



DIOGENES OF BABYLON ON WHO THE DEITY IS: AËTIUS 1.7.8 MANSFELD–RUNIA RECONSIDERED

ABSTRACT

In Aëtius 1.7.8 Mansfeld–Runia, Diogenes, Cleanthes and Oenopides are said to have maintained that the deity is the world-soul. However, the identity of the Diogenes whom the doxographer mentions here has long been a matter of scholarly dispute. In response to attempts to ascribe the doxa to Diogenes of Apollonia, this paper reassesses old arguments and proposes new considerations to argue that a fundamental aspect of Diogenes of Babylon’s theology is at stake here.

Keywords: Aëtius; Diogenes of Apollonia; Diogenes of Babylon; doxography; Stoic theology

The identity of the Diogenes in the Aëtian passage in which he, along with Cleanthes and Oenopides, is said to identify the deity with the world-soul (1.7.8 Mansfeld–Runia,¹ henceforth MR) has long been controversial. With a few exceptions, this fundamental theological tenet is ascribed to Diogenes of Apollonia. This paper endorses the opposing thesis—that the Diogenes in question is the Stoic philosopher—and paves the way for a reconsideration of other Aëtian evidence, such as Stoic *doxai*, in which the name Diogenes appears without the ethnicon.

In Book 1 of Aëtius’ compendium, chapter 7, devoted to the nature of God (Τίς ὁ θεός, *Who the Deity is*), is introduced by an extended paragraph, transmitted by Stobaeus (= Stob.) and absent from Ps.-Plutarch (= [Plut.]),² on the history of ancient atheism and its representatives in both poetry and philosophy. In this list, Diagoras, Theodorus, Euhemerus, Callimachus, Euripides, Plato and Anaxagoras are cited in that order.³ Immediately after §1, Aëtius describes the various conceptions of the deity that ancient thinkers, from the Milesians to Epicurus, espoused (§§2–25, in Stob. and [Plut.]). The doxographer here follows a sequence whose rationale is the same as that of chapter 1.3, *On Principles, What They Are* (Περὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν, τί εἰσιν): the number of items (in our case that of divinities rather than of principles) and the subsequent contrast between monists and pluralists.⁴ However, Aët. 1.7.2–25 MR combines the treatment of school successions and

¹ J. Mansfeld and D.T. Runia, *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer, V: An Edition of the Reconstructed Text of the Placita with a Commentary and a Collection of Related Texts*, 4 Parts (Leiden and Boston, 2020).

² On Stobaeus and Ps.-Plutarch as sources of Aëtius, see J. Mansfeld and D.T. Runia, *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer, Volume One: The Sources* (Leiden and Boston, 1997), 121–271.

³ See D.T. Runia, ‘Atheists in Aëtius: text, translation and comments on *De placitis* 1.7.1–10’, *Mnemosyne* 49 (1996), 542–76 = J. Mansfeld and D.T. Runia (edd.), *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer, Volume Three: Studies in the Doxographical Traditions of Greek Philosophy* (Leiden and Boston, 2010), 343–73.

⁴ As Mansfeld and Runia (n. 1), 1.389–95, at 319 point out, ‘at a first glance no dominating diaeresis or diaphonia is clearly visible in the lemmata order of the second part ... This is because systematic criteria have been combined with one belonging with the Successions order, just as in ch. 1.3.’ See also J. Mansfeld, ‘Lists of principles and lists of gods: Philodemus, Cicero, Aëtius,

single philosophers, and for the most part does not match the order of the analogous lists in Cicero's *On the Nature of Gods*⁵ and in Philodemus' *On Piety*, although in all three lists the beginning and the end, viz. Thales and Epicurus, are the same. Let us compare synoptically the sequence of philosophers provided by these three sources; I highlight in bold the cases in which the name Diogenes appears.

