

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/>

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

B. B. EDWARDS AND E. A. PARK,
Professors at Andover,

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

DR. ROBINSON AND PROF. STUART.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
WILEY AND PUTNAM,
1844.

for higher cultivation; and the philosopher who walks abroad and looks through all the forms of "nature up to nature's God," is capable of an enjoyment wider and more profound, than could otherwise have entered into his conceptions. I do not mean to say, that moral and religious sentiment in the heart of the unlearned man is not the same in nature and intensity as in the philosopher; the wine-glass and the pitcher may be equally *full*; but one holds many times more than the other. Let us then in all our efforts to increase knowledge, strive also to extend the influence of moral culture; to implant and cherish moral principle and religious feeling; so that while we incite others to observe and gather in treasures of knowledge from the natural and intellectual world, we may also lead them to regard these only as the means for higher moral trainings and enjoyment here, preparatory to the blessed rewards of an eternal hereafter.

Let us then go on our way rejoicing,—self-inspired and independent of all aid, but such as we can earn as a voluntary gift from enlightened public sentiment. We as a nation have been the first to cast off the union of Church and State; and, as we believe, with manifest advantage to the best interests of religion and the church; for where does religion, as controlled by the State, exert an equal influence in the hearts of the people? In like manner, let us prove to the world, that literature and science also can subsist and flourish, sustained by the public sentiment of an enlightened people,—without dependence on the State,—without wearing either the fetters of a slave, or the livery of kings!

ARTICLE II.

LIFE OF ARISTOTLE.

By Edwards A. Park, Bartlet Professor in Andover Theol. Seminary.

THE following article has been compiled from several works and fragments of ancient and modern historians. The ancient biographies which have been employed are, first, that by Diogenes Laërtius; secondly, that by Ammonius, who for distinction's sake is denominated Pseudo-Ammonius; thirdly, that which is sometimes called the Latin Biography, and sometimes the Ancient Translation, the writer of which is unknown: fourthly, that which

is usually designated as the Biography of the Anonymous Author and was first edited by Menage; fifthly, that by Dionysius of Halicarnassus; sixthly, that by Hesychius Milesius; seventhly, that by Suidas. All of these are contained in Buhle's Edition of the works of Aristotle, Vol. I. pp. 3—79. Of the modern biographies which have been examined, one is by Buhle in the above cited volume, pp. 80—104, one by Tennemann in the third volume of his *History of Philosophy*, pp. 21—39, one by Ritter in his *Hist. of the Ancient Phil.* pp. 1—32 (Morrison's Translation), one by Erdmann, and by far the most important, by Stahr.¹ To the treatise of the last named author is the ensuing memoir indebted more than to any other. Much of the arrangement which Stahr has adopted, and not a little of his style have been transferred to these pages. He has, however, omitted some notices which the writer of the present article has inserted. His arrangement, too, has not been followed in all instances; his opinions have not uniformly, although they have for the most part been acquiesced in; and his phraseology cannot be said to have been translated but to have been sometimes borrowed in a paraphrase by the present writer. This article, then, may be considered as written after a careful study of the above cited treatises ancient and modern, and chiefly, though by no means entirely, on the basis of Dr. Adolf Stahr's *Life of Aristotle*, contained in the first part of his *Aristotelia*, pp. 3—188.

In a journal devoted to theological literature no apology is needed for inserting the memoir of a man, who is called by Jerome "a wonder of the world," declared by Jonsius to have been "the most pious of all the heathen," pronounced "a saint" by some catholic divines in the sixteenth century, and regarded with so great reverence by many preachers in the middle ages, that they selected passages from his works instead of the Bible for the texts of their sermons. On the other hand, he has been the abhorrence of many divines on account of the supposed conflict of his philosophy with the spirit of the Gospel, and so resistless has been his domination over the theology of the church, that Martin Luther is reported² to have "trembled with rage when even the name of Aristotle was pronounced in his presence; and he went so far as to say that if Aristotle had not been a man, he should be tempted to take him for the devil."

¹ Author of "*Aristotelia*," in two volumes, formerly Teacher in the Royal Pedagogium at Halle, and more recently at Oldenburg.

² Merle's *Hist. of the Reformation*, Vol. I. p. 130. 7th Am. Ed.

BIRTH PLACE OF ARISTOTLE.

Aristotle was born in Stagira, and is therefore called the Stagirite. Herodotus, Thucydides and Strabo write the name *Στάγειρος*, in the singular, but Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Pausanias, Tzetzes, Suidas, Pseudo-Ammonius, and others adopt the plural form, *Στάγειρα*-*ων*. Buhle asserts that Diogenes Laërtius and Eusebius write *Σταγείρα* in the singular, but this is a mistake. This form is seldom if ever used by the standard Greek writers. The plural termination is nearly universal among the Latins also.

