

Biography and Doxography. Four Crucial Questions Raised by Diogenes Laertius

Diogenes Laertius' book, *Lives and Opinions of Famous Philosophers*,¹ is the only collection of biographies of philosophers which has been preserved in its entirety and transmitted to us through Medieval manuscripts.² There are other biographies of philosophers, most of them belonging to the Neoplatonic school,³ to some extent autobiographical, and not, as far as we can judge, representative of the Hellenistic tradition. Furthermore, there are some biographies written within the Epicurean school of philosophy and incompletely preserved on papyrus.⁴ Diogenes therefore has played a major role in our understanding of the history of ancient philosophy, in particular in the many cases where the works of individual philosophers have been lost, so that we have to rely on the philosophical information provided by Diogenes.

Diogenes' text is divided into 10 'books':

1: Introduction and various 'wise men', including Thales.

(2–7: *The Ionian tradition*)

2: The Ionian physicists, Socrates, and the minor Socratic schools down to the early 3rd cent. BC.

3: Plato.

4: The Academy down to Clitomachus (late 2nd cent. BC).

5: Aristotle and the Peripatetics down to Lyco (late 3rd cent. BC).

6: Antisthenes and the Cynics down to the end of the 3rd cent. BC.

7: Zeno and the Stoics down to at least Chrysippus (late 3rd cent. BC); the missing end of the book perhaps went down even to the 1st cent. AD.

(8–10: *The Italic Tradition*)

8: Pythagoras and his early successors; Empedocles.

9: Heraclitus; the Eleatics; the Atomists; Protagoras and Diogenes of Apollonia; Pyrrho.

10: Epicurus.

1 On the title, cf. Mejer (1978) 50–51 n. 111. If the title transmitted in the medieval manuscript reflects the original title, it is unique in Antiquity, cf. below p. 440.

2 The best edition is M. Marcovich's Teubner text (1999–2002), but it should be used in combination with the French translation edited by Goulet-Cazé (1999) which has an extensive commentary.

3 Porphyry wrote a life of his teacher, Plotinus, both Porphyry and Iamblichus wrote lives of Pythagoras, Marinus wrote a life of his teacher Proclus, and Damascius wrote a *Historia Philosopha*, basically a life of his teacher Isidorus.

4 Since, moreover, all three texts are incompletely preserved, they cannot serve as good evidence for the structure of philosophical biographies.

This structure is important since it seems to indicate that Diogenes' work belongs to a type of ancient literature in which the lives of philosophers were arranged as two or three series of biographies so that teacher and student followed one another within each major philosophical school. This type of literature had the title *Successions of Philosophers*,⁵ though there are also other books with different titles that seem to belong in this category, not least Philodemus' two surveys of the Platonic and the Stoic schools.⁶

Some of Diogenes' biographies, however, seem to have been composed later than the Hellenistic period (Xenophon, Democritus), and some of his reports on philosophical systems show features that are similar to texts from the second century AD (Plato, Skeptics). Therefore, we must ask:

To which extent is Diogenes representative of the *Successions* type — and in general of the Hellenistic tradition of biography and historiography of philosophy?

Diogenes' biographical sections are composed of a number of items like birth, parents, name, appearance, relationship to other philosophers, travels, life style and circumstances of death; there is no particular order in which these items are presented, and though many details also were found in Hellenistic sources, they cannot have come from one particular source. In any case, we must ask:

Is the biographical information we get, trustworthy?

The dominating element in all the biographies is Diogenes' use of anecdotes; sometimes the same anecdote is told about more than one philosopher, hence it is hard to believe that Diogenes himself was convinced of them being literally true. Since it is commonly assumed that anecdotes are fictitious, we must ask a third question:

What is the biographical value of anecdotes?