Cic. <i>Nat. D.</i> 1.10.25–1.20.56 Dyck ⁶	Phld. <i>Piet., P.Herc.</i> 1428 Vassallo ⁷	Aët. 1.7.2–25 MR
- Thales (1.10.25)	- [Thales,] Anaximander, Anaximenes (col. 319 = fr. 8 S.)	- Thales (§2)
- Anaximander (1.10.25)	- Anaxagoras (col. 320 = fr. 9 S.)	- Anaximander (§3)
- Anaximenes (1.10.26)	- Anaxagoras (or Alcmaeon?), Pythagoras (col. 321 = fr. 10 S.)	- Anaximenes (§4)
- Anaxagoras (1.11.26–7)	- Pythagoras (col. 322 = fr. 11 S.)	- Archelaus (§5)
- Alcmaeon (1.11.27)	- Xenophanes, Parmenides (col. 323 = fr. 12 S.)	- Anaxagoras (§6)
- Pythagoras (1.11.27–8)	- Parmenides (col. 324 = fr. 13 S.)	- Democritus (§7)
- Xenophanes (1.11.28)	- unknown Presocratic (col. 325)	- Diogenes , Cleanthes, Oenopides (§8)
- Parmenides (1.11.28)	- unknown Presocratic (col. 326)	- Pythagoras (§9)
- Empedocles (1.12.29)	- Empedocles (?) (col. 327 = fr. 14 S.)	- Posidonius (§10)
- Protagoras (1.12.29)	- Protagoras (or Prodicus?), Democritus (?) (col. 328 = fr. 15 S.)	- Speusippus (§11)
- Democritus (1.12.29)	- Democritus (col. 329 = fr. 16 S.)	- Critolaus, Diodorus of Tyre (§12)
- Diogenes of Apollonia (1.12.29)	- Heraclitus (col. 330 = fr. 17 S.)	- Heraclitus (§13)
- Plato (1.12.30)	- Diogenes of Apollonia (col. 331 = fr. 18 S.)	- Zeno of Citium (§14)
- Xenophon (1.12.30)	- unknown Presocratic ([col. 332])	- Mnesarchus (§15)
- Antisthenes (1.13.32)	- Prodicus[, Diagoras, Critias?] (col. 333 = fr. 19 S.)	- Boethus (§16)
- Speusippus (1.13.32)	- [Socrates (?), Plato,] Xenophon (col. 334 = fr. 20 S.)	- Parmenides (§17)
- Aristotle (1.13.33)	- Xenophon, Antisthenes (col. 335 = fr. 21 S.)	- Melissus, Zeno of Elea (§18)
- Xenocrates (1.13.34)	- Antisthenes, Speusippus, Aristotle (col. 336 = fr. 22 S.)	- Empedocles (§19)
- Heraclides Ponticus (1.13.34)	- [Aristotle] ([col. 337])	- Polemon (§20)
- Theophrastus (1.13.35)	- [Xenocrates, Heraclides Ponticus] ([col. 338])	- Xenocrates (§21)
- Strato of Lampsacus (1.13.35)	- Theophrastus (col. 339 = fr. 23 S.)	- Socrates, Plato (§22)
- Zeno of Citium (1.14.36)	- unknown Peripatetic (col. 340)	- Aristotle (§23)
- Aristo of Chios (1.14.37)	- Strato of Lampsacus (?) (col. 341 = fr. 24 S.)	- Stoics (§24)
- Cleanthes (1.14.37)	- [Zeno of Citium (?), Aristo of Chios (?), Cleanthes (?)] ([cols. 342–6])	- Epicurus (§25)
- Persaeus (1.15.38)	- Cleanthes (col. 347 = col. 1 H.)	
- Chrysippus (1.15.39–41)	- Cleanthes, Persaeus (col. 348 = col. 2 H.)	
- Diogenes of Babylon (1.15.41)		
- Epicurus (1.16.43–1.20.56)		

Continued

and others', in C. Vassallo (ed.), *Presocratics and Papyrological Tradition: A Philosophical Reappraisal of the Sources* (Berlin and Boston, 2019), 609–30.

⁵ One of the exceptions to the chronological order is the place assigned to Diogenes of Apollonia: A.R. Dyck, *Cicero: De natura deorum Book 1* (Cambridge, 2003), 96–7.

⁶ Dyck (n. 5).

⁷ C. Vassallo, 'The "pre-Socratic section" of Philodemus' *On Piety*: a new reconstruction. *Praesocratica Herculanensia* X (Part II)', *APF* 64 (2018), 98–147 [henceforth V.]. Below the correspondence with the editions by A. Schober, 'Philodemi *De pietate* Pars prior', *CErc* 18 (1988), 67–125 = A. Schober, *Philodemi Περὶ εὐσεβείας libelli partem priorem restituit A. Schober* (Diss., Königsberg, 1923) [henceforth S.] and A. Henrichs, 'Die Kritik der stoischen Theologie im *PHerc.* 1428', *CErc* 4 (1974), 5–32 [henceforth H.]. For the bibliographical reconstruction backing my new column-numbering, see C. Vassallo, 'La "sezione presocratica" del *De pietate* di Filodemo: una nuova ricostruzione. *Praesocratica Herculanensia* X (Parte I)', *APF* 63 (2017), 171–203. The list of philosophers in *P.Herc.* 1428 proposed here modifies the list by D. Obbink, "'All gods are true" in Epicurus', in D. Frede and A. Laks (edd.), *Traditions of Theology: Studies in Hellenistic Theology, its Background and Aftermath* (Leiden / Boston / Köln, 2002), 183–221, at 196–7.