The city lies in Chalcidice, on the coast of the Strymonic Gulf, at the point where the shore commences its southerly direction. It was but a few hours' sail from Amphipolis, and within a short distance from Argilos, Acanthus and Mount Athos. Its harbor was delightful, and the surrounding country picturesque and enchanting. It was originally peopled by barbarians, subsequently occupied by a colony of Andrians, and at a still later day by a colony from Chalcis. From this latter colony was the mother of Aristotle descended, and it was to Chalcis that he made his escape from the Athenians after the death of Alexander. It has been conjectured that some of his relatives on the maternal side, resided at Chalcis even in his own time.

The influx of Grecian colonists made Stagira at length the abode of refinement and taste. But its prosperity was checked in 348, B. C., when it fell a prey to Philip of Macedon. He razed to the ground thirty-two cities of Chalcidice, Stagira among the rest, and either slew or sold into slavery all the inhabitants who had not saved themselves by flight. Through the intercessions of Aristotle, the city of his birth was subsequently rebuilt by his friend, the king of Macedon. It never attained, however, any considerable distinction, except as it was the residence of the father of philosophy. By some writers it is called a city of Macedon, and by others, a city of Thrace; the former designation referring to it as it was *after* its conquest by the Macedonian king, the latter referring to it as it was *before* that conquest.

TIME OF ARISTOTLE'S BIRTH.

Aristotle was born in the first year of the ninety-ninth Olympiad, or in 384 B. C. This is the statement of Apollodorus whose

chronology is preserved by Diogenes Laërtius,¹ and is generally adopted by the ancient biographers. Dionysius of Halicarnassus says, that Aristotle was born three years before Demosthenes, and assigns the birth of Demosthenes to the year 381 B. C. But it has been proved by Petitus and Corsini, and is now generally admitted, that the great orator was born either at the end of the fourth year of the ninety-eighth Olympiad, or at the beginning of the first year of the ninety-ninth. The time of his birth, therefore, was within a twelve month of the time of Aristotle's.

Here it may be fitting to remark that these two illustrious men died also in the same year, and at the same age. For a long time they resided in the same city, and yet probably had but little friendly intercourse with each other. Demosthenes was the leader of the party hostile to the Macedonians, and must have found it difficult to hold communion with one who, like Aristotle, was a favorite at the Macedonian court. The orator was at one time, according to reports detailed by Hermippus, a student of Plato, although Niebuhr thinks this improbable. But even if he were, he might still have avoided an intimacy with his fellow pupil who was a friend of Philip. Aristotle mentions the orator only once in all his writings, and then attempts to ridicule an attack which Demades had made upon him. How far the orator availed himself of his contemporary's Rhetoric, we do not know. It is singular that the ancients have written so little with regard to the personal relations of two men whose history, as the reader will perceive in the sequel, exhibits many coincidences beside those of their birth and death.

FATHER AND GUARDIAN OF ARISTOTLE.

The father of Aristotle was Nicomachus, who was the son of Nicomachus, the grandson of Machaon and, as Hermippus and Diogenes Laërtius relate, a lineal descendant of Æsculapius.² Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Suidas and others agree with Diogenes Laërtius in tracing the Stagirite's ancestry to the father of medicine. But we must remember that as Nicomachus and his father and grandfather were physicians, they would naturally be called, by a figure of speech used even at the present day, descendants of Æsculapius; we must remember that all physicians were often

¹ See *Arist. Opp. Ed. Buhle. Tom. I. p. 10.*

² *Arist. Opp. Ed. Buhle. Tom. I. p. 3.*

termed Asclepiads by the Greeks, that the members of Aristotle's family, so long devoted to the science of healing, would with peculiar ease and emphasis acquire this appellation, and that the phraseology, so conformable to the Grecian tastes and manners, might come in process of time to be interpreted literally. We would therefore incline with Tzetzes and Buhle to the opinion, that Aristotle may have been an Asclepiad only by a figure of speech.

Nicomachus the father of the Stagirite, we have said, was a physician. He seems to have been a man of eminence in his profession. He was a friend and the body-surgeon of Amyntas the Second, king of Macedon, and father of Philip. According to Suidas, he was the author of six books on Medicine, and one on Natural Philosophy. Situated at the court of Pella, it should seem that he had great facilities for securing the accomplished education of his son, and he bequeathed to him, as there is reason to suppose, a considerable fortune. He probably introduced his son into the best society of the day; and, as Aristotle was of about the same age with Philip, there is reason to believe that the young prince and the young philosopher contracted an early acquaintance with each other. An intimacy in childhood may have been an occasion of the subsequent relations between these distinguished men.