Many, but not all, of Diogenes' Lives include a section on the philosophical ideas, if not of an individual philosopher, then at least of a philosophical school. In the case of the Post-Socratic schools (the Cyrenaics, Plato, Aristotle, the Cynics, the Stoics, the Skeptics and Epicurus) there is no uniform way of presenting their philosophy: Plato is presented in the light of second century AD Platonism, while Aristotle's philosophy seems to represent a fairly early way of doing Peripatetic philosophy; the Stoic philosophy is described with references to many Stoics of different periods while Epicurus' philosophy is represented by four texts going back to Epicurus himself. The survey of the Skeptic tropes (9,79–105) is shorter than in Sextus Empiricus but otherwise comparable.⁷

5 Cf. Mejer (2000). Fragments in Giannattasio Andria (1989).

6 Tiziano Dorandi's two editions of Philodemus (Dorandi 1991; 1994) have superseded all previous editions.

7 For these philosophical sections in Diogenes, cf. Mejer (1992).

The philosophy of the Presocratics is, however, for the most part described by means of fairly short systematic surveys similar to what we find in Hippolytus' *Refutatio omnium haeresium* Book One, and — in content, if not in form — to Pseudo-Plutarch's *Placita* and to sections of Stobaeus. These surveys have since Diels' pioneering work *Doxographi Graeci* (1879) been called doxographical, though the term 'doxographical' unfortunately has been extended to mean any text reporting the views of previous philosophers.

Considering this variety of philosophical information, we must ask a fourth important question:

To which extent can we assume that Diogenes just copied his predecessors, or to put the question in another way: are we justified in assuming that most of the Hellenistic biographies of philosophers contained separate sections on the philosophers' views?

I would like to discuss these four crucial questions⁸ by examining Diogenes' *Life of Democritus* (9,34–49) and draw some more general conclusions on that basis.

Factual Information

"Democritus, son of Hegesistatus, others say of Athenocritus, some of Damasippus, from Abdera, or as some say, from Miletus." (D. L. 9,34)

There is often disagreement in ancient biographies about the names of fathers and native city-state.⁹ This is not surprising. Unless a philosopher himself had given these pieces of information in the incipit of his book, or was a famous public figure who might have been mentioned in an inscription (though such are rarely mentioned in ancient biographical texts), there was no way to find out what the truth was.¹⁰ There were no public records. Nor was it easy to determine when a person had been born. In the case of Democritus (cf. D. L. 9,41), it seems that he had said in one of his books that he was young when Anaxagoras was old — Diogenes adds that he was 40 years younger than Anaxagoras; this was probably Apollodorus' fixation of this interval since this was his usual method of estimating the interval between two philosophers

8 A fifth important question which I shall not discuss in this context, is to which extent Diogenes' presentations of philosophical ideas are reliable, cf., however, the paper mentioned in the previous note.

9 Thus, many entries on poets and intellectuals in the *Suda* show the same uncertainty. Plutarch's *Lives* have fewer examples of this uncertainty.

10 It is probably no coincidence that ancient biographies tell us so little about how an individual developed into whatever he became, nobody would know about the early childhood, and in general it seems to have been a dogma that a person's character is more or less determined from birth; hence most stories (anecdotes) of early childhood and education only confirm what we find in the grown-up individual. When we know the names of philosophical teachers, it is because in that way it was possible to certify one's rightful association with a particular school.

who might have been in a teacher-student relationship. Apollodorus placed Democritus' birth to Ol. 80, having placed Anaxagoras' birth in Ol. 70. Most of our dates for the birth of philosophers are as imprecise as this. In fact, since we can see that Thrasyllus accepted Apollodorus' date for the birth of Socrates, Ol. 77.4, he must have had some reason to reject Apollodorus' date for Democritus and to prefer Ol. 77.3. I think that any date that is not in agreement with Apollodorus and the common dating of philosophers deserves to be considered seriously.¹¹

How desperate the ancient biographers were for finding sources for the lives of philosophers is evident from the references Diogenes gives for the biographical information in his *Life of Democritus*:

- 1: Herodotus
- 2: Favorinus
- 3: Demetrius Magnes, who quotes Democritus himself, and Antisthenes
- 4: Thrasyllus who refers to Platonic *Anterastai*¹² — and to Democritus' own writings, especially his *Pythagoras*
- 5: Hippobotus
- 6: Glaucus of Rhegium
- 7: Apollodorus of Cyzicus
- 8: Aristoxenus
- 9: Athenodorus
- 10: Hermippus

Herodotus said nothing about Democritus, but did mention some magoi and Abdera at various points (7,109. 8,120), and there is no indication that the anonymous philosopher mentioned in the *Anterastai* had anything to do with Democritus. The reason why Thrasyllus came to that idea must have been that he divided Democritus' writings into five groups (cf. D. L. 9,37 and the bibliography, 9,46–48) and then found the 'pentathlet' philosopher in the Platonic dialogue.