Continued

Cic. <i>Nat. D.</i> 1.10.25–1.20.56 Dyck ⁶	Phld. <i>Piet., P.Herc.</i> 1428 Vassallo ⁷	Aët. 1.7.2–25 MR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Persaeus (col. 349 = col. 3 H.) - [Persaeus (?), Chrysippus] ([cols. 350–5]) - Chrysippus (cols. 356–9 = cols. 4–7 H.) - Chrysippus, Diogenes of Babylon (col. 360 = col. 8 H.) - Chrysippus (col. 361 = col. 9 H.) - Stoics (cols. 362–6 = cols. 10–14 H.) - Stoics, Epicurus (reference) (col. 367 = col. 15 H.) 		

Cicero’s and Philodemus’ parallel passages differ from each other to the extent that they demonstrate that neither depends on the other, nor do they share a unique common source.⁸ Proof that Cicero and Philodemus did not draw on each other’s work includes (a) striking doxographical lacunae, such as the lack in Cicero of any reference to Heraclitus, whose theology is instead the subject of an important snippet in Philodemus’ extant text; (b) the dissimilar style, much more polemical in Cicero than in Philodemus; (c) the often substantial difference in the philosophical content of the *doxai* of the authors cited in the two catalogues. Their varying treatment of Diogenes of Apollonia illustrates these discrepancies well. Cicero briefly expounds the theology of this Presocratic philosopher between his discussions of Democritus and Plato; Philodemus, on the other hand, mentions Diogenes of Apollonia between Heraclitus and the unknown (Presocratic) philosopher whose theology is described in an unfortunately lost column of *P.Herc.* 1428. However, in addition to the differing placement of the *doxa*, what stands out is the dissimilar content of Cicero’s and Philodemus’ reports: in Cicero, Velleius denounces the unacceptable consequences of identifying God with air for the conception of the nature of divinity; in Philodemus, by contrast, Diogenes is the representative of a demythicized version of God, which leads him to praise Homer for having identified Zeus with air.

Cic. <i>Nat. D.</i> 1.12.29	Phld. <i>Piet., P.Herc.</i> 1428, col. 331.22–31 V. (= fr. 18.2–10 S.)
-----------------------------	--

quid aer, quo Diogenes Apolloniates utitur deo, quem sensum habere potest aut quam formam dei?	Διογένειος ἐπαίν[ει] τὸν Ὁρσμηρον ὡς ο[ὐ] μυθικ[ῶς] ἀλλ’ ἀληθῶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ θείου διειλεγμένον· τὸν ἀέρα γὰρ αὐτὸν Δία νομίζειν φησιν ₃₀ ἐπειδὴ πᾶν εἰδέ[ναι] τὸν Δία λέγει καὶ κτλ.
--	---

Diogenes of Apollonia makes air a god; but how can air have sensation or divinity in any shape? ⁹	Diogenes [<i>sc.</i> of Apollonia] praises Homer for having spoken about the divine without using mythology but according to the truth. For he maintains that he [<i>sc.</i> Homer] thought Zeus was the air, for he says that Zeus knows everything and ... ¹⁰
--	--

⁸ C. Vassallo, *The Presocratics at Herculaneum: A Study of Early Greek Philosophy in the Epicurean Tradition* (Berlin and Boston, 2021).
⁹ Transl. H. Rackham.
¹⁰ My translation.

This is a necessary precondition for any attempt to resolve an important problem of Aëtius' passage in question, viz. the *doxa* mentioned above, placed between those of Democritus and Pythagoras, which ascribes the idea that the deity should be identified with the world-soul to Diogenes, Cleanthes and Oenopides alike (Aët. 1.7.8 MR):

Διογένης καὶ Κλεάνθης καὶ Οἰνοπίδης τὴν τοῦ κόσμου ψυχήν.

Diogenes and Cleanthes and Oenopides [say that the deity is] the soul of the cosmos.¹¹

This *doxa* is transmitted only by Stobaeus (*Ecl.* 1.1.29b) and is placed between those concerning Democritus' and Pythagoras' theologies: the former identified the deity with the Mind residing in a spherically shaped fire (§7); the latter considered the Monad as the deity and the Good, and the Undetermined Dyad as a daemon and the Evil (§9). As for Oenopides (41 A 6 DK), Zeller supposed he was an otherwise unknown Stoic,¹² but this unlikely suggestion has never gained credence. In the *Placita*, Oenopides appears only twice more, always along with Pythagoras.¹³ Independently of the question of the Stoic interpretation of his thought in the Aëtian passage at hand, he should be identified with the homonymous astronomer of Chios (fifth century B.C.).¹⁴ Scholars have long disagreed on the identity of the Diogenes cited by Aëtius in §8. Among the many scholarly arguments, Diels' stance is peculiar. From the *index nominum* of the *Doxographi Graeci*, it is clear that he previously ascribed the *doxa* to Diogenes of Babylon,¹⁵ later, in *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, he changed his mind and included the *doxa* among the witnesses to Diogenes of Apollonia collected in 64 A 8 DK (however, except for Aëtius, in none of these witnesses is the soul, whether individual or cosmic, in question). By contrast, von Arnim recorded this *doxa* in *SVF* III 31 (= *SVF* I 532), among bits of evidence concerning Diogenes of Babylon's physics that transmit important fragments of his treatise, *On the Regent Part of the Soul* (*SVF* III 27–37).¹⁶ In his edition of Diogenes of Apollonia, Laks treats this testimonium neutrally, placing it among the *dubia* (S 1).¹⁷ In his collection of the Presocratics co-edited with Most (henceforth LM), however, Laks cautiously mentions the passage among the *Stoicizing Versions of Diogenes (?)* (28 R 17 LM), along with two other Aëtian witnesses pertaining to the