It is natural to think, that the profession of Nicomachus was not without its influence upon the mind of Aristotle. It was one means, perhaps, of imbuing the future philosopher with a decided taste for the physical sciences. He certainly must have formed an early predilection for those studies, in which he afterwards became so accomplished. We know that in his time children, who were devoted to the medical profession, commenced their attention to it at a very early age. "I do not blame the ancients," says Galen,¹ "for not writing books on anatomical manipulation; though I commend Marinus who did. For it was superfluous for them to compose such records for themselves or others, while they were from their childhood exercised by their parents in dissecting, just as familiarly as in writing and reading; so that there was no more fear of their forgetting their anatomy than of their forgetting their alphabet. But when grown men as well as children were taught, this thorough discipline fell off; and the art being carried out of the family of the Asclepiads, and declining by repeated transmission, books became necessary for the student." It is probable that the young Stagirite was subjected to some such early disci-

¹ Quoted by Whewell, in

pline in physical science, and the eligible situation of his father must have afforded him many facilities for the prosecution of his favorite study.

We do not know, however, the length of time in which Aristotle enjoyed the benefits of his father's tuition. It is certain that he had lost both his parents when he was seventeen years old, and probable that he had some time before. There is indeed no reason for believing, with Schott, that he became an orphan at the age of three years, but we know that at the close of his seventeenth year he left his home, and that previously to this period he had been under the guardianship of Proxenus, and had received from him the attentions of a father.

Proxenus was a native of the Mysian city Atarneus, but had been for some time a resident in Stagira. His wife took the place of Aristotle's mother, as he himself took that of the father. That they must have been his guardians some considerable time before his seventeenth year, is indicated by the fact that Aristotle manifests the strongest sense of obligation to them, and he cannot well be supposed to have experienced a continuance of their kindness after his seventeenth year, when he no longer resided in their vicinity. He ordered in his last will that a statue be erected to each of these benefactors. He also took their son Nicanor when an orphan under his paternal care, provided for his scientific education, gave his daughter Pythias to him in marriage, made him the administrator of his estate, appointed him one of the guardians of his son Nicomachus, and in his will ordered a statue to his memory.

It has been thought singular by some, that Aristotle makes no mention in his will of any statue to his father. The probability is that this had been erected in his early life. It certainly cannot be supposed that he was deficient in gratitude to his benefactors. This is one of the virtues that shine brightest in his character, and he doubtless manifested it to his father as well as to his guardian.

MOTHER OF ARISTOTLE.

The name of the Stagirite's mother was Phaestis. She had three children, Arimnestus a son, and Arimneste a daughter, both of whom died before Aristotle. She was descended from a family who emigrated from Chalcis to Stagira. She has been supposed by some to belong to the posterity of Æsculapius. Pseudo-Ammonius has preserved a Greek epigram on "the divine Aristotle

the son of Phaestis and Nicomachus, τῶν Ἰσκληριαδῶν." But this appellation, as has been already intimated, does not denote a lineal descendant of Æsculapius so often as a member of a medical family, and besides there is no sufficient reason to believe that, even in this figurative sense, it can be rightfully applied to the mother as it can to the father of the Stagirite.

It has been stated that Phaestis died when her son was yet a boy, certainly before he was seventeen years old. He seems however to have cherished her memory with long continued affection. He had a friend, Protogenes, the celebrated painter, whom he would fain persuade to immortalize his art by delineating the exploits of Alexander the Great, and whom he is said to have induced, long after the death of Phaestis, to paint her portrait, or rather to take a copy of an original likeness already in possession of the family. In his last will, Aristotle requested that a statue of his mother be set up in honor of Ceres at Nemea, or in some other more agreeable location. Here we see another evidence of the affection and thankfulness so often exhibited by the man, who is sometimes described as the impersonation of mere intellect.

PERSONAL APPEARANCE AND EARLY HABITS OF THE STAGIRITE.

It has been said by one of the commentators on Aristotle, that his character appears like a statue found amid the ruins of an antique temple. It is difficult to trace out the exact expression which it once wore. Some of its most beautiful features have faded away in the lapse of time, or have been defaced by the barbarity of enemies. It lies before us as the mutilated Torso lay before the greatest of the Italian sculptors, an object of the deepest interest, and deserving as well as rewarding the intensest study. We should restore the original lines of beauty which have been covered over and distorted by corrupters of the truth, and in place of which the most odious features have been delineated; and even when we cannot determine what were some of the precise shadings of the likeness, we can easily determine what are the Vandal-like disfigurings of it, we can easily see that the head of a Thersites should not be placed upon the shoulders of an Agamemnon, and that the minute representations of a character should accord with its whole spirit and genius.

