

Text 1: Plu., QC 8, 10 (Clement – Hoffleit)

Προβλήμασιν Ἀριστοτέλους φυσικοῖς ἐντυγχάνων Φλῶρος εἰς Θερμοπύλας κομισθεῖσιν αὐτός τε πολλῶν ἀποριῶν, ὅπερ εἰώθασι πάσχειν ἐπιεικῶς αἱ φιλόσοφοι φύσεις, ὑπεπίπλατο καὶ τοῖς ἐταίροις μετεδίδου, μαρτυρῶν αὐτῷ τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει λέγοντι τὴν πολυμάθειαν πολλὰς ἀρχὰς ποιεῖν. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα μεθ' ἡμέραν οὐκ ἄχαριν ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις διατριβὴν παρέσχεν· τὸ δὲ λεγόμενον περὶ τῶν ἐνυπνίων, ὥς ἐστὶν ἀβέβαια καὶ ψευδῆ μάλιστα περὶ τοὺς φυλλοχόους μῆνας, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐφ' ἑτέροις λόγοις πραγματευσαμένου τοῦ Φαβωρίνου μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον ἀνέκυψεν. Τοῖς μὲν οὖν σοῖς ἐταίροις ἐμοῖς δ' υἱοῖς ἐδόκει λευκέναι τὴν ἀπορίαν Ἀριστοτέλης, καὶ οὐδὲν ὄντο δεῖν ζητεῖν οὐδὲ λέγειν ἀλλ' ἢ τοὺς καρπούς, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος, αἰτιᾶσθαι. Κτλ.

Florus, who was engaged in reading a copy of Aristotle's *Natural Problems* that had been brought to Thermopylae, was himself full of questions, as is natural for a philosophical spirit, and shared them with his friends too, proving Aristotle's own statement that "great learning gives many starting-points." Most of the questions raised provided us with a pleasant pastime during our daytime walks; but the common saying about dreams – that they are especially likely to be unreliable or false in the fall months – somehow came up after dinner, after Favorinus had finished a discourse on other topics. Your friends, my sons, thought that Aristotle had solved the problem, and that there was no point in any further inquiry or discussion, except to say, as he had, that the harvest is to blame. Etc.

Text 2: Gell., NA 19, 6 (Rolfe)

Quod pudor sanguinem ad externa diffundit, timor vero contrahit.

In Problematis Aristotelis philosophi ita scriptum est: Διὰ τί οἱ μὲν αἰσχυρόμενοι ἐρυθριῶσιν, οἱ δὲ φοβούμενοι ὠχριῶσιν, παραπλησίων τῶν παθῶν ὄντων; ὅτι τῶν μὲν αἰσχυνομένων διαχεῖται τὸ αἷμα ἐκ τῆς καρδίας εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ μέρη τοῦ σώματος, ὥστε ἐπιπολάζειν· τοῖς δὲ φοβηθεῖσιν συντρέχει εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, ὥστε ἐκλείπειν ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν. *Hoc ego Athenis cum Tauro nostro legissem percontatusque essem quid de ratione ista reddita sentiret, "Dixit quidem," inquit, "probe et vere quid accideret diffuso sanguine aut contracto, sed cur ita fieret non dixit. Adhuc enim quaeri potest quam ob causam pudor sanguinem diffundat, timor contrahat, cum sit pudor species timoris atque ita definiatur: 'timor iustae reprehensionis.' Ita enim philosophi definiunt: αἰσχὺν ἔστιν φόβος δικαίου ψόγου."*

That shame drives the blood outward, while fear checks it.

In the *Problems* of the philosopher Aristotle is the following passage: "Why do men who are ashamed turn red and those who fear grow pale; although these emotions are similar? Because the blood of those who feel shame flows from the heart to all parts of the body, and therefore comes to the surface; but the blood of those who fear rushes to the heart, and consequently leaves all the other parts of the body." When I had read this at Athens with our friend Taurus and had asked him what he thought about that reason which had been assigned, he answered: "He has told us properly and truly what happens when the blood is diffused or concentrated, but he has not told us why this takes place. For the question may still be asked why it is that shame diffuses the blood and fear contracts it, when shame is a kind of fear and is defined by the philosophers as 'the fear of just censure.' For they say: αἰσχὺν ἔστιν φόβος δικαίου ψόγου."

Text 3: Gell., NA 20, 4 (Rolfe, adapted)

Artificum scaenorum studium amoremque inhonestum probrosumque esse; et super ea re verba Aristotelis philosophi adscripta.