¹¹ Transl. J. Mansfeld and D.T. Runia.

¹² See E. Zeller and E. Wellmann, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Bd. III.1: *Die nacharistotelische Philosophie*, erste Hälfte (Leipzig, 1909; repr. Darmstadt, 2006), 50 n. In addition to others, K. von Fritz, 'Oinopides', *RE* 17.2 (1937), 2258–72, at 2271–2 and Mansfeld and Runia (n. 1), 1.397 disprove this hypothesis.

¹³ Aët. 2.12.2 (with the ethnonicon) and 2.32.6 MR.

¹⁴ Sextus Empiricus, i.e. the only source of Oenopides' theory of the elements, claims that he believed fire and air were the principles (*Pyr.* 3.30 = 41 A 5 DK).

¹⁵ H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (Berlin 1879; repr. 1965⁴), 676: 'Diogenes Babylonius ... deum esse mundi animam'.

¹⁶ Among other things, this evidence attests that, according to Diogenes of Babylon, the regent part of the (individual) soul was in the heart, viz. where it is possible to draw nourishment and *pneuma* in larger quantities (especially *SVF* III 30: cf. n. 26 below).

¹⁷ A. Laks, *Diogène d'Apollonie: Edition, traduction et commentaire des fragments et témoignages* (Sankt Augustin, 2008²), 237. The only real evidence for ascribing this *doxa* to Diogenes of Apollonia derives, according to Laks, from the possible authenticity of Anaximenes' 13 B 2 DK (= As 35 Wöhrlé), transmitted by Aët. 1.3.3 MR: so K. Alt, 'Zum Satz des Anaximenes über die Seele: Untersuchung von Aëtios περὶ ἀρχῶν', *Hermes* 101 (1973), 129–64; contra, J. Mansfeld, 'Anaximenes' soul', in J. Mansfeld, *Studies in Early Greek Philosophy: A Collection of Papers and One Review* (Leiden and Boston, 2018), 167–76.

chapters of Book 2 of the compendium that deal with the causes of the world's tilt (Τίς ἡ αἰτία τοῦ τὸν κόσμον ἐγκλιθῆναι)¹⁸ and with the world itself, that is, its nature (Περὶ κόσμου), respectively.¹⁹ Lastly, Mansfeld and Runia, in the commentary on their new monumental edition of Aëtius, reiterate that the issue remains unclear, as indicated in their *apparatus testimoniorum* on page 373, where both possibilities are given. However, they also offer arguments in favour of Diogenes of Apollonia and a 'Stoicizing' reading of his theory of the elements.²⁰

There are four strong arguments in favour of identifying the Diogenes in Aët. 1.7.8 MR with the Stoic rather than with the Presocratic philosopher. The first three rest on formal aspects of the passage, while the fourth focusses on the philosophical content of the testimonium. 1) It has been observed that the only argument that Diels could have used to rule out the possibility that Diogenes of Babylon is meant in the *doxa* at issue is that the Stoic would then appear only here in the *Placita*.²¹ But this conclusion is clearly untrue. In Aët. 2.32.9 MR, Diogenes is explicitly indicated as ὁ Στωικός and is said to maintain that Heraclitus' Great Year is to be multiplied by 365 times (*SVF* III 28). But even if Diogenes of Babylon appeared only here in the compendium, this would not be reason enough to rule out a priori that Aëtius was referring to him in the passage under consideration: his name would not be the only hapax legomenon in the *Placita*.²² Among several examples, I find the case of the Stoic philosopher, pupil and successor of Diogenes of Babylon, Antipater of Tarsus, significant. His name appears only in the chapter *On Fate* (Περὶ εἰμαρμένης) of Book 1 of the compendium, where, immediately after the *doxa* on Zeno of Citium, he is said to support the theory that God and Fate coincide.²³ 2) Moreover, although it is true that in the *doxai* concerning him Diogenes of Apollonia is rarely cited by Aëtius with his ethnicon, viz. 1.3.10 and 4.3.8 MR, Diogenes of Apollonia is also cited alongside a Stoic only in this passage of the *Placita*, to the best of my knowledge. 3) The sequence of philosophers in Cicero and Philodemus does not automatically indicate that Aëtius' Diogenes must be the Presocratic philosopher. I have already highlighted above the differences in the content of Cicero's and Philodemus' reports on Diogenes of Apollonia. However, in neither of these reports is Diogenes' theology connected with that of other philosophers, let alone with that of the Stoics. In addition, in the long list from Aëtius, each Presocratic theological *doxa* is devoted to a single thinker. The only exception is Melissus, who is linked with Zeno of Elea (within the same *doxa*) in saying that the deity is the One/All, the only entity that is everlasting and unlimited (§18). 4) The deciding reason, however, for ascribing the Aëtian *doxa* to the Stoic Diogenes is the philosophical argument. I now develop this point in greater detail.