Demetrius, Antisthenes, Hippobotus and Hermippus belong to the standard Hellenistic biographers who obviously told the same — or similar — stories again and again. It is important to be aware that these authors often copy one another, and that the reliability of a report has nothing to do with the number of authorities quoted. We will return to these stories a little later.

Glaucus of Rhegium is important because he proves that the idea that Democritus had something to do with the Pythagoreans goes back to around 400 BC. Thrasyllus' emphasis on Democritus' Pythagorean background is sometimes attributed to his own Pythagorean tendencies, but it is not random.¹³

11 As for Democritus' dates, cf. D. O'Brien (1994) 655–677.

12 132 b1 + c1. Marcovich's emendation of Diogenes' text is unnecessary and the text should be left as it is. Since the *Anterastai* is part of the tetralogies, Thrasyllus must have considered it Platonic.

13 As for the last two sources, Athenodorus (RE 20) is otherwise unknown; considering that he treated a variety of topics in book 8 of his *Peripatoi*, it is hard to believe that he was more than an author of trivialities. If he is identical with Apollodorus (RE 19), he must have lived at the end

Thrasyllus¹⁴ is one of the most interesting sources quoted by Diogenes: §§ 37–38 (Democritus' intellectual versatility and his relations to the Pythagoreans), 41 (date), and 45–48 (bibliography). Thrasyllus must have organized the corpus of Democritean books in tetralogies and he must have had access to his books — why else would he write an *Introduction to the Reading of Democritus' Books*? This, however, does not mean that he need edited or published them; his 'editorial' efforts were so influential that the Medieval tradition of Plato's dialogues followed his arrangement. There is no reason to doubt the information that comes from Thrasyllus, nor to doubt that Democritus wrote a book on Pythagoras and mentioned other philosophers in his works. Few people seem to have read Democritus' works before Thrasyllus; the only quotation from them prior to Thrasyllus is "I came to Athens and nobody knew me" in D. L. 9,36 from Demetrius Magnes, obviously a stray quotation used to illustrate the insignificance of fame.¹⁵ The context of this statement is unknown, but it is unlikely that we can draw the same conclusion from this statement as Demetrius did, viz. that he met Socrates, but was unknown to him.

The most important aspect of Thrasyllus as a source for Diogenes is that he proves that Diogenes did not copy a Hellenistic book: two of his main sources: Demetrius Magnes and Thrasyllus (and one other authority, Favorinus) are more recent than most quoted Hellenistic sources. We must conclude that Diogenes composed his *Life of Democritus* by himself.

It is worth noticing how few good sources were available to the ancient biographers. Most of the books referred to by Diogenes are general biographical collections that have nothing to do with the historiography of philosophy or philosophical literature. The references to *Anterastai*, to Herodotus and to Democritus' own writings are not reassuring. The problems with literary texts as sources for biography are different from using philosophical texts for the same purpose: we cannot be sure that literary works like plays can be taken to relate directly to the life of the author, while it is rather unlikely that the philosophical works will yield much biographical information at all, even philosophical dialogues need not relate to the biography of the participants or of their authors.¹⁶ When we get a quotation from one of Democritus' books, viz. that he wrote his *Small Diacosmos* 750 year after the fall of Troy (D. L. 9,41), we are unable to exploit it. It does not agree with Eratosthenes' date for the fall

of the first cent. BC. Apollodorus of Cyzicus is otherwise unknown; even if he is identical with the mathematician Apollodorus (RE 19), we cannot determine his date, and we have no idea in which context he said that Democritus has been with Philolaus. This is yet another instance of an association of Democritus with the Pythagoreans.

