

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Digitized by Google

ARTICLE II.

LIFE OF ARISTOTLE.

Concluded from No. I. p. 84. By Edwards A. Park.

DISTURBANCE OF THE FRIENDLY RELATIONS BETWEEN ARISTOTLE
AND ALEXANDER.

It is a decree of heaven, that no man shall pass a life of uninterrupted prosperity, and that suffering shall often follow the highest of our joys. In the former part of our philosopher's residence at the Lyceum, he had attained the zenith of his fame; in the latter part of that residence he began to descend from the height of his popularity, and to experience the vicissitudes which are inseparable from the imperfect state of our race. His royal pupil, who had honored him as a father, became alienated from him; not indeed to so great a degree as some have pretended, but yet to a greater degree than suits the taste of one who, like the Stagirite, sees an unwonted beauty in the permanence of old friendships. He had lived for several years at a distance from his illustrious scholar, and the readers of his *Nicomachean Ethics* need not be told how strenuously he there insists on frequent intercourse, on living together and acting together, as the means of preserving mutual confidence. Had he continued to hold daily interviews with Alexander, he would probably have stifled the disaffection of the king, even if he had not altogether precluded its existence, by his wise exhibitions of faithfulness and love.

But instead of residing himself in the companionship of the monarch, he was represented there by his nephew Callisthenes. This young man was the son of Demotinus of Olynthus; was but little older than Alexander, and had been, as we have seen, a fellow-pupil, but never, as Seneca reports, a teacher of the king. He was an intimate friend of Theophrastus, and enjoyed in an uncommon degree the reverence of the good. He exhibited great seriousness and strictness of life; abhorred flattery, and loved to utter the truth in a plain, blunt way. He had never learned how to clothe a reprimand in the most inoffensive dress; he had a contempt for going circuitously at an object when he could reach the same in a straight line. He was therefore not precisely the man for a king's counsellor. A reprover must go round a throne rather than at it. In an especial manner was he unfit to become

a favorite of Alexander, who like himself was young, and needed therefore the advice of older men; who was flushed with unexampled victories, surrounded with a crowd of suitors, and unable, with all his inborn philosophy, to rise above the adulations that were lavished upon him.

At the first, Alexander treated his adviser and historian with deference. He was bound to him by the remembrance of their former union in the school and of their common teacher. But the flatteries which the king received were stealthily operating on his heart, too susceptible as it was to such an influence; operating to relax the severity of his self-discipline, and to alienate him from the counsels of stern men. The sycophants who clustered about him, and whom the historian had sharply rebuked, were eager to prejudice his mind against their obnoxious censor, and the king at length became impatient of those honest reproofs, which, the more he needed, so much the more he eschewed. But Callisthenes knew not how to temper his animadversions to the growing sensitiveness of Alexander. As he perceived the degenerating tendencies of his once hopeful friend, he redoubled the energy and bluntness of his reprimands. Aristotle was too shrewd an observer of men, not to have foreseen the jarrings of his nephew's honesty with the susceptible spirit of one who loved not to be thwarted. He had lived too long at court, not to have learned how needful it was to intimate rather than to speak out, and to select soft words for hard things. He had therefore cautioned Callisthenes, not only to blend wisdom with his frankness, to divest his reproofs of all that was harsh and bitter, but also, in the words of Valerius Maximus, VII. 2: *ut cum rege aut rarissime aut quam jucundissime loqueretur*. When he heard from Ströbus a description of the style in which the historian had discoursed with the king, he said, "Callisthenes is indeed great and powerful in speech, but he has not common sense." The result of his nephew's caustic addresses he predicted¹ in the following quotation from the *Iliad*:

Ah me! such words, my son, foretell a speedy death!

Callisthenes himself was not ignorant of Alexander's growing aversion to him. But it may be said of him as of Kent, "he must speak truth: an they will take it, so; if not, he's plain." On one occasion he was called on, while at a banquet, to display his ora-

¹ Diogenes Laërt. *Opp. Om. Arist. T. I. p. 6.*

torical talents in a panegyric upon the Macedonians. This he did in the presence of Alexander, and elicited great approbation. He was then told by the king, that the excellence of his speech was owing not to his superior power, but to the goodness of his cause, and that, if he would exhibit the true measure of his talent, he should make an address against, rather than for the Macedonians. Callisthenes obeyed the summons, and surpassed his former effort. He inveighed against the countrymen of Alexander *con amore*. He ascribed their elevation, not to their own merits, but to the misfortunes of their adversaries. He stated that Alexander's father triumphed over the Greeks, not by manly power but by intrigue, by taking a sly advantage of their dissensions among themselves. He finished his harangue by quoting the following line from Homer,

When civil broils prevail, the vilest soar to fame !

By this sarcasm he enraged the Macedonians, and provoked the king to say, that the historian "gave in this case a specimen not of his eloquence, but of his malevolence." Callisthenes, perceiving that the vengeance of Alexander was aroused, left the banquet, but as he went out, he repeated two or three times a verse of the Iliad, in which he darkly intimates the catastrophe that awaited him.

We are aware that many ancient authors represent Callisthenes as a vain and conceited man, even as a flatterer of Alexander; and that some pretended fragments of his writing seem to favor such a representation. But these ostensible fragments of his works are, it is thought, the forgeries of his enemies, who desired to exhibit some valid reason for persecuting their reprover.

The charges which his maligners bring against him are irreconcilable with the fact, that he enjoyed in so high a degree the esteem of Theophrastus and Aristotle, and possessed so commanding an influence over the Macedonian army, as to become an object of fear even to Alexander the Great. These charges are irreconcilable with his demeanor, as it is portrayed by Plutarch and Arrian. He saw that death would be the consequence of his boldness in resisting the crowd of flatterers, who were daily accelerating the downward progress of the king. But he feared not to die, could he only save from ruin a mind which was formed for great virtues, or in want of them, for great vices. He struggled bravely against the degenerating process of his friend; for unless this process were checked in its incipient stages, it

would soon become irresistible. Therefore must he be censured not too severely, for overlooking the rules of prudence in his zeal to protect the virtue of one, who had bidden fair to accomplish as much in letters as in arms. He was too proud to restrain his indignation at the ceremonials of the Macedonian court, which required all who saluted the king to prostrate themselves in obsequence, as they would before a divinity. When asked by Hermolaüs, how a man might make himself the most renowned of his race, he replied: "By slaying him who is already most renowned." This was indeed an imprudent answer, and led to results which he ought to have foreseen and avoided. So when Philotas asked him, who were most highly honored by the Athenians, he replied, "Harmodius and Aristogiton, because they were tyrannicides;" and when Philotas queried whether a tyrannicide would be still protected in Greece, the reply was, "Athens is a place where the murderer of a despot will always find shelter." These and similar remarks were so reported to the king, as to excite a suspicion of treasonable designs on the part of his reprover. Agis, Lysimachus, Hagnon, Hephaestion, and above all Anaxarchus,¹ whom Callisthenes had irritated by cauterizing rebukes, were too desirous of elevating themselves upon the ruins of their rival, to neglect any opportunity of representing him as a foe, and as waiting to become an assassin of the monarch.