¹⁸ Aët. 2.8.1 MR (= 64 A 11 DK = 28 R 15 LM).

¹⁹ Aët. 2.1.8 MR (= 64 A 10 DK = 28 R 16 LM).

²⁰ Mansfeld and Runia (n. 1), 1.392–3 and 397. So already F. Hüffmeier, 'Theologische Weltbetrachtung bei Diogenes von Apollonia?', *Philologus* 107 (1963), 131–8, at 137. See also J. Dreßler, 'Diogenes von Apollonia und die Entstehung des Gottesbeweises in der griechischen Philosophie', *RhM* 156 (2013), 113–40, at 128–34.

²¹ Laks (n. 17), 237.

²² Laks (n. 17), 239. For an analytical overview of the name-label data in the *Placita*, see E. Jeremiah, 'Not much missing? Statistical explorations of the *Placita* of Aëtius', in J. Mansfeld and D.T. Runia (edd.), *Aëtiana IV: Papers of the Melbourne Colloquium on Ancient Doxography* (Leiden and Boston, 2018), 279–373, at 353–61. Jeremiah, however, ascribes the *doxa* in Aët. 2.32.9 MR to Diogenes of Babylon only (Διογένης ὁ Στωικός).

²³ Aët. 1.27.6 MR: Ἀντίπατρος ὁ Στωικός θεὸν ἀπεφάνετο τὴν εἰμαρμένην.

None of the witnesses in 64 A 8 DK relates Diogenes of Apollonia's view of air *qua* (physical) principle to the idea of a world-soul. As Laks points out, none of the sources allows us to argue that Diogenes of Apollonia ever upheld the world-soul doctrine or, more generally, the existence of a cosmic intelligence.²⁴ Neither is this reported in Augustine's account (*De ciu. D.* 8.2 = 64 A 8 [4] DK), where Diogenes of Apollonia's *aer* is only said to be provided with a *diuina ratio*, nor in the other two bits of evidence that are recorded, not in DK, but only in Laks's edition: Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* 5.64.1–3 = T 7b Laks) and Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 19.5 = T 7d Laks). In the doxographical sources specifically devoted to Diogenes of Apollonia's psychology in the *Vorsokratiker* (64 A 20 DK) as well, no link between the theory of the world-soul and Diogenes of Apollonia appears. In *On the Soul* (1.2.405a21–5), Aristotle only says that for Diogenes soul is air and, since it is the thinnest of all things, it is also its principle (above all the principle of its motion).

In Book 4 of Aëtius' compendium (4.7.1 MR), the *doxa* on the indestructibility of the soul is ascribed to Diogenes (of Apollonia) along with Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Plato, Empedocles and Xenocrates. Note that no Stoic appears here. The Stoics as a general group are discussed instead at 4.7.3 MR. At the end of 64 A 20 DK, Diels adds in parentheses Aët. 4.5.8 MR, where the opinion that the regent part of the soul is placed in the heart's arterial cavity, which is pneumatic (Διογένης ἐν τῇ ἀρτηριακῇ κοιλίᾳ τῆς καρδίας, ἣτις ἐστὶ πνευματικὴ), is ascribed to a Diogenes who is not otherwise specified. Scholars strongly suspect that Aëtius is speaking here not about Diogenes of Apollonia but about Diogenes of Babylon.²⁵ Moreover, an apparently heterodox opinion in comparison to the official Stoic position—which maintained that the regent part of the soul is found in the entire heart or in the heart-embracing *pneuma* (Aët. 4.5.7 MR), not in a part of the heart—is ascribed to Diogenes of Babylon. If, as I am inclined to believe, Aët. 4.5.8 MR concerns Diogenes of Babylon's psychology, then its close connection to Galen's witness in *SVF* III 30—in which the regent part of the soul is said simply to be in the heart—is evident.²⁶ Finally, among the evidence for Diogenes of Apollonia's psychology in the *Vorsokratiker*, Diels did not include Aët. 4.3.8 MR (T 5b Laks = 28 D 12 LM), where the essence of the soul is said to be air (ἔξ ἀέρος τὴν ψυχὴν). Now, it is clear that Aëtius also speaks in these passages about the soul *tout court*, not about a world-soul, and that he introduces the *doxa* under the name of Diogenes, who is unequivocally provided with his ethnicon (Διογένης ὁ Ἀπολλωνιάτης).²⁷

All the evidence just cited refers only to the physiological aspects of Diogenes of Apollonia's psychology, without ascribing to him the idea of a cosmic soul.