14 Cf. Tarrant (1993), with testimonia in an appendix.

15 Also mentioned by Cicero and Valerius Maximus (cf. DK 68B116). — It seems likely that Democritus' writings reached Alexandria, cf. DK 68A32, and this explains that they were available to some intellectuals in the Roman Empire.

16 Notice that Diogenes' remark on Zeno and Parmenides in 9,25 is based on Plato's *Parmenides* and the *Sophist*; Diels' addition is not necessary.

of Troy (1184-730 = 454, too early for the dates of Democritus). If Diogenes and Apollodorus accepted Eratosthenes' date, they cannot have been very clear about chronology.¹⁷ Certainly, Diogenes' sense of chronology is often weak, as we see from his remark that Protagoras was a contemporary of Socrates, though he was more than 20 years older according to Diogenes (cf. 9.56).¹⁸

The answer to the second question I posed: Is the biographical information about ancient philosophers we find in biographies, trustworthy, must be that we have little reason to consider it reliable. We have no way of knowing more than the ancient biographers, but if, by some remote luck, we find some documentary evidence that contradicts the information in ancient texts, there is no reason to reject it automatically.

Anecdotes

The larger part of Diogenes' *Life of Democritus* consists of what we call anecdotes: Democritus' secluded life in the garden (Demetrius Magnes), his stay in a graveyard and his poverty and reward for reading his opus magnum to the public (Anisthenes, Demetrius and Hippobolus), his meeting with Hippocrates (Athenodorus) and finally, his postponing his death to the end of the Thesmophoria (Hermippus).

The anecdote in the sense 'a short narrative with a witty and/or surprising final point, often told to express a particular moral view' is a fairly modern term, and as such it was unknown to the ancient Greeks and Romans.¹⁹ There is no indication that the ancient biographers distinguished between historical facts and (fictitious) anecdotes. Plutarch's programmatic statement in the beginning of his *Alexander* comes close to it, but his point is not the distinction between fact and anecdote, but between major events and smaller incidents:

"... I am writing biography, not history, and the truth is that the most brilliant exploits often tell us nothing of the virtues or the vices of the men who performed them, while on the other hand a chance remark or a joke may reveal far more of a man's character than the mere feat of winning battles in which thousands fall, or of marshalling great armies, or laying siege to cities."²⁰

Ancient biography is always moralizing.²¹

17 Of course, you can change the number of years, as Mansfield (1990) does. But there is nothing in the *mas.* to suggest an error, and Mansfield's emendation presupposes that Democritus' book was published in the year of his Apollodorean floruit — and we know nothing about that.

18 Other examples of shaky chronology in Diogenes are his dates for Anaximander and Anaximenes, 2.2 and 3; of course, most scholars emendate the text, but the question is whether they correct manuscript errors, or Diogenes himself.

19 Cf. Gärden (1996) with bibliography.

20 Scott-Kilvert (1973) 252.

21 Most eminently expressed by Plutarch, e.g. *Pericles* 1, *Demetrius* 1, *Timoleon* Tract.

The problem with anecdotes is that they often are so full of life, so full of wit and common sense, so simple, that they very well could be true, in the sense that they did happen. Democritus may have secluded himself in his father's garden, he may have spent some time in a cemetery to prove that ghosts do not exist (cf. the more complete version of this story in Pseudo-Lucian *Philopseudis* 32), but it is improbable that anybody knew much about incidents in his life after his death. The value of anecdotes is rather that they inform us about what some biographers considered characteristic of him. In Diogenes' selection of anecdotes it seems significant that they all serve to give a positive impression of Democritus: he worked hard, he was unperturbed and intelligent, and he faced his death calmly. There were other versions of Democritus' death than Hermippus', but Diogenes chose this version because it suited his purpose, viz. to make a hero of Democritus, as we see from his epigram on the philosopher (and confirmed by Timon's description of him, quoted in 9.40).