A fit opportunity at length arrived. The same Hermolaüs, who had received so suspicious an answer from Callisthenes, had been insulted by Alexander on the hunting-ground. He was a noble youth of Macedon, a page of the monarch, and was thus unfitted to brook the indignity which was laid upon him. He entered into a conspiracy with some of his fellow-pages, all of whom belonged to the Macedonian nobility, against the life of the king. The plot was discovered, and the conspirators apprehended. Some of them had been intimate with Callisthenes; Hermolaüs had been often seen in his society, Philotas had received from him a significant intimation about tyrannicide; and it was reported, though probably without proof, that he had told the leader in the conspiracy, "not to fear the couch of gold, for such a couch often holds a sick or wounded man." The occasion was too good to be lost. Callisthenes was taken into custody. The pages were put to the torture in the hope of eliciting some testimony against him. But no such testimony could be extorted from them. No

¹ See Plutarch's *Life of Alexander*, for instances of the manner in which Anaxarchus was rebuked by Callisthenes.

valid evidence could be found of his participation in the crime. Yet Aristarchus and his fellow-sycophants would not rest, until this formidable obstacle to their selfish and sensual schemes was removed. They succeeded in embittering the mind of the king. In his first paroxysms of rage, he determined to send for Aristotle, and subject Callisthenes to trial in the philosopher's presence. But this purpose was abandoned in a cooler hour. Chares of Mytilene asserts, that Callisthenes was kept seven months in prison, for the purpose of conveying him at last to be tried before the Stagirite. After having been cruelly maimed, even his ears, nose, and lips having been cut off, he was kept in fetters, was carried from place to place as a prisoner with the army, and exhibited as an object of terror to all malcontents. He died in consequence either of the cruelties inflicted on him, for the purpose of extorting a confession of his guilt, or else, as Chares asserts, of a disease (phthiriasis) which he contracted in gaol, through the negligence of his keepers.¹ His death was regarded by the Macedonians as a disgrace to their monarch, and is said to have been afterwards lamented even by Alexander himself.

In a letter to Antipater, the mutual friend of the monarch and of Aristotle, Alexander writes, that the pages concerned in the conspiracy were, soon after their detection, stoned to death by the Macedonians; but that he himself would attend to the punishment of Callisthenes, *of those who had sent him on the expedition*, and of those who had given shelter to the conspirators. It has been supposed, with good reason, that allusion is here made to Aristotle, as a victim of future retribution; for it was he who recommended Callisthenes as the companion of Alexander. It is probable that the same sensualists who contrived to exasperate the king against the nephew, were also desirous of inflaming his resentment against the uncle. Their safety demanded the downfall of Aristotle. They even proposed, (if we may confide in Chrysostom's² statement), that he be put to death. It is natural to believe, that they found Alexander not so impervious as he should have been to their influence; that he was induced to associate the teacher with the obnoxious pupil, and to anticipate the displeasure of the former at the imprisonment of the latter. We know not how much of epistolary correspondence had been continued between Alexander and Aristotle, but it were not at all

¹ For several different but improbable narrations of the mode of his death, see Buhle's *Arist. Vit.* p. 98.

² *Orat.* LXIV.

singular if the most delicate insinuations of the sage, with regard to the king's apostasy from virtue, were received by his sovereign with sullenness and resentment; that the consciousness of having lost the relish for philosophical discipline and of deserving to be esteemed a god, had created an aversion in the hero to the rigid precepts of his old teacher. We may also well suppose, that Aristotle viewed with some indignation the disgrace which his relative had borne, as well as the increase of the king's vanity and wilfulness.

Still we cannot believe that there arose any settled enmity between these two individuals, or that they ever made any serious expression of mutual antipathy. The ebullition of Alexander's rage soon subsided. He did not send for Aristotle, nor punish him, as he had threatened to do. Many writers have stated, on the authority of Diogenes Laërtius,¹ that he made presents to Xenocrates, and flattered Anaxarchus (Anaximenes), for the purpose of awakening the jealousy of the Stagirite. But there is every reason to suppose, that such donations to Xenocrates would have gratified Aristotle, for the two philosophers were long-tryed friends;² and there is but little ground to surmise, that Alexander would have deemed it possible to afflict his old teacher, who was at Athens, by flattering Anaxarchus (Anaximenes), who was at that time with the king in Asia. The authority of Plutarch is adverse to the idea that Alexander, in his partial alienation from Aristotle, inflicted any evil upon him; and there is no worthy voucher for the statement of Buhle, that the philosopher lived in daily expectation of suffering, from his disaffected pupil, the same calamities that had befallen his nephew.—There is also good reason to think, that the philosopher never allowed his dissatisfaction with the king to assume the type of personal hatred. Indeed he had too much of a temporizing genius to cherish any great degree of unprofitable indignation. He was not born to be a martyr. He was made for dominion rather; and like all others of like destiny, he calculated the results before he ventured on a contest. The vulnerable heel of our Achilles was the prevalence of a shrewd insight into consequences, which precluded the noble expression of such feelings as every virtuous man must in-

¹ *Opp. Omn. Arist. Ed. Buhle, T. I. p. 11.*

² Antipater, the confidential favorite of Aristotle, made a similar present to Xenocrates, and honored him with distinguished marks of reverence, when he was sent as ambassador to Macedonia, in the Lamian war.

wardly entertain. His instructions to his nephew, with regard to the treatment of Alexander, were sagacious rather than high-souled. We cannot suppose, then, that when his nephew had disregarded these instructions, and incurred the penalty which Aristotle had predicted, his death would have awakened any sudden violence of feeling, in a man who was politic enough to suppress all dangerous emotions. It is possible that he may have heard of the threats which Alexander had uttered against him; his friend Antipater, to whom they were communicated, may or may not have apprized him of them; but no one who understands his character can suspect, that he would be induced by such menaces to retaliate evil upon their irritated author. He would probably regard them, as indeed they were, the kindlings of a youth,

That carries anger as the flint bears fire,
Who much enforced shows a hasty spark,
And straight is cold again.

REPORTED AGENCY OF ARISTOTLE IN THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER.

There are various representations of the part taken by the Stagirite in the alleged murder of his pupil. It is pretended by some, that Alexander was poisoned by Iollaus, the cup-bearer of the monarch, and the son of Aristotle's friend Antipater; by others, that he was poisoned by Cassander, an elder brother of Iollaus; by a third party, that Cassander, Philip, and Iollaus, three sons of Antipater, were the chief accomplices in the transaction. The father is reported to have instigated the murder, and Aristotle is accused by some of having been privy to it, and also of having recommended the materials for it. Vitruvius¹ thus describes the poison which was employed: "There is in Arcadia a region named Nonacris, in the mountains of which is a rock that distils the coldest water. This is called Stygian water, and it can be contained in no vessel either of iron, or silver, or gold. It evaporates at once, and is gone. It can be preserved in nothing except a mule's hoof."² This is said to have been conveyed from Antipater, by one, two, or three of his sons, into the province where Alexander was at that time, and to have been administered to the

¹ De Architectura, VIII. 3.

² A similar superstition with regard to this water exists at the present day. See Leake's Travels in the Morea, Vol. III. p. 165—9. Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor, is the first philosopher who has described the Stygian poison, and there is no evidence that Aristotle had ever heard of it.

king, whose death was the consequence. There are other writers who give a different description of the water used as a poison. The bones of Iollaus were disinterred and disgraced by the queen Olympias, some time after his death, for his participation in the regicide; and she likewise ordered a hundred Macedonians, who had been the friends of his father Antipater, to be slain in testimony of her aversion to the supposed principal in the crime. The author of the *Life of the ten Orators*, who is erroneously cited as Plutarch by Buhle,¹ says that Hyperides made a speech to the Athenians, not more than a year after Alexander's death, and proposed that Iollaus receive some public honor for this act, which had freed Athens from oppression. Later writers affirm, that the horn in which the poison had been preserved was deposited, and often seen, in the temple at Delphi. An epigram was also written in relation to it at an early day, and is still preserved in Brunck's *Analects*.² Five hundred years after the alleged tyrannicide, the emperor Caracalla, who had heard the suspicions expressed against the Stagirite, and who was ambitious of being thought to resemble Alexander, testified his admiration for the hero, by expelling all the followers of Aristotle from the city of Alexandria, and by causing their writings to be burned. This outrage of Caracalla was the means of fixing the stigma upon Aristotle, and of giving permanence to what had been before a mere floating rumor. "It cannot be proved," says Buhle, "that in this punishment of the Peripatetics, the emperor did any injustice to the founder of their sect." A cursory examination, however, will manifest the unrighteousness of fastening a charge upon Aristotle, which had been nothing better than a vague surmise until the fifth century after the death of all contemporary witnesses.