²⁴ Laks (n. 17), 34 and 237.

²⁵ So also Mansfeld and Runia (n. 1), 3.1473, app. *loc. sim.* ('probabilior Diogenes Stoicus'). See Laks (n. 17), 238 (S 2). The same should go for the embryological *doxa* in Aët. 5.15.4 MR: Diels ascribes it to Diogenes of Apollonia (64 A 28 DK = T 20 Laks = *om.* LM), but almost certainly it should be ascribed to Diogenes of Babylon (thus T. Tieleman, 'Diogenes of Babylon and Stoic embryology: Ps. Plutarch, *Plac.* V 15.4 reconsidered', *Mnemosyne* 44 [1991], 106–25; Mansfeld and Runia [n. 1], 3.1883, app. *loc. sim.*: 'verisimiliter Diogenes Babylonius').

²⁶ Gal. *PHP* 2.8, pages 164–7 De Lacy: οὐκουν οὐτε τούτων τῶν λόγων ἰσχυρὸς οὐδεὶς οὐθ' ὅταν ὁ Διογένης εἴπῃ "ὁ πρῶτον τροφῆς καὶ πνεύματος ἀρύεται, ἐν τούτῳ ὑπάρχει τὸ ἡγεμονικόν, ὁ δὲ πρῶτον τροφῆς καὶ πνεύματος ἀρύεται, ἢ καρδία." See T. Tieleman, *Galen and Chrysippus on the Soul: Argument and Refutation in the De Placitis, Books II–III* (Leiden / New York / Köln, 1996), 79–101, at 81 (with n. 57).

²⁷ In this chapter (Εἰ σῶμα ἢ ψυχὴ καὶ τίς ἢ οὐσία αὐτῆς), Aëtius specifies the ethnicon *only* for Diogenes of Apollonia.

Conversely, to prove on a philosophical level that Aët. 1.7.8 MR refers to the Stoic, we need a source that, even indirectly, connects Diogenes' God to psychology, and in particular to a cosmic concept of the soul. This source does exist: Philodemus, in the last section of his treatise *On Piety*, provides an account of Diogenes of Babylon's theology which is much more detailed than that of the parallel passage in Cicero's *On the Nature of Gods*.²⁸ Below I give a synoptic overview of the two texts with a translation.

Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.15.41 =
Diog. Bab. *SVF* III 34

Phld. *Piet., P.Herc.* 1428, cols. 360.14–
362.8 V. (= cols. 8.14–10.8 H.) =
Diog. Bab. *SVF* III 33

quem [sc. Chrysippum] Diogenes
Babylonius consequens in eo libro qui
inscribitur *de Minerua* partum Iouis
ortumque uirginis ad physiologiam
traducens deungit a fabula.