Comoedos quispiam et tragoedos et tibicines dives adulescens, Tauri philosophi discipulus, ut liberos homines in deliciis atque in delectamentis habebat. Id genus autem artifices Graece appellantur οἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνσον τεχνῖται. Eum adulescentem Taurus a sodalitatibus convictuque

hominum scaenicorum abducere volens, misit ei verba haec ex Aristotelis libro exscripta, qui Προβλήματα Ἐγκύκλια inscriptus est, iussitque uti ea cotidie lectitaret: Διὰ τί οἱ Διονυσιακοὶ τεχνῖται ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ πονηροὶ εἰσιν; ἢ ὅτι ἤκιστα λόγου καὶ φιλοσοφίας κοινωνοῦσι διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀναγκαίαις τέχνας τὸ πολὺ μέρος τοῦ βίου εἶναι, καὶ ὅτι ἐν ἀκρασίαις τὸν πολὺν χρόνον εἰσίν, ὅτε δὲ ἐν ἀπορίαις; ἀμφοτέρωθεν δὲ φαυλότητος παρασκευαστικά.

That devotion to play-actors, and love of them, was shameful and disgraceful, with a quotation of the words of the philosopher Aristotle on that subject.

A wealthy young man, a pupil of the philosopher Taurus, was devoted to, and delighted in, the society of comic and tragic actors and musicians, as if they were freemen. Now in Greek they call artists of that kind οἱ περὶ Διόνυσον τεχνῖται or “craftsmen of Dionysus.” Taurus, wishing to wean that youth from the intimacy and companionship of men connected with the stage, sent him these words extracted from the work of Aristotle entitled Universal Questions, and bade him read it over every day: “Why are the craftsmen of Dionysus for the most part worthless fellows? Is it because they are least of all familiar with reason and philosophy, since the greater part of their life is given to their essential pursuits and much of their time is spent in intemperance and sometimes in difficulties too? For both of these things are incentives to wickedness.”

[Arist.], *Pr.* 30, 10, 956b11-15 (Mayhew)

Διὰ τί οἱ Διονυσιακοὶ τεχνῖται ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ πονηροὶ εἰσιν;

ἢ ὅτι ἤκιστα λόγου <καὶ> σοφίας κοινωνοῦσι διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀναγκαίαις τέχνας τὸ πολὺ μέρος τοῦ βίου εἶναι, καὶ ὅτι ἐν ἀκρασίαις τὸ πολὺ τοῦ βίου εἰσίν, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν ἀπορίαις; ἀμφοτέρωθεν δὲ φαυλότητος παρασκευαστικά.

Why are Dionysian artists in most cases bad people?

Is it because they least of all partake of reason and wisdom, owing to most of their life being concerned with the necessary arts, and because most of their life is passed in incontinence, and some of it also in difficulties? Both of these prepare the way for baseness.

Text 4: *Apul.*, *Apo.* 36 (Hunink, with adaptation)

legat ueterum philosophorum monumenta, tandem ut intellegat non me primum haec requisisse, sed iam pridem maiores meos, Aristotelen dico et Theop<h>rastum et [t]Eudemum et Lyconem ceterosque Platonis minores, qui plurimos libros de genitu animalium deque uictu deque particulis deque omni differentia reliquerunt. Bene quod apud te, Maxime, causa agitur, qui pro tua eruditione legisti profecto Aristotelis περὶ ζώων γενέσεως, περὶ ζώων ἀνατομῆς, περὶ ζώων ἱστορίας multiuaga uolumina, praeterea problemata innumera eiusdem, tum ex eadem secta ceterorum, in quibus id genus uaria tractantur. Quae tanta cura conquisita si honestum et gloriosum illis fuit scribere, cur turpe sit nobis experiri, praesertim cum ordinatius et cohibilius eadem Graece et Latine adnitar conscribere et in omnibus aut omissa adquirere aut defecta supplere?

Let him (sc. Aemilianus) read the monumental works of ancient philosophers, so that he finally understands that I am not the first one to have looked for these things. For a long time my masters have done so – I mean Aristotle, Theophrastus, Eudemus, Lyco, and the other successor Platonists, who have left on record many books on the origin of animals, their diet, anatomy, and differentiating characteristics. Thank goodness this case is held before you, Maximus! Of course, as an educated man you have read Aristotle’s many volumes, *On the Origin of Animals*, *On the Anatomy of Animals*, and *On the History of Animals*, and the countless *Problemata* by the same man, and by others from the same philosophical school, in which various similar subjects are treated. If they earned fame and glory by writing on material which they had gathered with so much care, why would it be shameful for us to attempt this, particularly since I try to write more coherently and concisely on these matters, both in Greek and in Latin, while adding details that have been left out and correcting errors?