When the same anecdote is told in connection with different philosophers, it is usually impossible to decide to whom it may have belonged. In D. L. 2.13 we are told that Anaxagoras when he was informed that he had been sentenced to death and that his sons had died, said regarding his conviction that "Nature has condemned both me and the Athenians a long time ago", and about his sons that he knew that they were born mortal. The former remark is also attributed to Socrates, (2.35) while the second, as explicitly acknowledged by Diogenes himself, was also attributed to Xenophon (2.55). In both cases, it seems quite likely that the same event happened to two different persons (we can be sure that both Anaxagoras and Socrates were convicted by an Athenian court), but it is also possible that one of the involved parties referred to a remark by his predecessor, or that a later author transferred this saying from one to the other because he thought that this anecdote would serve to characterize the person he was writing about.

On the other hand, it should be noticed that different anecdotes were told about different philosophers, cf. e.g. the anecdotes told about Zeno and his death, protesting tyranny (D. L. 9.26-27). Though it can be claimed that these anecdotes were invented by later biographers to express their own view of the philosophers, the different stories might also be explained by referring to the individual characteristics of each philosopher. The anecdotes seem not to be random, even though we cannot take them for true in the sense that they did in fact occur in the life of the philosopher in question. It is possible that Hermippus' death scene has been created on the basis of various items in Democritus' philosophy, and it is indisputable that the idea that you can stay alive by sifting the fumes from hot bread is part of folk medicine.²² Even so, it is possible that Democritus did what the anecdote tells us. He may have taken advantage of

22 The various ways of explaining Democritus' death are well described by J. Bollasac in his commentary to Hermippus, *FrgHist.* 1026 ff. 66. Cf. also Chirwood (2004).

folklore, or he may be the origin of this attempt to postpone death. It is only when we have various anecdotes and different versions of the same anecdote that we can discover possible motives for telling them. Only rarely can we identify the origin of the anecdotes, most obviously in the case of poets where the ancient biographers tended to interpret their literary works as being autobiographical.²³ — Socrates' *Life of Euripides* is a good illustration of this principle.²⁴

The significance of the various anecdotes about Plato and books²⁵ (as here in the *Life of Demosthenes*, that he wanted to gather and burn the books of Demosthenes, from Aristoxenus, not the most impartial biographer of Plato), is not so much that Plato had this idea, but that already in the first generation after Plato's death somebody had noticed that Democritus was not mentioned in Plato's dialogues, and that it was possible to assume that Plato was in fact interested in books.²⁶

The value of anecdotes, then, is that they in some cases do tell us something about the person in question, and that they usually tell us about how the later tradition looked upon a philosopher.

Doxography

After the description of Democritus' death and Diogenes' epigram (9,43) and before the bibliography (9,46–49),²⁷ we find a section on doxography:

§ 44 to some extent follows the general scheme found in other Presocratic doxographies: principles, heavenly bodies, meteorology, psychology and human physiology, but it begins by adding an epistemological sentence to the usual statement on principles: "all other things are conventional". Since similar statements are found in Galen, Diogenes of Oenoanda and Sextus Empiricus, this point must have struck this period as being significant. After having mentioned the usual topics, Diogenes goes on in § 45:²⁸

"Everything comes to be by necessity, the swift, which he calls necessity, being the cause of the coming to be of everything. The goal in life is to be in a good state of mind (eὖθυμία), but this state is not, as some erroneously have interpreted it, the same as pleasure, but the state in which the soul is quiet and well balanced, undisturbed by any

fear or superstition or any other emotion. Democritus calls this state of mind 'well-being' (εὖνομία) and uses many other terms. Conventions are artificial;²⁹ in reality only atoms and the void exist. — These are the opinions of Democritus."³⁰

The remark on necessity is out of order compared to the usual doxographies, unless it comes here because it is the start of the ethical section: cf. Leucippus where it is mentioned in connection with the development of cosmos (D. L. 9,33 and Hippolytus 1,12,2). Seen in the context of Democritus' ethics, it means that human beings should live for their own well-being and not be bound by any of the human conventions except as far as they accept these conventions.³¹