Δ[ι]ογένης δ' ὁ Βαβυ|₁₅λώνιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ |
τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὸν | κόσμον γράφει τῷ | Δι[τ]ί
τὸν αὐτὸν ὑπάρ|[χει]ν ἢ περιέχειν |₂₀
τ[ὸ]ν Δία καθάπερ | ἄνθρωπ[ον ψ]υχῆν· |
καί | τὸν ἡλ[ι]ον μ[έν] | Ἀπόλλω, [τ]ὴν δ[ὲ]
σε|[λή]νην [Ἀρ]τεμιν· [καί] |₂₅
παῖδα[ρι]ῶδες εἶνα[ι] | θεοῦς
ἀ[ν]θρώποε[ι]δεῖς λέγειν καὶ ἀδύνατον·
εἶ[ν]αί τε τοῦ | Διὸς τὸ μὲν εἰς τὴν |₃₀
θάλατταν διατε|τακὸς
Ποσειδῶνα, τὸ δ' εἰς τὴν γῆν | Δήμητρα,
τὸ δ' εἰς | τὸν ἄερα Ἥραν, κα|θάπερ καὶ
Πλά|των²⁹ λέγειν, ὡς εἰάν πολλάκις “ἀήρ”
λέγειν τις ἐρεῖν “Ἥρα”, τ[ὸ] |₅ δ' εἰς τὸν
αἰθ[ε]ρά Ἀθηνᾶν· τοῦτο γὰρ λέγ[ε]σθαι
τὸ “ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς” καὶ “Ζεὺς ἄρρη |
Ζεὺς θῆλυς”. τινὰς |₁₀ δὲ τῶν Στωικῶν |
φάσκειν ὅτι τὸ ἡγε|μονικὸν ἐν τῇ
κε|φαλή· φρόνησιν γὰρ | εἶναι, διὸ καὶ
Μῆτιν |₁₅ καλεῖσθαι· Χρύσιπ[το]ν δ' ἐν τῷ
στή|[θ]ει τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν | εἶναι κάκει τὴν
[Ἀ]θ[η]νᾶν γεγονένα |₂₀ φ]ρόνησιν οὐσαν,
τῷ | δὲ τ[ῆ]ν φωνὴν ἐκ | τῆς κεφαλῆς
ἐκκρί|νεσθαι λέγειν “ἐκ τῆς | κεφα[λ]ῆς”,
“ὑπὸ δὲ Ἡ|₂₅φαί[στου]” δ[ι]ότι τ[ῆ] τέ|[χνη]³⁰
γίνεθ' ἢ φρόνησις· καὶ Ἀθηνᾶν μὲν | οἶον
Ἀθρηνᾶν εἰρησ[θαι], Τριτω|νί|δα δὲ
καὶ |₃₀ Τριτογένειαν διὰ | τὴν φρόνησιν |
ἐκ τριῶν συνεσ|τηκέναι λόγων, || τῶν
φυσικῶν καὶ | τῶν [ἡ]θικῶ[ν] καὶ τῶν |
λογικῶν· καὶ τὰς ἄλλας | δ' αὐτῆς

Continued

²⁸ Obbink (n. 7), 205–9.

²⁹ καὶ Πλά|των²⁹ Obbink : κ[αί] τ[ὸ]ν Πλά|των²⁹ Henrichs.

³⁰ τ[ῆ] τέ|[χνη] Obbink : τ[ῆ] τέ|[χνη] Henrichs.

Continued

Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.15.41 =
Diog. Bab. *SVF* III 34

Phld. *Piet., P.Herc.* 1428, cols. 360.14–
362.8 V. (= cols. 8.14–10.8 H.) =
Diog. Bab. *SVF* III 33

πρ[ο]σηγορί|σας καὶ τὰ φορήματα | μάλα
καταχρύσως τῆι | φρονήσει συνοικειοῖ.

In this he [*sc.* Chrysippus] is followed by Diogenes of Babylon, who in his book entitled *Minerva*³¹ rationalizes the myth of the birth of the virgin goddess from Jove by explaining it as an allegory of the processes of nature.³²

Diogenes of Babylon writes in his *On Athena* that the cosmos is the same as Zeus or that it [*sc.* the cosmos] embraces Zeus as a man his soul. [He adds that] the sun is Apollo and the moon Artemis, and that it is childish and impossible to speak about gods as being of human form. [He says that] the part of Zeus extending to the sea is Poseidon, [the part] extending to the air Hera —as Plato³³ also does, often saying ‘Hera’ when he would say ‘air’— and [the part] extending to the aether Athena. This is the meaning of expressions such as ‘from the head’ and ‘Zeus male, Zeus female’. He [*sc.* Diogenes of Babylon] [claims that] some Stoics say that the regent part [*sc.* of the soul] is in the head: for it is wisdom, hence it is also called Metis. [And he claims that] Chrysippus said that the regent part is in the breast and that there Athena, that is, wisdom, was born; and [that] the expression ‘from the head’ is said because the voice derives from the head, while [they say] ‘from Hephaistos’ because wisdom arises by means of art. And [he says that] Athena is called [as though it were] ‘Athrena’ (that is, ‘without lamentation’), and [she is called] ‘Tritonis’ and ‘Tritogeneia’, since wisdom is constituted out of three fields of study: physics, ethics and logic. And he very slyly brought her other names and attributes into relation with wisdom.³⁴

³¹ According to D.R. Shackleton Bailey’s conjecture, in *Att.* 13.39.2 Cicero calls this Diogenes’ work *On Pallas* (Περὶ Παλλάδος). See Obbink (n. 7), 188 (with n. 10) and 208, with regard to Phld. *Piet., P.Herc.* 242, fr. 3.1–9; A. Henrichs, ‘Philodems *De pietate* als mythographische Quelle’, *CErc* 5 (1975), 5–38, at 30.

³² Transl. H. Rackham.

³³ *Cra.* 404c.

³⁴ My translation.