In the first place, our philosopher seems to have had no sufficient inducement to commit the alleged crime. We have already seen, that he was neither disappointed nor highly irritated by the murder of Callisthenes; yet this event has been assigned as the cause of his mortal offence. His enemies have said that he feared the execution of the threat contained in Alexander's letter to Antipater; but why, under the influence of such a fear, did he allow six years to intervene between the alarming epistle and the needed measures for self-defence? In this long interval, he had time to learn that the commination was but a word of the moment, and that the variable king had not only neglected to punish the uncle, but had even repented of his hostility to the nephew.

¹ Vit. Arist. p. 100.

² T. III. 182.

On the one hand the king's revenge, if it had endured against the Stagirite, would have been wreaked upon him before the lapse of six years; and on the other hand, the dread of punishment, if it had been the ruling passion of Aristotle, would have instigated him to an earlier stratagem for relief. He had means enough for the removal of Alexander, which he would have employed at the announcement of the king's threats, if he had intended to employ them at all. Secondly, it is not to be believed, that so subtle a chemist as the Stagirite would have employed so violent and self-detecting a potion as the Stygian water, for a crime which demanded secrecy more than quickness of action. He would have been wise enough to select a poison, energetic indeed in its workings, but leaving behind it fewer discernible traces of itself. If the Stygian water were so deadly as is reported, it must also have been widely known, and thereby unfitted for the use of a secret murderer.

Thirdly, the whole description of the fatal ingredients is in the style of fable, rather than of fact, and the divers reporters of the crime vary so much in their narrations, as to be justly suspected of mistaking the tales of garrulous mischief-makers for well authenticated records. Fourthly, it seems incredible that if the Stagirite had been an accomplice in the regicide, he should not have been openly accused of his crime in his own day, or the days immediately following his own. His enemies resorted then to much more trivial accusations, and did not publicly avail themselves of this, until centuries after the pretended crime. Fifthly, it seems also improbable, that if he had been accessory to the death of Alexander, he should not thereby have propitiated the favor of the Anti-Macedonian party in Athens. Shortly after the regicide, he was compelled to leave the city, by the very persons whom this regicidal act had promised to deliver from bondage. He certainly was a man of more political tact than to hazard his safety with his own countrymen, and at the same time secure no favor from his country's enemies, by an exploit which favored the latter as much as it injured the former. He was too shrewd to have disgraced himself, while living, with two opposing parties, by a crime which must have been foreseen to disgrace him, when dead, with all parties.

But lastly, the evidence of the best historians militates decidedly with this imputation upon the character of our philosopher. It is true that Justin speaks of Alexander's death by poison, but he makes no mention of the Stagirite's agency in it. Curtius,

also, does not allude to Aristotle's coöperation, although he regards as probable the report of Antipater's activity in the crime. Pausanias, Diodorus of Sicily, and Vitruvius, relate the circumstances of the regicide, not as a fact but as a rumor, and do not implicate Aristotle in the deed, which they even do not assert was actually committed. The elder Pliny ascribes the death of Alexander partly to the influence of the Stagirite, and considers his participation in the homicide to be the reproach, which can never be effaced from his name. But such a testimony, given more than four hundred years after the imputed crime was committed, and by one who shows no signs of having minutely investigated the charge, is insufficient to secure our credence. We confide rather in the testimony of Arrian, who had examined the details of the transaction with the greatest fidelity. He had scrutinized the daily reports of the physicians, who attended Alexander during his last sickness, and had read the various narratives which had been written of the event. He rejects, as unworthy of all credit, the tale that Alexander was poisoned; still more, that Aristotle and Antipater were the homicides. He affirms that the hero died a natural death, after having surfeited himself at a feast. Plutarch avers the same, and assures us that he describes the conqueror's last days almost word for word as they were described in the diary of his attendant physicians. He relates that at the time of the monarch's decease, and for six years afterward, there was no suspicion of his having been poisoned, and that the circumstances of his death make any such surmise untenable. In consequence of the contentions among his generals, his corpse was neglected several days, it lay unembalmed in a hot and sultry climate, and yet showed no symptoms of any poisonous agency. In agreement with Plutarch and Arrian is the testimony of Seneca, Athenaeus, (who follows the work of Ehippus concerning Hephaestion's and Alexander's burial), Orosius, Cedrenus, and others. The rumor of the regicide probably arose from a desire of Olympias to blacken the memory of the regent Antipater, and the implication of Aristotle in the crime was perhaps suggested by his known intimacy with that celebrated regent, his known skill in chemical admixtures, and by the erroneous conjecture that a deadly feud had arisen between him and his monarch. The garrulity of his foes would easily form a connected tale from a few obscure intimations. It is remarkable that they could adduce no more tangible authority for their calumnies, than is found in the following passage of Plutarch,—“They men-

tion one Agnothemis, as their author, who is pretended to have had the information from king Antigonus." Pretended by whom? on what evidence? and how was Antigonus apprized of the fact? and above all who is Agnothemis?

DEPARTURE OF ARISTOTLE FROM ATHENS.

Alexander died in Babylon on the eleventh or thirteenth of June, 323 B. C. At his death was enkindled anew the spirit of liberty, which himself and Philip had attempted to smother among their tributary provinces. The descendants of the heroes of Marathon and Salamis arose, intent on regaining the freedom they had lost. Demosthenes and Hyperides stood forth as the leaders of the democratic party. Since the bloody days of Chæronea, these orators had lost no opportunity to inflame the resentment of the Athenians against their tyrants, and now when the Macedonian colossus had become, in the words of Demades, like a blinded Cyclops, the oppressed people were easily excited to resistance. They entered on the Lamian war with the spirit of a people conscious of being wronged and determined to obtain redress.

It were interesting to learn whether Demosthenes, at this time, exerted any influence against Aristotle directly. It is not improbable that he did so, for the philosopher had been intimate with the tyrants whom the orator abhorred.¹ But we can affirm nothing more. We only know that Aristotle was an early victim to the vengeance of the Anti-Macedonian party. While his royal protector lived, he was shielded against the assaults of his enemies both secret and avowed; but now that he was left defenceless, the envy and the revenge which had lain so long compressed burst forth with redoubled energy. It was difficult to obtain any valid accusations against him, and it is always unpleasant to persecute an antagonist without some ostensible reason. It was at length resolved to assail the philosopher on religious grounds, there being no prejudice so strong as that which results from theological differences. It was decided to employ, as the Stagirite's accuser, the hierophant Eurymedon; and for the purpose of adding more importance to the accusation, a respectable citizen of Athens, Demophilus by name, was associated with the complainant.

¹ It is an historical fact that one of the nephews of Demosthenes, named Demochares, was a calumniator of Aristotle and of Antipater. He wrote much against them.

Aristotle was cited to appear before the Areopagus. The charges preferred against him were, that he had manifested impiety (*ἀσεβεία*) in various ways; that he had, for example, written a paean to his friend Hermias, erected statues to him at Delphi, and written impious inscriptions upon them; that he had even presented offerings to him, as if he were a god. Another specification probably was, that in his writings or lectures he had impugned the popular faith, and in particular had taught, that prayers and sacrifices to heaven were of no avail.¹ "I never intended," says Aristotle in an Apology which he afterwards published, "to make an oblation to Hermias, as to a super-human being. I erected a monument to him as a man not as a god. I honored him with sepulchral rites, from a desire to perpetuate the remembrance of him."

But, as has been already remarked, Aristotle had not the character which disposes a man to martyrdom. He always developed at least one characteristic of the prudent man, who "foreseeth the evil and hideth himself." He was not willing, like Socrates, in reliance on the goodness of his cause, to await the uprising of the Athenians. He fled from their city to Chalcis, the capital of Euboea, and never obeyed the summons to appear before the Grecian court. "Perceiving," says Origen, "that he was to be prosecuted for irreligion, on account of certain dogmas of his philosophy, which the Athenians thought to be impious, the Stagirite instituted a school in Chalcis, having said in self-defence to his friends, Let us go from Athens, so that we may not give her citizens an occasion for perpetrating a second crime, like that which they committed against Socrates, and that they may not offer a second profanation to philosophy."²

In Chalcis the metaphysician was safe. This city remained under Macedonian influence, and is said to have been occupied by a Macedonian garrison. We have already noticed the conjecture, that some relatives of his mother still resided here, as it was the city of her ancestors. It was perhaps the nearest refuge to which he could flee with assurance of permanent safety. According to Apollodorus, he made his escape in Olympiad 114, 3, or the beginning of the year 322 B. C. Dionysius of Halicarnassus assigns the same period for the flight. But in the *Life of Epicurus* by Diogenes Laërtius, we find a report, that when this philosopher came from Samos to Athens in his eighteenth year, Xenocrates was in the Academy, and Aristotle was teaching at

¹ Vid. Origen. c. Celsum, L. I. et II.