Ethics do not belong to doxography. Since Diels it has been customary to claim that Diogenes here had combined or mixed up two different kinds of doxographies, one of which was transmitted through the biographers.³² A sign of this combination was that the end of the text of § 45 was said to be a repetition of the beginning of § 44. But this is only the case if we emend the text and there is no reason to do that. Whatever the meaning of the transmitted text of § 45, it makes good sense in the context of ethics and as an important idea in Democritus' philosophy. Since the closest parallel to this section is found in Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 2,130 (DK 68B4), it seems much more likely that it is Diogenes who has used or written a brief survey of Democritean ethics. He certainly did not find it in one of his usual sources, and the way he indicates that there have been different ways of interpreting the Democritean key concept is proof that there must have been discussions of this question before. Furthermore, it is not unusual to find that a doxographical text has been adapted by the author to suit his own purpose. Doxographical texts are never the result of mindless copying, as D. Runia and J. Mansfeld have demonstrated.

The similarity between Diogenes and early third century AD Christian texts seems to indicate that Diogenes did not just copy one of the usual Hellenistic sources used elsewhere in his book. The fact is that we do not have one single fragment from Hellenistic biographical authors that presents us with a doxographical section. Nor are there any doxographies in Philodemus' two surveys of the Platonic and Stoic schools of philosophy, not to mention the *Life of Philonides*. When, finally, we remember that Diogenes uses different sets of sources in his biographical and doxographical sections, the conclusion must be that Hellenistic biographies had no doxographies. Needless to say, they may have indicated that a particular philosopher was the first to say or think this or that,

²³ Cf. Leffkovitz (1981).
²⁴ Cf. the informative pages in Schorn (2004) 37–46.

²⁵ Cf. Rignos (1976) nos. 123–128.

²⁶ Cf. Mejer (forthcoming).

²⁷ Notice that both here and in his *Life of Plato* Diogenes uses *Thesaurus* bibliographies, a sign that he tried to find up-to-date material for his book.

²⁸ On this chapter, cf. Onodera (1993) 104–109.

²⁹ Or the other way around "things produced by human beings are conventional".

³⁰ Translation by C.C. Taylor, with some changes.

³¹ It is, however, worth noting that Leucippus B2: "Nothing happens in vain, but everything from reason and by necessity" comes from his book *On the mind* (Περί νοῦ).

³² Cf. Diels (1879) 161–169. I have previously criticized this theory, cf. Mejer (1978) 83–85. For a more decisive criticism, cf. Mansfeld/Runia (1996).

e.g. D. L. 9, 20, "Sotion says that Xenophanes was the first to say that everything was incomprehensible, but he is mistaken,"³³ or the passage on Plato's inventions, 3, 24–25, but this is not doxography. Conversely, doxographical texts may have short introductory statements pertaining to biography, e.g. Hippolytus on Democritus: "Democritus was Leucippus' acquaintance. Democritus, son of Damasippus, met many people: the gymnosophists in India, the priests in Egypt and astrologers and magi in Babylon." (Hipp. Ref. 1, 13, 1), but this tag of identification is *not* biography.

Diels' use of the term doxography was meant to identify the texts that ultimately seem to have been based on Aristotle's and Theophrastus' presentation of their predecessors' handling of their own problems, but Diels never explained when the *systematic* approach found in Aetius was created, nor did he deal with the many other works which to judge from their titles, must have reported the *doxai* of the philosophers. And finally, we do not know the origin of the type of doxography which we find in Hippolytus and Diogenes, though it may have something to do with the surveys found in the *On the Senses* (Περὶ αἰσθησέων) — which, however, usually describe philosophy as systems formulated by different schools.³⁴

So to answer the fourth question: we have no indication that doxographies were part of the Hellenistic biography. It need not surprise anyone that the ancients wrote biographies of philosophers without really bringing their philosophical ideas into their lives. It is not uncharacteristic of human beings to be more interested in other human beings, their doings and sayings, than in their intellectual contributions — so much is clear from Diogenes' collection of biographies of philosophers. If philosophy is looked upon as a systematic set of philosophical ideas, it can easily be detached from the philosopher adhering to that set of ideas. This is what we find in the doxographies in Diogenes and Hippolytus. In antiquity the one exception to this rule is Pythagoreanism where Pythagoras' personality seems to have been tightly interwoven with the Pythagorean way of life. But, then again, what we know about Pythagoras' life seems more influenced by the Pythagorean way of life as described in later Antiquity than the other way around.

So, finally, we come to the answer to the first question I raised:

It is quite likely that Diogenes in his biographical parts continued the Hellenistic tradition of biography, but his book as a whole, combining biography with doxography, may have been his own idea. Some may object that this gives too much to Diogenes, but as I have tried to indicate in my examination of

his *Life of Democritus*, he was not as poor a writer as he often has been said to be. This is in fact the outcome of scholarship on Diogenes during the last generation.

IN DIE GRIECHISCHE BIOGRAPHIE
IN HELLENISTISCHER ZEIT

³³ Notice that Diogenes here criticizes Sotion for a philosophical remark.

³⁴ The section on ethics must come from someone familiar with Democritus' writings; thus, it is likely to be later than Thrasylus. Or Diogenes may have found it directly in Thrasylus to whom we can be sure that he had access.

Bibliography

- Chitwood (2004) = Ava Chitwood: *Death by Philosophy. The Biographical Tradition in the Life and Death of the Archaic Philosophers Empedocles, Heraclitus, and Democritus* (Ann Arbor 2004).
- Diels (1879) = *Doxographi Graeci, collegit recensuit prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit Hermannus Diels* (Berolini 1879).
- Dorandi (1991) = Tiziano Dorandi: *Filodemo. Storia dei filosofi* [J. Platone e l'Academia (PHerc. 1021 e 164). Edizione, traduzione e commento a cura di T. D. [La scuola di Epicuro 12] (Napoli 1991).
- (1994) = *Storia dei filosofi: La Stoà da Zenone a Panezio* (PHerc. 1018) (Leiden–New York 1994).
- Gärtner (1996) = Hans A. Gärtner: *Anekdote*, in: DNP 1 (1996) 697–698.
- Goulet-Cazé (1999) = Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (éd.): *Diogène Laërce. Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres. Traduction française sous la direction de M.-O. G.-C.*, Paris 1999.
- Lefkowitz (1981) = Mary R. Lefkowitz: *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London 1981).
- Mansfield (1990) = J. Mansfield: *Apollodorus on Democritus*, in: *Studies in the Historiography of Greek Philosophy* (Assen 1990) 307–312.
- Mansfield/Runia (1996) = John Mansfield/D. Runia: *Aëtiana, The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer. I. The Sources* (Leiden 1996).
- Marcovich (1999–2000) = Miroslav Marcovich: *Diogenes Laertii Vitae philosophorum* (Leipzig 1999–2002).
- Mejer (1978) = Jørgen Mejer: *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background* [Hermes Einzelschriften 40] (Wiesbaden 1978).
- (1992) = *Diogenes Laertius and the Transmission of Greek Philosophy*, in: ANRW II 36.5 (1992) 3556–3602.
- (2000) = *Überlieferung der Philosophie im Altertum — Eine Einführung* (København 2000).
- (forthcoming) = *Heraclides and His Intellectual Context* (forthcoming).
- O'Brien (1994) = Denis O'Brien: *Démocrite d'Abdère*, in: R. Goulet (éd.): *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, 2 (Paris 1994) 649–715.
- Onodera (1993) = Go Onodera: *Diogenes Laertius IX 45*, in: *Philologus* 137 (1993) 104–109.
- Riginos (1976) = Alice S. Riginos: *Platonica. The Anecdotes concerning the Life and Writings of Plato* [Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 3] (Leiden 1976).
- Schorn (2004) = Stefan Schorn: *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel 2004).
- Scott-Kilvert (1973) = Ian Scott-Kilvert: *The Age of Alexander. Nine Greek Lives by Plutarch* (Baltimore 1973).
- Tarrant (1993) = Harold A. S. Tarrant: *Thrasyllan Platonism* (Ithaca 1993).
- Giannattasio Andria (1989) = Giannattasio Andria Rosa: *I frammenti delle Successioni dei filosofi* [Università degli Studi di Salerno. Quaderni del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità 5] (Napoli 1989).