Philodemus goes into detail here concerning Diogenes' allegorical method for approaching the gods, viz. an 'inductive' (or 'rationalistic') theological method in which the Stoic identifies the gods' names with physical entities and renders some of the most important members of the Olympic pantheon—Poseidon, Hera, Athena (and indirectly Demeter as well)—mere emanations or parts of Zeus. But who is Zeus for Diogenes? Philodemus maintains that the Stoic, in his work *On Athena*, said that the cosmos is identified with Zeus, or that the cosmos contains Zeus as a man does his soul.³⁵ Such an allegory is in itself a cosmo-theological tenet which posits that the cosmos and man, on the one hand, and deity and soul, on the other, neatly correspond to each other. Hence, in analogical terms, Diogenes' Zeus is the soul (that is, the life) of God/cosmos that some sources ascribe to the early Stoics.

In fact, immediately after the report on Diogenes of Babylon's theology Philodemus maintains that all the Stoics, generally labelled as 'Zeno's followers', held that God is one, and is the same entity as the universe endowed with a soul.³⁶ The Epicurean philosopher is here plainly employing the macrocosm/microcosm model that Democritus (68 B 34 DK) introduced and that is ubiquitous in Plato's *Timaeus*. In addition, according to Arius Didymus, Chrysippus claimed that the cosmos is also called Zeus because it coincides with God and is for us the cause of life.³⁷ But even before Chrysippus, Cleanthes in his *Hymn to Zeus* outlined a 'cosmic theology' of this sort when he said that the entire universe obeys Zeus.³⁸ In Cicero's *On the Nature of Gods*, Velleius describes this aspect of Cleanthes' theology in even more clear-cut terms: Cleanthes—he says—maintained, among other things, that God is the cosmos in that he is both the mind and the soul of all nature.³⁹

When Aëtius cites Diogenes and Cleanthes together in Book 1 of his compendium (1.7.8), he must be alluding to a divinity provided with all of these features. These characteristics go beyond a God identified with a natural element according to the model of Presocratic physics: they clearly subscribe to an 'immanentistic' concept of deity that aligns with the Stoic 'pantheistic' and 'monotheistic' tenets.⁴⁰ In light of the textual correspondences discussed above, the Diogenes to whom Aëtius ascribes the concept of a God *qua* world-soul cannot represent a 'Stoicized' Diogenes of Apollonia. He must be rather identified as the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon.⁴¹

Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

CHRISTIAN VASSALLO
christian.vassallo@uni-jena.de

³⁵ On this, see J.-P. Dumont, 'Diogène de Babylone et la déesse Raison', *BAGB* 3 (1984), 260–78, at 265–6.

³⁶ *P.Herc.* 1428, col. 362.8–16 V. (= col. 10.8–16 H. = Zen. Cit. *SVF* I 164 [II]): πάντες οὖν οἱ ἀπὸ Ζ[ῆ]νονος, εἰ καὶ ἀ[π]οπ[ο]σ[τ]ο[σ]φ[ε]ρῶν λείπον τὸ δαμόνιον, ὡς περ οἱ μὲν οὐκ ἀπ[ε]λείπον, [οἱ] δ' ἔν | τισιν οὐκ ἀπέλ[ε]πον, | ἕνα θεὸν λέγου[σ]ιν εἶ[ν]αι· γινεσθῶ[ι] δ[ῆ] καὶ | τὸ πᾶν σ' ἄν | τῆ ψυχῆ. Cf. Lactant. *De ira* D. 11 (= Zen. Cit. *SVF* I 164 [II]).

³⁷ *SVF* II 528 (= Eus. *PE* 15.15–35 = Ar. Did. fr. 29 Diels): ὅλον δὲ τὸν κόσμον σὺν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μέρεσι προσαγορεύουσι θεόν· τούτων δὲ ἕνα μόνον εἶναι φασὶ καὶ πεπερασμένον καὶ ζῶον καὶ αἰδίων καὶ θεόν. ... διὸ δὴ καὶ Ζεὺς λέγεται ὁ κόσμος, ἐπειδὴ τοῦ ζῆν αἴτιος ἡμῖν ἐστί.

³⁸ *SVF* I 537.7–8 (= Stob. *Ecl.* 1.1.12): σοὶ δὴ πᾶς ὅδε κόσμος ἐλισσόμενος περὶ γαίαν | πείθεται ἡ̅ κεν ἄγης, καὶ ἐκὼν ὑπὸ σεῖο κρατεῖται. See J.C. Thom, *Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Tübingen, 2005), 69–72.

³⁹ *SVF* I 534 (= Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.14.37): *tum ipsum mundum deum dicit esse, tum totius naturae menti atque animo tribuit hoc nomen, tum ultimum et altissimum atque undique circumfusum et extremum omnia cingentem atque complexum ardorem, qui aether nominatur, certissimum deum iudicat ...*

⁴⁰ Cf. Aët. 1.7.24 MR.

⁴¹ This research was made possible thanks to funding from the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation.