofi antichi 5 (Naples, 1974). Bos's latest publication on the topic is a Dutch transl. with introd. and notes, Aristoteles: Over de kosmos (Meppel and Amsterdam, 1989); see also A. P. Bos, 'Greek Philosophical Theology and the De mundo', in On and Off the Beaten Track. Studies in the History of Platonism (Nijmegen, 1986), pp. 1ff.