² Orig. c. Cel. l. I.

Chalcis; that some time afterward, when Alexander had deceased, and Athens was in commotion, Epicurus left the city and returned to his father. According to this report, the Stagirite had fled from Athens before the death of his protector. It is thought by some, that he was thus early allured to Chalcis by its peculiar stillness and quiet. Strabo (X. § 11) says, that the city had a great reputation in peace as well as in war, so that it furnished agreeable and undisturbed employment to philosophers; and one proof of its attractiveness, he adds, is the fact that Aristotle established a school there. It is also surmised by some, that the philosopher must have foreseen the triumph of the Anti-Macedonian party at Athens, and his own perils in such an event; that he would have disliked to delay his escape, because the increasing violence of the Athenians might soon preclude the possibility of fleeing from their assaults; that above all, he must have chosen to dwell aloof from the disturbances of politics, and amid those who peacefully acknowledged the empire of his pupil. The foregoing opinion is thought to receive some sanction from a certain correspondence between the Stagirite and his friend Antipater. It appears that this king had expressed his surprise at Aristotle's change of location, which surprise he would not have felt if Alexander were already deceased. The Stagirite would fain mitigate this wonder, and wrote in reply that he forsook the Athenians in order to prevent their sinning a second time against philosophy. "Athens," he says, "is indeed a beautiful city, but she can be described in the words of Homer, as a place where,

Pear after pear grows old, fig after fig.

By these words Aristotle intended to aver, according to a comment of Eustathius upon them, that Athens was a spot where slanders grew rife; where one calumny succeeded another without intermission and without end; and that he chose to escape this *σκηνοποιία* before it ripened into a deadlier evil. But all this conjectural evidence, and the indirect testimony found in Diogenes Laërtius are insufficient to refute the positive assertions of Apollodorus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that Aristotle left Athens not until after the demise of Alexander.¹

In Chalcis Aristotle wrote, as is reported, a defence of himself against the accusations of the Athenians. Diogenes learned from Phavorinus the existence of such an apology, and Athenæus read an exculpatory paper, of which he doubted the genuineness, but

¹ Vid. Opp. Om. Arist. Ed. Buhle, T. pp. 10 et 70.

which was ascribed to the Stagirite. This exculpatory document, however, produced no effect. An imputation of religious infidelity was sure of ruining its victim among a people whom Paul afterwards characterized, *κατὰ πάντα αἰς δεισιδαιμονεστίτους*.

Unable to injure the person of their adversary, the Athenians became the more eager to sully his good name. They had formerly awarded him certain honors, which they now took away. According to the Latin biographer,¹ they had erected for him a statue on the Acropolis; Philip and Olympias had placed a statue for him somewhere, perhaps in Athens, and had raised near it images of themselves. Alexander, also, had caused a statue to be erected at Athens for the philosopher; and the same honor perhaps, some honor certainly, had been conferred on him at Delphi, by some of his friends. The probability is that all these works of art, which were intended to immortalize him, were now displaced or disfigured. Ælian preserves the fragment of an epistle from Aristotle to Antipater, in which this truly philosophical sufferer says, "As to the honor which was decreed to me at Delphi by the people, and which is now taken from me, I have only to say, that I would not allow myself to be unduly troubled, and yet am not altogether without feeling in regard to it." Ælian adds, that Aristotle manifests in this letter no vain ambition, and at the same time no unnatural and unbecoming apathy. For although man may easily bear the absence of honors which he has never possessed, he must yet endure some mortification when he is deprived of such as he has long enjoyed. The writings of our metaphysician, especially his Nichomachean Ethics, show that he was not bereft of human sensibilities with regard to popular applause, and yet that he did not live for such a volatile enjoyment. "Honor," he says, "is a reward of virtue, and is bestowed upon those who have done well." "A man of great mind is solicitous for honor, but by no means regards it as the highest good; authority and wealth are desirable for the sake of the applause that follows in their train; and they who receive but little renown have other advantages counterbalancing their want of this."²

Other expressions of Aristotle, like the foregoing, indicate that he was not indisposed to indulge a temperate love of glory; but the ambition which has often been ascribed to him was not a long-ing after the applauses of the day, so much as the homage of succeeding times. The ambition which he stimulated in Alexander

¹ Opp. Omn. Arist. T. I. p. 55 et 56.

² Ethic. Nicom. IV. 3. 16—18.

was of the loftier sort, and was intended to operate as a counterpoise to the prince's sensual inclinations. It has been often said, that in his attempt to instil a love of fame into the prince's breast, he nourished the same principle in his own. "Caeterum," says Lord Bacon,¹ "de viro tam eximio certe, et ob acumen ingenii mirabili, Aristotele, crediderim facile, hanc ambitionem eum a discipulo suo accepisse, quem fortasse aemulatus est, ut, si ille omnes nationes, hic omnes opiniones subigeret, et monarchiam quandam in contemplationibus sibi conderet." While, then, we admit the justness of the charge, that our philosopher loved the praise of men, we see no evidence that he was more ambitious than persons of kindred genius usually are, and we must award him the credit of having endured reverses and reproaches with a patience worthy of the father of metaphysics.

DEATH OF ARISTOTLE.

After the Stagirite had withdrawn from Athens, and his pupil Theophrastus had taken charge of the Lyceum, he lived but a few months. He died in but little more than a year after the demise of Alexander, perhaps in August or September, 322. Aulus Gellius states, that Demosthenes poisoned himself shortly after the death of the Stagirite, and as we know from Plutarch that the orator died on the fourteenth of October, 322, we cannot greatly err in assigning the philosopher's death to one of the months immediately preceding. He was in his sixty-third year at the time of his decease. Suidas and Eumelus assert, that he died at the age of seventy,² but this is an obvious mistake. He certainly died too soon for the world, but soon enough to save himself from many a painful spectacle, especially from that of the Macedonian empire rent asunder, involved in bloody wars, and the family of his royal pupil exterminated.

Censorinus in his work, *De die natali*, ascribes the death of the Stagirite to an hereditary and chronic affection of the stomach, and says that "he endured this natural infirmity and his frequent sicknesses with great fortitude, and it is more wonderful that he could have prolonged his life sixty-three years, than that he did not live beyond that age." His constitution, naturally weak, was injured by his excess of study during his last years. Diogenes Laërtius reports that he endeavored to alleviate the disorder of his digestive organs by fomentations of warm oil, a remedy which

¹ De Dig. et Aug. Scient. L. III. 4.

² Opp. Om. Arist. T. I. pp. 7 et 78.

was often applied by the ancients for similar infirmities. The use of this oil-bath was the probable origin of a calumny propagated by Lycon the Pythagorean, that Aristotle was wont to bathe his whole body in a tub of warm oil for the sake of luxurious gratification, and that he afterwards sold the oil from motives of avarice. But the unparalleled labors which had exhausted his frail system, and predisposed it to that lethargy of the digestive apparatus, which is so common among sedentary men, are a sufficient commentary upon the charge of sensualism, and the whole structure of his mind refutes the charge of avarice, so often and gratuitously presented against this victim of popular envy.¹

It is related of our philosopher, that when in his last sickness he was visited by his physician, and advised to adopt certain rules of regimen without being apprized of the reasons for adopting those rules, he replied, "Treat me not as you would a herdsman or a day-laborer, but if you wish that I follow your prescriptions, show me that you have prescribed nothing without sufficient grounds." This anecdote is related by Caelius Rhodiginus, but without reference to the authority from which it was derived. It is characteristic of Aristotle.