The maligners of our philosopher have begun with his physical constitution. They have represented him as small of stature.

and bald-headed. Diogenes Lærtius repeats the rumor that he was *ἰσχυροσελής*, from which and from his well-known feebleness of health we may believe him to have been of meagre habit; also that his eyes were small, from which Pisistratus infers a *μικροπυγία*; that he wore beautiful raiment, costly shoes, rings withal, and used the tonsure. According to some writers, the consciousness of his unpleasant personal appearance induced his peculiar attentiveness to dress. The best statues represent him as beardless or shaven, and this peculiarity is thought to have been the offspring of pride. Some of these statues indicate the sarcastic expression complained of by Plato. Like his contemporary Demosthenes, he had an organic defect of the vocal organs. He was unable to articulate distinctly the letters L and R, and this imperfection is probably the sole ground of his being called a stammerer by Plutarch, Diogenes and others.

Athenæus, Aelian and Eusebius, relying solely on the assertions of Epicurus, a very unsafe guide, have narrated that in his minority the Stagirite wasted his inheritance by extravagant living, then betook himself to the army, and afterwards sought to regain his lost character and peace of mind by philosophical studies. Timæus of Tauromenium adds that, having reduced himself to poverty, Aristotle earned his subsistence by the sale of medicines, and he is sometimes called in reproach "the medicine-vender." That he early began to practise the healing art may be readily admitted, for by some acquaintance with the practical application he could best learn the theoretical principles of therapeutics. Indeed the science of medicine was learned in ancient days almost entirely from the practice of it. Nor need it be denied that he may have found a pleasure in administering relief to the sick, while he was in his novitiate. But that he was driven by poverty to such an expedient, and that his poverty was the result of his early extravagance are at the best gratuitous conjectures. It seems improbable that he could have been so grateful to Proxenus, if the guardian had permitted the ward to indulge in such ruinous excesses. It seems improbable that he could have run the rounds of such a course of dissipation, so early as his seventeenth year; and we know that in this year he commenced his regular philosophical training. We have reason to believe that in his riper youth he purchased a valuable library for himself, and such a purchase in such an age is full proof that he had not squandered his estate. The reporters of this scandal do not appear to attach full credit to it themselves: some of the most vio-

lent foes of Aristotle do not endorse or even mention it; no credible historian represents Aristotle as ever in a state of poverty; on the contrary, the faults ordinarily ascribed to him are those which are connected with a state of affluence. There is no reason then for crediting this tale of Epicurus. There is, on the other hand, good reason for believing that our philosopher's early habits were those of a student. He was a rational student, not a book-worm; a thinker and observer, but no recluse. He was fond of dress and attentive to the fashions of the day. Far from being a disciple of Diogenes, he chose to appear as a man of the world, to live as a scholar not yet metamorphosed into a library. His regard for external appearance may have savored too much of the courtier, still it may have counteracted the tendency of his studious life to induce an unhealthy and morbid tone of sentiment.

FIRST RESIDENCE IN ATHENS.

It is related by Pseudo-Ammonius, that Aristotle received his incitement to engage in the pursuits of science, from a decision of the Delphic Oracle in favor of his doing so. But he was not the man to wait for such impulses to study. His mind was philosophical in its structure. He had an inborn desire to learn the nature and causes of things. Instead of assigning his pecuniary distress, or his deference to an oracle, as the occasion of his devoting himself to science, it were safer to assign the cravings of his inner nature, his constitutional inquisitiveness and love of analysis. Desirous of enjoying the best possible instruction, he repaired to Athens, the garden even of Greece. He was attracted hither by the fame of the Athenian philosophers, and particularly by that of Plato. He had nearly completed his seventeenth year, when he became a pupil in this city of the arts and letters. He remained here twenty years, from 367 B. C. to 347 B. C.