There is another anecdote related by Aulus Gellius,² which is also in keeping with the peculiarities of our sage. When he had passed his sixty-second year, and his health had so far declined as to preclude all hope of his continuing long at the head of the Lyceum, he was entreated by his pupils to appoint his successor. There was but little doubt that either Theophrastus the Lesbian, or Menedemus,³ the Rhodian would be selected for this office, as these were the two most eminent of his scholars. But he chose to decline the immediate announcement of his will with regard to the rival candidates, and thus evade the occasion of fomenting a jealousy toward himself. He wished at the same time to be represented in the Lyceum by a fit successor. He therefore contrived to intimate his preference. When the pupils who had importuned him to make the selection were afterwards in his society, he complained of the wine which he usually drank, and re-

¹ For specimens of the scurrility of those writers, who attempt to fasten on Aristotle the charge of sensuality and avarice, see his biography by the Anonymous Author, and by Suidas, in *Opp. Om. Arist.* pp. 67, 78, 79.

² *Noct. Att.* XIII. 5.

³ Buhle in agreement with the majority of critics says, that Eudemus instead of Menedemus is the true name of this Rhodian.

requested them to procure for him a better article, "for instance, the Lesbian or the Rhodian." These were the most celebrated of wines in his day, as the Lesbian and the Rhodian philosophers were the most accomplished among his pupils. When the two choice liquors were presented him, he tasted the Rhodian first, and praised it highly. He then drank of the Lesbian and seemed to hesitate which to prefer. At length he decided; "Both are excellent wines, but the Lesbian is the pleasanter of the two." This is the only designation of a successor which he ever made, but this was sufficient. He was understood to intimate his preference of the Lesbian pupil, as the master of the Lyceum, and this bland as well as sound instructor was therefore unanimously acknowledged as the chief of the Peripatetics.

A good illustration of the garrulity of some ancient biographers and christian fathers,¹ is found in a rumor which they circulated that the Stagirite drowned himself in the Euripus, in consequence of his chagrin in not finding the causes of the ebb and flow in that celebrated strait. One of these writers recites the last words which the suicide uttered before making the fatal plunge: "Quoniam Aristoteles Euripum non cepit, Aristotelem Euripus habeat."

The same love of the marvellous is indicated in another report which obtained some currency among the ancient historians; and was the more confidently related, as the distance of time increased between their day, and that of the sage whom they defamed. Suidas, Hesychius Milesius, and the anonymous biographer² assert, though with some apparent misgiving, that Aristotle died of poison at Chalcis.³ He is said to have seen the inefficacy of his attempt to rebut the charges of his antagonists, and to have dreaded the result of the trial to which he was summoned before the Areopagus, and therefore to have adopted the same expedient which Demosthenes employed a few days afterward. Hesychius Milesius asserts, that the sentence of the Areopagus had been already pronounced against him, and that, like Socrates, he was condemned to drink the hemlock. But the statements, which are

¹ Among the Fathers, who have circulated this report Justin Martyr is somewhat conspicuous. Gregory Nazianzen simply states, that the Stagirite lost his life by excessive application of mind to the phenomena of the Euripus, and perhaps this was the original narrative from which the subsequent tale was fabricated.

² Opp. Omn. Arist. T. I. pp. 78, 71, 61.

³ Diogenes Laërtius preserves an epigram which was written on Aristotle's death, and which ascribes the death to the hemlock. See Opp. Om. Ar. p. 9.

given with obvious distrust by these writers, will not stand in competition with the statements which are made with fuller confidence by, in other respects, more credible historians. Apollodorus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus make no allusion to Aristotle's suicide. There seems, besides, to have been no sufficient motive for his courting death. We have seen that he was safe at Chalcis under Macedonian protection. Even if fears still lingered in his breast, he might easily have repaired to Antipater, his bosom friend, who became master of all Macedonia at the death of Alexander. The assertion of Buhle, that he had applied to this friend for aid, but was too late in his application, is not sustained by any ancient authority. Why then should the Stagirite have resorted to a needless crime, which, in his own view, was characterized by a peculiar enormity? "To die" he says,¹ "for the sake of escaping poverty, or disappointed love, or any other sorrow is not the part of a man, but rather of a coward. It is pusillanimity thus to flee from trouble." In another passage² he proves that no one has a right to take his own life; that existence is a boon of the highest worth, given by Heaven for the benefit of the good; that nothing but the remorse and disgust of vile men can prompt to suicide, and that the crime is rightly regarded as disgraceful to its perpetrator. They who have committed many foul deeds, and who are hated for their wickedness, are the persons who rid themselves of life.³ Now it is inconsistent with the character of our sage, to disgrace his final hour by a sin which he had stigmatized as peculiarly shameful, when he might have protected himself against his enemies by honorable means, when in fact he was already protected; and no wise man, as Aristotle certainly was, would have forgone his love of science and still more of life for the threats of powerless foes.

It were besides a very singular fact, if the venerable sage had drunk the poison, that none of the ancient biographers, except the three above-mentioned, should have accused him of it. The death of such a man at such a time would have been no secret, and his enemies would not have forborne to blazen abroad the suicide, which would have proved his want of heroism, consistency and virtue. The report can now be regarded only as an emanation of that envious spirit, which began to sully the good name of the youth, and would not satisfy itself without an effort to darken

¹ Ethic. Nic. III. cp. 7.

² Ethic. Nic. V. 9, 11 § 1-4.

³ Ethic. Nic. IX. cp. 4. § 8.

the closing moment of his old age, and withal dared not breathe out the last calumny until the lapse of centuries had lessened the ability to refute it.¹

The ancient historians are generally silent in relation to the mode and place of Aristotle's burial. The Latin biographer is the only one who alludes to it. His statement is, that the corpse was conveyed from Chalcis to Stagira, and interred in his native city; that an altar and a monument were there erected to his honor, that the site of the monument was distinguished as the place of the citizens' public councils, and that the name Aristoteleum was given to this their favorite resort.²

LAST WILL OF THE STAGIRITE.

Diogenes Laërtius, in his *Life of Aristotle*, p. 11, relates that he had seen the will of the philosopher. Athenæus also mentions such a document. The Latin biographer speaks of it as preserved in the writings of Ptolemy and Andronicus the Rhodian. There is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the will which is recorded by Diogenes Laërtius;³ but there is reason to suppose that this is a supplement or codicil to a more copious testament which is now lost, rather than the original testament itself. In this codicil no mention is made of Aristotle's library or manuscripts; but we know that these constituted the most valuable portion of his property, and that he bequeathed them to his pupil and successor Theophrastus. They would not, in all likelihood, have been overlooked in this testamentary document, had they not been disposed of in a previous one. It was, besides, the custom of the ancient philosophers, particularly of Aristotle's successors, to give especial prominence, in their last wills, to their literary property, which they commonly bequeathed to their favorite disciples.⁴ There is also, in the copy preserved by Diogenes Laërtius, internal evidence that it is a supplement to a will previously

¹ That Aristotle died a natural death is generally admitted by modern biographers, but Buhle, after lamenting the loss of a letter which Antipater wrote in relation to the event, says, *Nunc enim dubitationi semper erit obnoxium, utrum ipse sibi mortem consciverit, an morbo quodam sit extinctus.* *Arist. Vit.* p. 102.

² *Opp. Omn. Arist. T. I.* p. 56.

³ *Arist. Vit.* p. 11—15.

⁴ Straton left his library, but not his own manuscripts, to his successor. Lycon and other Peripatetics left their own productions, as well as their other books, to their disciples. So, too, Epicurus bequeathed his books and his garden to his successor, Hermachus.

made, and that it was written on some sudden emergency, in the absence of Theophrastus and the other most intimate friends of the author. It is supposed to have been prepared at Chalcis, in the midst of the philosopher's persecutions, and while he was suffering from bodily disease. He may have apprehended a sudden and fatal termination of the malady; he is supposed by some to have anticipated death from his enemies. The following is a translation of the will:

"It will be well. In case that anything should happen,¹ Aristotle has made the following will. Antipater is to be the chief administrator of all that I leave behind me. Until Nicanor² shall come into possession of the estate, let Aristomenes, Timarchus, Hipparchus, Dioteles, Theophrastus, (if he be willing, and if it be practicable), have the care of my children and of Herpyllis, and of the things which I leave. When my daughter shall have arrived at maturity, let her be given in marriage to Nicanor. But in case that anything should happen to my daughter, (would that such a calamity may not take place, nor will it take place,) before she is married, or after her marriage, yet before she has borne children, in that event let Nicanor have the authority over my son and over all my affairs, and let him make such a disposition of them as shall be worthy of himself and of us. Let Nicanor take such care of my daughter³ and of my son Nicomachus,⁴ as their circumstances demand. Let him be to them as a father and a brother. But in case that anything should previously happen to Nicanor, (would that it may not so happen,) either before he has married my daughter, or after his marriage, yet before he has begotten children by her, in that event if he shall have left any commands (or made any arrangements) let them be regarded as obligatory.—But if Theophrastus desire to take my daughter for a wife, let him have the same authority as was previously committed to Ni-

¹ This is one of the phrases, which are supposed to indicate that Aristotle was in danger of speedy death, when he wrote the present codicil, the words *ἰάν δέ τι συμβαίῃ* conveying a general allusion to an afflictive catastrophe, and the first clause, *ἔσται μὲν εἰ*, being designed to express a degree of confidence that the danger would be averted.

² Nicanor, previously mentioned as the son of Aristotle's guardian, Proxenus, and the youth whom our philosopher educated and adopted as his own child.

³ His daughter Pythias, already referred to, the only child of his first wife.

⁴ The son of Herpyllis, whose education, as we have already seen, was well provided for. He is supposed to have been in his infancy at the time of his father's death.

canor. If, however, he do not desire it, then let the executors, taking counsel with Antipater, make such a disposition as shall seem to them advisable, with regard to the daughter and the son.¹

“ And let the executors and Nicanor, mindful of me and of Herpyllis, (for she hath been faithful to me,) take charge of the other things and see that, if she desire to be married, such a husband be provided for her as shall not be unworthy of us. And let them give to her from the estate, in addition to what may have previously been granted to her,² a talent of silver³ and three maid-servants, if she desire them, and the young female attendant which she now has, and the boy Pyraeus. And if she desire to dwell in Chalcis, let her have those apartments of the house which are near the garden; if however she prefer to live in Stagira, let her have the paternal mansion. Whichsoever of these abodes may be selected by her,⁴ let the executors provide her with such furniture as shall be convenient for her, and such as shall seem to them appropriate. Let Nicanor also take charge of the boy Myrmex, that he be treated in the manner which becomes us, be restored to his friends and receive back the goods which we have obtained from him. Let Ambracis also be free, and let the executors give to her, when married, five hundred drachmae,⁵ and the young female attendant which she now has. Let them also give to Thales, in addition to the young handmaid which she has, and which was purchased, a thousand drachmae,⁶ and also another young handmaid. To Simon, also, besides the money which he has already received toward procuring a servant,⁷ let there be given money, or else let another servant be bought for him. Let Tycho be free when his daughter is married, Philo also, Olympius and his son. Let none of the boys be sold who have waited on me, but let them continue in the service of my

¹ No one who is acquainted with the views of the ancients with regard to matrimony, will consider such stipulations as at all singular or inconsistent with the spirit of the heathen religions.

² This phrase, *πρὸς τοῖς πρότερον δεδομένοις*, is one of the expressions which are supposed to indicate, that Aristotle had previously made a will, to which this is supplementary.

³ More than twelve hundred dollars.

⁴ Aristotle specifies Chalcis and Stagira as the dwelling-places of Herpyllis, because they were both free from the power of Athens, and were under the government of Macedon.

⁵ More than a hundred dollars.

⁶ More than two hundred dollars.

⁷ Another indication of a previous will, in which the slaves, as well as others, were provided for.

heirs; and when they have become of age, let them be manumitted according to their deserts. Let the executors, likewise, take care that the statues which were to be wrought by Gryllion, be finished and erected, one to the honor of Nicanor, one to the honor of Proxenus, (which I had resolved to raise,) and one in memory of the mother of Nicanor. Also let the statue, which has been made for Arimnestus,¹ be erected to his memory, so that there may be a monument of him, for he died childless. Also let the statue of my mother be consecrated to Ceres, at Nemea, or wherever it may be agreeable to raise it. In whatever place they make my grave, thither let the bones of Pythias be borne, and there let them be deposited, as she gave orders that they should be. And if Nicanor be saved,² let him erect at Stagira four stone images of animals, each four cubits in length, to the honor of Jupiter and Minerva, who are to be praised as the preservers of his life. This will fulfil the vow which I have made on his account."

ARISTOTLE'S LITERARY MANUSCRIPTS.

Diogenes Laërtius gives us the names³ of a large number of works, which our philosopher left behind him; but the titles by which these works are designated are so different from the titles now employed, that we cannot determine how many of the writings specified in the catalogue are preserved to our day. Another list is given by the Anonymous Biographer,⁴ but it is so much like that of Diogenes Laërtius that we can derive little benefit from it. A third catalogue is found only in the Arabic language, and is less extensive than the two preceding. Diogenes Laërtius informs us, that the number of lines in Aristotle's manuscripts is four hundred and forty-five thousand, two hundred and seventy. Now "if we calculate that one volume (*alphabet*) contains about ten thousand lines, there must have been about forty-four volumes (*alphabetete*) of Aristotle's works. But we possess what would amount to about ten (such) volumes of them, so that only about a fourth part of his writings has come down to us."⁵

¹ The only brother of Aristotle.

² It is supposed that Nicanor, at the time of Aristotle's making this will, was absent on some dangerous expedition, and hence it was provided that Theophrastus should take his place, *ἐάν δέ τι συμβαίῃ Νικάνορι*.

³ See Opp. On. Arist. T. I. pp. 19—24.

⁴ Opp. On. Arist. T. I. pp. 61—66.

⁵ Hegel's Werke, B. 14. S. 273. The name of Hegel should have been inserted.

With regard to the fate of his manuscripts a very singular report has been circulated, and until within a few years commonly believed. The Geography of Strabo is the earliest voucher for the tale; and as his narrative has awakened so much interest in the literary world, it deserves to be read in this connection. It is as follows.

“Neleus a native of Scepsis in the Troad, a son of the Socratic philosopher Coriscus, who had been a pupil both of Aristotle and of Theophrastus, inherited the library of Theophrastus.¹ This library was in part composed of that of Aristotle; for the latter bequeathed his books to Theophrastus, to whom he also left his school. He was the first, so far as I know, who collected books, and taught the kings of Egypt to gather together a library. Theophrastus bequeathed his library to Neleus, who took it over to Scepsis, and at length gave it to his heirs. These being uneducated men, kept the volumes under lock and key, and let them lie unattended to. When, however, the heirs saw the eagerness with which the Attalic kings, to whose jurisdiction Scepsis belonged, sought for books in order to fill up the library at Pergamos, the heirs hid these manuscripts under ground in a kind of cellar. A long time afterward, when the books had been much injured by damp and worms, they were sold for a large sum, by the representatives of Neleus’s family, to Apellicon of Teius. Apellicon was an amateur of books rather than a philosopher;² therefore when he attempted to restore the defaced passages of the text, and to transcribe new copies of the manuscripts, he did not sup-

serted on page 40 in the first Number of the Review, instead of the name—Erdmann.

¹ Neleus is thought [conjectured] by Stahr, (*Aristotelia*, Theil II. S. 117) to have been a near relative of Theophrastus and a man of literary tastes. Melantes and Pancreon, (who are supposed to have been brothers of the philosopher,) inherited the greater part of Theophrastus’s estate; and Neleus, who was a joint heir with them, inherited simply the literary property.

² Apellicon is said by Athenæus to have possessed an immense estate; and, before he plunged into politics, to have expended a vast amount of labor as well as of money in the collecting of books. He had the true antiquarian spirit, and was ever intent on purchasing the most rare and ancient manuscripts, the autographs. Nor was he always scrupulous with regard to the means which he employed for the gratification of his passion; but once went so far as to violate the sanctity of the Metroön, for the purpose of plundering the state archives, which were contained in that temple. He was detected in his crime, and obliged, through fear of death, to leave Athens for a season. He was an Athenian citizen, but a native of Teius. He was an intimate friend of Athenion, the Peripatetic. See Stahr’s *Aristotelia*, Th. II. S. 117—119.

ply the deficiencies in a proper manner, but issued an edition full of mistakes. The more ancient of the Peripatetic philosophers, therefore, who immediately succeeded Theophrastus, as they had no books, except a very few and those chiefly of the exoteric class, were unable to philosophize systematically, and could write only in a rhetorical style.¹ The later Peripatetics, however, who flourished after these manuscripts were given to the public, philosophized better than they and more in the spirit of their master. Still they were obliged to give many conjectural explanations of his views, in consequence of the numerous imperfections of his manuscripts. Rome, also, contributed much to the increase of this evil. For immediately after the death of Apellicon, Sylla, having taken possession of Athens, carried away the library of that antiquarian. After it was brought hither (to Rome), it fell into the hands of Tyrannio,² the grammarian, a friend of the Aristotelian philosophy, who obtained permission of the librarian to make use of the manuscripts. Some booksellers also introduced new errors into them, for they employed unskillful transcribers, and did not rectify the copies by comparison with the originals. This is an evil which occurs both at Rome and Alexandria, in the case of other books, which are copied for the purpose of being sold.”³

The narrative of Plutarch is similar to that of Strabo, and was probably borrowed from a work, no longer extant, of the last named writer. Plutarch says: “Sylla took with him (from Athens) the library of Apellicon, the Teian, in which were most of the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus. There were not many persons, at that time, who had an accurate knowledge of these writings. It is said that when the books were brought to Rome, Tyrannio, the grammarian, prepared many of them for publication,

¹ *Φιλοσοφείν πραγματικῶς, ἀλλὰ θίσειε ληκνυθίζειν.*

² Tyrannio was a son of Corymbus, a contemporary and teacher of Strabo, a scholar of the grammarian Hestiacus of Amisus, and afterwards a pupil of Dionysius of Rhodes. He was taken prisoner by Lucullus, and carried to Rome from Amisus, in the year 67 B. C. Here he acquired great fame by his extensive learning. He also amassed wealth; for Suidas says that he collected a library, which contained more than 30,000 volumes. He enjoyed the friendship of the most illustrious of the Roman scholars, especially of Atticus and Cicero. In the year 55 B. C. he resided in Cicero's house, and was teacher of the young Quintus Cicero. That he was held in high estimation by the Roman orator, is evident from Cic. Epist. ad Atticum. II. 6; IV. 4; X. 11, 6 et 2; ad Quint. Frat. II. 4; III. 4. He died at an advanced age at Rome. See Stahr, Arist. Theil II. S. 122—129.

³ Strabo, XIII. p. 124 seq.

and that Andronicus the Rhodian,¹ obtaining copies from him, published them, and drew up the indexes which are now in use. The older Peripatetics, indeed, when considered by themselves, appear to have been well educated and learned men, but were not extensively nor thoroughly acquainted with the writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus. The reason was, that the inheritance of Neleus the Scepsian, to whom Aristotle left his library, fell into the hands of men who were uneducated and indifferent to the cause of literature."²

There is another passage in Suidas, Vol. III. Art. Σύλλας, which resembles the account of Plutarch, and rests on the same evidence. It appears, then, that there is only one independent authority for this narrative, and that is the authority of Strabo. His statement, however, has been sufficient to secure a very general belief in the temporary loss and the serious mutilation of Aristotle's writings. The opinion has been current among the writers of the history of philosophy, first, that Aristotle himself did not publish any of his more important scientific treatises; secondly, that his successor Theophrastus retained exclusive possession of these works during his life, and neglected even at his death to give any of them to the public; thirdly, that Straton, the successor of Theophrastus, and indeed all the more ancient Peripatetic philosophers were destitute of every valuable scientific treatise, which either Aristotle or his most intimate friend and pupil had written; fourthly, that the writings of the Stagirite remained hidden and unknown about two hundred years; and fifthly, that when at last they were brought forth from the cellar, they were found defective and soiled; attempts were made to supply what was wanting and introduce regularity into the confused materials; parts of different works were united into one heterogeneous treatise, and one regular treatise was separated into several distinct works; mere sketches and rough draughts were published, as if they had been finished discussions; defaced passages in the manuscripts were restored and *lacunae* filled out on mere conjectural authority, and *that* the authority of ignorant men; the works of other authors were ascribed to Aristotle, and given to the public as his; even the commentaries, which his disciples had written on his philosophy, were mistaken for his own scientific dis-

¹ It is now generally admitted, that the edition which Andronicus issued of Aristotle's works, may have formed the basis of the editions which we possess at the present day.

² Plut. vit. Syllae. cap. XXVI.

cussions; and in fine, there was so much want of critical care and skill in the earliest editions of the Aristotelian works, that it is now difficult, if not impossible to decide, whether a great part of the productions ascribed to the Stagirite, belong of right to him, or to his imitators and exposuists, to Endennus for example, or to Phantias, or to Theophrastus.¹ Patritius, a scholar of the sixteenth century, went even so far as to suppose that scarcely any of the pretended Aristotelian works can be relied on as genuine; and others have contended that they are translations from the Arabic, the original Greek manuscripts having been irrecoverably lost.

But these are extreme views. The enterprise of recent German critics such as Brandis and Kopp, has exposed the unreasonableness of such a scepticism, and has proved, after extensive researches and with altogether unexpected clearness, that most of the works, which have come down to us as Aristotle's, are both genuine and authentic. These critics have shown, in the first place, that in all probability some of the Stagirite's philosophical writings were published during his life; that he had no motive for adopting so unusual a course as that of concealing his scientific discoveries; that his peculiar qualities of mind and heart would predispose him to be forward in making his researches known to the world; that the work which Cephisodorus issued against him is indicative, in various ways, of his having even at that early period given more than his Book of Proverbs to the world; that the letter of Alexander, in which he expresses his regret for the publication of the acroämatic treatises, proves that the philosopher had not acquired his extensive fame without the aid of his published works, esoteric as well as exoteric. The German critics have shown, in the second place, that Theophrastus's successors in the Lyceum, Straton, Praxiteles, Lycon, Ariston, Lyciscus, Praxiphanes, Hieronymus, Prytanis, Phormio, Critolaüs were not deprived of access to the writings of Aristotle; that Theophrastus would not have bequeathed the Stagirite's manuscripts to Neleus, rather than to Straton, if these manuscripts had not been transcribed, and thus made accessible to the Peripatetic school; that copies of them or perhaps some of the originals themselves were early deposited in the library of Alexandria. Athenaeus begins the first book of his *Deipnosophistae* with commendations on Laurentius, who "possessed a library