It has been said, that he could not have selected this residence for the purpose of enjoying the society of Plato, for he came to Athens at the very time of Plato's temporary departure from it, at the time of his taking his second journey to Syracuse, where he remained from the second year of the one hundred and third Olympiad, to the fourth year of the same or perhaps still later. But no one knows, that Aristotle was apprized of Plato's intention to be absent three years from the city at this time. And when he found it impossible to sit down *immediately* at the feet of him whose instructions he prized above that of others, what wiser

course could he pursue, than to remain among the disciples of that great man, and in the city where were teachers of kindred spirit though of unequal merit. While the master of the academy was absent, his place was supplied by Heraclides of Pontus, and it was perhaps under the tuition of this sage that the Stagirite passed his first three years in Athens. Pseudo-Ammonius and the Latin biographer and Olympiodorus assert that our philosopher, on his arrival at Athens, did not at once avail himself of Plato's teachings, but remained three years under the instruction of Socrates. These writers had probably read, that before he attended the lectures of Plato, he studied three years with some Socratical philosopher, and they mistook the designation of a disciple (*Σωκρατικός*) for the name of Socrates himself, who had been dead fifteen years when Aristotle was born.

Eumelus asserts that our philosopher was in his thirtieth year when he became a pupil of Plato. This error was perhaps suggested by the remembrance, that Plato recommended the age of thirty years as the most fitting for the commencement of the higher philosophy, not however for all branches of study. It may also have received some sanction from the report of Epicurus, that Aristotle pursued a course of dissipation until he had wasted his patrimony, and it seems not very probable, that he would have satiated his alleged vicious propensities before his thirtieth year. But the best of all authorities, that of Apollodorus,¹ with whom the majority of historians agree, establishes the fact that the father of metaphysics commenced his studies at Athens in his seventeenth year, and consequently that he became a disciple of Plato in his twentieth, or thereabouts. He did not, however, enjoy the instructions of this "wisest pupil of the wisest teacher" without interruption. As we have seen, Plato returned from Syracuse in the year 365 B. C. or the beginning of 364; but about four years afterwards he took another journey, making his last visit to his friend Dionysius, and he remained absent from 361 until the latter part of 360 B. C., when he resumed his duties in the Academy.

LITERARY LABORS DURING THE PERIOD OF ARISTOTLE'S PUPILAGE AT ATHENS.

The twenty years of the Stagirite's first residence at the seat of Grecian learning must have been a period of intense and extensive study; for it was the season of his preparation for labors

¹ Preserved by Diogenes Laërtius in his *Life of Aristotle*, *Opp. Om. Arist.*, ed. Buhle, T. I. p. 6.

which, in difficulty and magnitude, have been seldom if ever equalled. Nor does he appear to have confined himself to private and merely preparatory investigations. He published some works at this time which are now lost. One was a Treatise on Rhetoric, chiefly historical in its character, and highly commended by Cicero. Another was a Collection of Proverbs; for Aristotle placed a high estimate on these compressions of popular wisdom. A third was an explanation of the principles of civil law, and entitled *Ἀγκυρώματα πόλεων*. A fourth work was an historical account of one hundred and fifty-eight States, (according to others, one hundred and seventy-one; according to the Latin biographer, who probably refers to the same work, two hundred and fifty States.) There is also reason to believe, that during the latter part of his residence at the Academy he gave public instruction in rhetoric and philosophy. One of his hearers at this time was Hermias, governor of Atarneus, who continued long afterwards a faithful friend of the Stagirite. Hermias was also a hearer of Plato. Probably many other pupils of the Academy attended the lectures of Aristotle; not because he appeared as the rival of his master, but because they desired, like the men of Athens in a later age, to hear as well as to tell some new thing. Having an original cast of mind, and having reduced to system a large mass of multifarious reading, it was natural that he should desire to make some use of his acquisitions; nor does he appear to have displeased his teacher by instituting a lecture of his own.

From the lost works of Hermippus there is a quotation, preserved by Diogenes Laërtius, from which it appears, that Aristotle toward the end of his first residence at Athens, was sent on an embassy by the Athenians to Philip of Macedon. But what was the object or the result of this embassy, we are not informed. Buhle¹ ascribes to Hermippus the account, that for Aristotle's success in his mission to Philip, he was honored by the Athenians with a statue upon the Acropolis. But this account seems to be falsely ascribed to Hermippus, and this conjecture, that he was rewarded by the Greeks for political benefactions, is corroborated by no valid testimony. The Latin biography declares, that the Athenians erected a statue to the philosopher as a token of their gratitude for his favors to them; but does not specify the particular favors. Pausanias states, that he had seen at Olympia a statue which had no inscription, but which was said by his guide to have been

¹ Opp. Om. Arist. Tom. I. p. 92.

erected for Aristotle. "Perhaps," he adds, "the statue was raised by a scholar of the Stagirite, or by a warrior; for Aristotle was held in high esteem by Alexander, and afterwards by Antipater." It is to be regretted, that we cannot determine how much and with what success the philosopher mingled in the political affairs of the Athenians, and how far he ever allowed his literary pursuits to be interrupted. On the one hand we know, that in order to accumulate his immense stores of knowledge he must have been a severe applicant to study. We are told by Diogenes, that wishing to avoid a drowsy state of the system, he was accustomed to hold a brazen ball in his hand while reading, and to keep a bowl or basin in such a position that, when sleepiness relaxed the muscles of his fingers, the ball would fall upon the basin and the noise would startle and wake him.¹ On the other hand, we know that he was not a recluse, uninterested in the passing events of life, but that he regarded himself as a man among men, and therefore may be well supposed to have concerned himself with the affairs of State.

PERSONAL RELATIONS OF ARISTOTLE AND PLATO.

It is supposed that, before Plato's return from his last visit to Dionysius in the year 360 B. C., he had not paid much attention to the superior claims of the Stagirite. But he did not remain ignorant of them a long time. The young philosopher having silently accumulated his learning, was unable to remain in concealment. In process of time, as Philoponus relates, he was so far honored by his teacher as to be called by him "the philosopher of the truth," and again, "the soul of the Academy (*τοῦς τῆς διατριβῆς*)." Pseudo-Ammonius says, that Aristotle's house was called by Plato "the house of the reader (*οἶκος ἀναγνώστων*)." The Latin biographer² relates, that when the young philosopher was absent from the Academy, Plato would say, "Intellectus abest; surdum est auditorium."

But this pleasant relation between two so distinguished men seems to have been not entirely undisturbed. The ancient biographies contain reports, which must have arisen from some want of sympathy between the teacher and the pupil. The reports are

¹ Opp. Om. Arist. Ed. Buhle. T. I. p. 15. Ammianus Marcellinus relates the same anecdote of Alexander the Great; "perhaps the pupil," says Buhle, "imitated the teacher in this habit;" vide Buhle's *Vita Arist.*, Opp. Om. A. T. I. p. 104.

² Opp. Om. Arist. p. 55.

exaggerations of the truth, but there was truth enough to make exaggeration possible. It is indeed very difficult to determine on this and on other subjects, how much credit can safely be attached to the historians of antiquity. They have been well described by Ast,¹ as fruitful in inventing stories, especially about great men, and so much the more fruitful when the men were retired in their habit of life. The want of actual fact was supplied by imaginative tales, and a trifling hint was amplified into a history. We must therefore be cautious in examining the narratives which are related in reference to celebrated philosophers, whose fame excited the fancy of the historians, and whose life was so hidden that nothing but an inventive imagination could detail the particulars of it. Such, for example, are the fictions which are recorded concerning Pythagoras and Socrates.

Particularly cautious should we be in examining the charges which are made against Aristotle; for he devoted so much of his time to the refutation of his predecessors in philosophy, that he embittered against himself such of his contemporaries as adhered to the old masters. Lord Bacon says,² "*Aristoteles regnare se haud tuto posse putavit, nisi, more Ottomanorum, fratres suos omnes contrucidasset.*" A controversialist whose hands had been raised against so many, must expect that some hands would be raised against himself. The most virulent of his opposers were Epicurus, Timaeus of Tauromenium, who for his slanderous propensities was denominated *ἐπιτίματος*, Alexinus the Eristic, Eubulides, Demochares, Cephisodorus, and Lycon the Pythagorean. Among the ancients, who have noticed the alienation said to have subsisted between Aristotle and Plato, the most conspicuous are Eubulides, who was a pupil of Euclid and a teacher of Demosthenes; Aristoxenus who was, according to Suidas, disappointed and chagrined because he did not succeed the Stagirite in the Lyceum, Aristocles, Ælian, Diogenes Laërtius, Origen, Cyril, Theodoret, Augustine, Eusebius, and others.

It is said by Ælian, that Plato disliked Aristotle's attentiveness to the outward life, his love of dress and finery; and that he stigmatized the pupil's regard for personal appearance as unfit for a philosopher. It must be conceded, that having been resident at the court of Macedon, and wishing perhaps to relieve a disagreeable exterior, the young metaphysician may have contracted a habit of attention to form and apparel, which must seem extra-

¹ Vide Platon's *Leben und Schriften*.