¹ See Buhle's Aufsätze in der *Allgem. Encyc. Wissensch. und Kunste.* v. Ersch und Gruber Th. V. S. 278—279, also Stahr's *Arist. Th. II.* S. 13—17, 33—35

exceeding in extent that of any other one who had gained a reputation as a book-collector, Polycrates the Samian, Pisistratus the tyrant of Athens, Euclid, Nicocrates of Cyprus, the kings of Pergamus too, and Euripides the poet, and Aristotle the philosopher, (and Theophrastus), and Neleus who possessed the books of these. All the books of Neleus were bought by my countryman, king Ptolemy, surnamed Philadelphus, and were carried away by him, together with the books which he brought from Athens and from Rhodes, to the fair city of Alexandria."¹ Now it seems incredible, that when Ptolemy purchased the library which had formerly belonged to Aristotle, he did not also purchase some manuscripts of that philosopher, especially as the manuscripts were so important a part of ancient literature, and were in the possession of the owner of the library. If he did not purchase these writings of the Stagirite, the reason would seem to be, that copies of them were already in the library or could easily be procured. The interest which Ptolemy is said to have felt in the Aristotelian theories is inconsistent with the idea, that in his favorite project of collecting a library, he could have overlooked the manuscripts of the father of these theories. He is, moreover, reported by David the Armenian, to have possessed a great number (*πολλῶν χιλίων*) of these writings, and even to have published a book concerning them and their author. There are many incidental proofs left by the writers who preceded Apellicon and Tyrannio, that the Alexandrine library contained at that time, some at least of Aristotle's philosophical works. The proofs are still more numerous and more direct that his writings, in whatsoever way obtained, were actually read not merely by Peripatetics, but also by Academicians, Stoics, Epicureans, by philosophers of the Megaric sect, and also by authors who are not usually denominated philosophers, such as Aristophanes of Byzantium, Antigonus of Carystus, etc. It was a common opinion of writers who preceded Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that Demosthenes obtained his rhetorical skill from the study of Aristotle's treatise on Rhetoric; this opinion would not have been so prevalent, if the treatise of Aristotle had not been known to have been published by its author. Distinct traces not merely of his Rhetoric, but also of his Logic, Natural History, Metaphysics, Politics, Ethics and other works, are found in the writings of men who flourished before the reported exhumation at Scepsis, and who yet were familiar with these treatises. The most ancient commentaries on Aris-

¹ Deipnos. l. cp. 2. p. 3.

totle which are now extant, refer to commentaries still more ancient which are now lost, and from these we learn that certain questions were discussed in the time of Andronicus the Rhodian, which indicate that previously to his day, the more important works of Aristotle must have been not merely known but studied also, not indeed so assiduously studied as they should have been, nor as they were in after times, still much more so than critics have pretended.

There are also certain remarks made by Cicero, in reference to the Aristotelian system, which prove that he was familiar both with those treatises of the Stagirite which have been transmitted to us, and also with some which are no longer in existence. He speaks of Aristotle as "pouring forth a golden flood of language,"¹ but certainly no such criticism is applicable to the jejune and arid treatises which now remain of that philosopher. He gives us certain specimens of the Aristotelian diction, which are far more oratorical than we could have looked for, or can now find, in the works of the father of logic. This is one of the circumstances favoring the supposition, that Aristotle's writings, which did not belong to the regular series, were written in a popular style, were adapted not so much to the race, as to the contemporaries of their author, were not of such standard value and of such universal interest as to secure the continued attention of scientific men, and were therefore by degrees either forgotten or lost; while on the contrary, the most valuable of those treatises which did constitute his combined system, his consecutive philosophical series,² were composed in the concise, didactic method, best fitted for permanent remembrance, and easy transmission to posterity, were therefore looked upon as not only important for coming generations, but as even essential to the progress of science, and a necessary part of the history of mind, were prized as authoritative text-books, and of course were preserved with care. Not by any

¹ Veniet, flumen orationis aureum fundens, Aristoteles. Acad. Pr. II 38. See also De Fin. I. 5, where Torquatus notices the "ornaments of style" which are found in the writings of Plato, of Aristotle and Theophrastus.

² Among the numerous definitions that have been given of the terms exoteric and esoteric, as applied to Aristotle's writings, one is this, the exoteric are insulated distinct treatises, the esoteric are parts of a comprehensive system; the former are independent essays, the latter are discussions forming a portion of a consecutive series; the former may be understood by themselves alone, the latter only in connection with the whole of which they are a part; hence the former may easily be supposed to be more popular, less fundamental than the latter, and consequently more liable to be lost from the libraries of the learned.

means that they are immaculate, but they are in such a state of preservation, as to give us an adequate idea of the Aristotelian philosophy. "There are many of the Stagirite's works," says Hegel,¹ "some of his principal treatises, which may be considered as whole and uninjured; there are others which may be looked upon as here and there mutilated, or not well arranged, but yet, such defects do not injure the main part of these manuscripts so much as would at first appear. We possess enough of his writings to be able to form a definite idea of his philosophical system, of its great comprehensive plan and even of much of its detail."

Meanwhile, the results of German criticism in favor of the genuineness of Aristotle's works, are not entirely in conflict with the narrations of Strabo, and of those who have repeated his statements. It may be readily admitted, in coincidence with his authority, that Neleus inherited from Theophrastus some of Aristotle's unpublished manuscripts, that these manuscripts were the rude sketches, the first outlines of works which were never intended to be published, or which had been already published in another and more perfect form, that they were at length sold as autographs to a literary *dilettante*, who placed as high a value upon the disconnected scribblings, the note-books, the common-places, the scattered hints, the half-finished plans and incipient draughts which had been left by the philosopher, as upon the finished treatises which had already been published, and the contents of which he might or might not have known. These imperfect skeletons of thought were filled out by Apellicon, *οὐκ ἐν*, as Strabo affirms; and the editions published from these private scrawls were *ἀμαρταδῶν πλήρη*. Nor is it in any degree improbable, that when the editions of Apellicon were re-examined by Tyrannio and Andronicus the Rhodian, they were compared unskillfully with the more authentic works of Aristotle, that paragraphs were inconsiderately transferred from the fragmentary edition of Apellicon to the editions that had been previously in vogue, and *vice versâ*; that hence a degree of confusion was introduced into our present copies; that there are so many redundancies in one part of a treatise and deficiencies in another part; that some of the Stagirite's works appear to be fragmentary, and others full and finished. Thus may the narrative of Strabo have been founded on a fact, and, like so many statements of ancient historians, it may be a mere exaggeration of the truth.

¹ Werke, Band 14. S. 273.

The question with regard to the genuineness of Aristotle's pretended works, and the state in which they are preserved, is discussed in the following works. Franciscus Patritius, *Discussiones Peripateticæ*, T. I. Lib. IV. Renat. Rapin, *Comparison de Platon et d'Aristote*. ed. 2. 1686. Pierre Bayle, *Dictionnaire histor. et crit.*, art. Tyrannion et Andronique. J. A. Fabricius, *Bib. Græca*. Tom. III. Lib. III. cp. 5. J. Brucker, *Otium Vindelic.* pp. 80 seq., et *Historia crit. phil.* Tom. I. p. 799. C. G. Heyne, *Opuscula Academ.* V. I. pp. 126 seq. J. G. Buhle, *Pref. ad edit. Opp. Arist.* Tom. I. pp. xvii, xviii, et *Allgem. Encyc. v. Ersch u. Gruber*, Art. Aristoteles. F. N. Titze, *De Aristotelis Operum serie et distinctione liber singularis* pp. 5 seq. J. G. Schneider *Epimetr.* II et III vor seiner Ausgabe der Aristotelischen *Historia de Animalibus*. Tom. I. Chr. A. Brandis, *Ueber die Schicksale der Aristotelischen Schriften und einige Kriterien ihrer Aechtheit*, im Rhein. Mus. I. 3. Kopp, *Nachtrag zu der vorgenannten Untersuchung*, in Rhein. Mus. III. 1. Stahr, *Aristotelia*, Theil. II. S. 5—172. *Histories of Philosophy* by Hegel, Ritter, et al.

ARTICLE III.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF MONASTICISM;—FROM THE ORIGINAL SOURCES.

By Rev. Ralph Emerson, D. D., Prof. of Ecclesiastical History in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

AFTER some general statements and remarks respecting monasticism, the history of its rise in the christian church will be presented in the form of translations from the most authentic sources. The pieces presented will consist chiefly of biographical notices of some of the earliest and most noted monks.

It may well be supposed no easy thing for us of this age and in this country, to form a just estimate or even a very definite conception of monasticism, from the ordinary helps we enjoy. The chief object of my remarks, and indeed of the whole account to be given, will be to aid in the formation of such an estimate, especially in regard to its earliest period in the church.—A full history of the institution down to the present time, would require many volumes.

VOL. I. No. 2.