² De Augm. Scient. III. ep. 4.

gant to one living like Plato in the spirit more than in the body. It was not unnatural for a mind, precise and definite like Aristotle's, to become punctilious in reference to personal habits. Some of our gravest divines have transferred their habits of minute exactness, from the "corpus theologiae" to the "corpus proprium." Still it is not impossible that our metaphysician's fondness for outward beauty was less of a foible, and Plato's disapproval of it less decided and severe, than has been given out by the garrulous biographers. One thing is certain, the Stagirite, though a great reader, did not indulge in those negligences of etiquette, which some men rely on as the sole evidences of their genius. He acquainted himself with practical life in a practical way, and acquired common sense from common objects. His writings show, that he was busied not with idle theorizings so much as with actual observation; that he watched the outward movements of men and the outward workings of nature. His taste for the physical sciences may have appeared to Plato disproportionate, and his attention to the matters of daily life may have seemed unphilosophical. The venerable sage may have disliked to see his pupil so much a man of the world and so much inclined to enjoy life, even though the pupil indulged in no vicious excesses. Diogenes relates that Aristotle's maxim was, "not apathy but moderation," and we can easily conceive how a young man, acting on this maxim, may have incurred the displeasure of a father in philosophy who lived more aloof from the world, and how this displeasure, perhaps slight in degree, and expressed with reserve, may have been distorted by fabulists into an abhorrence of Aristotle's foppery and extravagance.

Ælian further narrates that there was not only a sarcastic expression in Aristotle's countenance, but also a loquacity in his intercourse, which were highly offensive to his teacher; and that his ingratitude to Plato was so marked as to cause the latter to compare him to a colt, which kicks at its mother when it has once satisfied its cravings for milk.¹ He also relates² the following instance, in which the Stagirite's ingratitude toward his teacher was very disgracefully manifested. On one occasion Xenocrates took a journey from Athens to Chalcedon, and Speusippus was confined to the house by illness. These two Academicians, having been the main supporters of Plato when he would defend his system from assaults, and having now left him to refute opposing sophisms

¹ Indeed some of the words of Ælian seem to imply that Plato, at one time, refused Aristotle permission to attend lectures in the Academy.

² Var. Hist. III. ep. 19.

without the aid of his expert disciples, himself also being now in his eightieth year and having lost the vigor which he once possessed, and in especial degree the readiness of his memory; thus infirm and defenceless the old philosopher was assailed by the Stagirite proud of his youthful alertness and vigor, was plied with subtle and almost unanswerable questions, and at length compelled by his pupil's perseverance in the rencontre, to leave the groves of the Academy, and retire for the delivery of his lectures into a private apartment. Having thus compelled Plato to abandon his beloved walks, the Stagirite took possession of them as his own theatre of instruction, and established a school in opposition to his former master.¹ Three months afterward Xenocrates returned, and in his indignation at the Stagirite's treatment of Plato attacked Aristotle, and forced him to relinquish the Academy in favor of its former occupant. One would almost infer from Ælian's language, that Xenocrates used physical violence for the expulsion of the intruder.

This narrative seems to have originated from a misinterpretation of a passage in the life of Plato by Aristoxenus, surnamed Musicus. He relates that during Plato's absence from Athens, and while he was journeying to and fro in foreign lands, certain aliens established a school in opposition to him. "Some have supposed," says Aristocles, "that this statement of Aristoxenus refers to Aristotle, but they do not consider that the author of the statement never speaks of Aristotle, except in the most respectful terms." He might have added, says Stahr, that the words of Aristoxenus refer, in all probability, to a period of Plato's absence which was previous to Aristotle's first residence in Athens, and of course those words could have had no reference whatever to the Stagirite. Thus has the prolific imagination of the Greek biographers erected a large superstructure upon a mere point. The fact, that Xenocrates was in after times one of the most intimate friends of Aristotle, would appear sufficient to refute one part of Ælian's narrative; and the whole of it is rendered improbable by the daily life of Aristotle,² which exhibits a benevolent gratitude as one of the cardinal virtues of his character. He often extols friendship as one of the chief blessings of life, and manifests toward his family and associates and even slaves a degree of af-

¹ That Aristotle did not institute a school in rivalry of Plato is proved by Ammonius, *Vid. Opp. Om. Arist. Tom. I. p. 45.*

² Ammonius speaks of him, as "wonderfully gentle in his manners," *Vit. p. 49.* The structure of his mind would imply the same.

fection, which, in so intellectual a man, is remarkable. The codicil to his last will is a monument of his grateful affection to all who had done him service; and the person, who in his old age retains so warm and generous a spirit, could not have been in his youth a cold-hearted and close-handed egotist. "Ingratitude," says Goethe, "is always a species of weakness; I have never found that clever men have been guilty of it." In speaking of Aristotle's kindness to benefactors, Stahr quotes "the short but excellent description of the philosopher, which is given by the physician Bernard Dessenius Cronenburg, the able opponent of Paracelsus. *Aristoteli, says he, jucunda suavisque compositio, non aliter quam musica harmonia, suis numeris figuraque absoluta; fuit enim in dicendo facilis, in componendo promptus, in elocutione splendidus, in loquendo affabilis, in victu magnificus, in vestitu exquisitus, amicis fidus, inimicis infensus, philosophiae disciplinae observantissimus.* He is indeed accused by the Platonic philosophers of avarice, arrogance and heartlessness, but we must remember that his accusers were jealous of his growing fame, and eager to prevent its eclipsing that of their master. Many of them penned their calumnies after an interval of centuries from the period which they described, and were not careful to compose a narrative from authentic records, so they could fill it up with sketches of the fancy. They knew that Plato makes no mention in any part of his writings of Aristotle's name, although Aristotle was by far the most eminent pupil of the Academy. They knew that Plato appointed Speusippus¹ as his successor at Athens, although the Stagirite had far higher claims to such an honor. Here were indications of Plato's want of sympathy with Aristotle, and the garrulous historians tasked themselves to invent causes for such a reserve. They knew also, that Aristotle in his writings often opposes and sometimes ridicules the Platonic philosophy, and they were unable to divine how an inquirer after truth could reject a theory without hating the theorist. They understood little of that pure mindedness which can be earnest in

¹ This appointment seems to have had an undue influence over the modern biographers of Aristotle, as Tennemann for example; (see his *Geschichte der Philosophie*, Band III, S. 27.) It must be remembered that Speusippus was the son of Potona, Plato's sister, (see *Arist. Vit. Ammon.* p. 46,) and the aged philosopher might naturally prefer to be succeeded by his nephew rather than an alien; especially so, when the nephew was a supporter of the Platonic system, and the alien an opposer of it; when also, it may be, the personal manners of Speusippus were more congenial to Plato's taste than those of Aristotle.

refuting an argument, and yet reverential in separating the person of the antagonist from his errors in logic.

We are indeed compelled to admit, that there may have been but little congeniality of feeling between Plato and Aristotle. The latter was a man of sharp discrimination, of accurate and minute attention to individual phenomena whether of matter or mind, of a strong taste for physical sciences, of severe and logical ratiocination; while the former lived within himself, strove to elevate his spirit above the world and its low realities, and preferred the sublime to the exact, a refined sentiment to an observed fact. The latter strove to understand the reality of things, and to decypher the laws by which actual existences are at present regulated; the former strove to emerge from the grossness of reality and to live in a world of ideas. Aristotle wrote in prose and abhorred figures of speech; Plato's prose is poetry, and his philosophy as well as style must have appeared to the Stagirite, as the work of the imagination. The former would be called by some a man of the understanding; the latter, a man of the reason. We can easily imagine how much the style of Plato may have disgusted the Stagirite, who wished to look at once through the language to the fact which lay beyond it. So must the arid style of Aristotle have been equally distasteful to Plato, who loved the freshness and luxuriance of speech as well as of thought. The mind of the abstract logician must have been often dissatisfied, oftener unsatisfied, with such reasonings as captivated the poetical philosopher, and the latter must have been wearied, if not disgusted, by the rude and dry syllogisms of the former. It is possible too, that Aristotle was impatient of the intellectual dominion of his teacher, that he could not brook submission to the authority of any man, that he possessed a consciousness of strength which made it appear unworthy in him to regard himself, or suffer himself to be regarded, as a follower even of Plato. To his aspiring feelings the enthusiasm, with which the master of the Academy was admired and extolled, may have been unwelcome. Nor is it on the other hand improbable, that Plato in his old age looked with some distrust upon the acute logician, so dissimilar to his teacher, and promising or rather threatening to eclipse all his predecessors.¹ He may have shrunk back from that sharpness of judgment and that cold analysis, which would never be satisfied with a flower when the search was for fruit. He may have dreaded him as the

¹ Vide *Arist. Vit. per annos digesta*, *Opp. Om. Arist.* p. 37: et *Tennemann's Geschichte der Phil.* B. III. pp. 27, 28.

founder of a new, opposing and triumphant school in philosophy. All this may be, yet all warrants no more than the admission, that there was not between these two men such a congeniality of feeling, as is essential to the truest inward friendship. It does not involve the necessity of supposing them to have been mutual enemies. Enlarged minds like theirs, how great soever the discrepancy between them, may yet cherish a deep-seated esteem for one another. Each may be often disgusted with the peculiarities of the other, and still in many respects admire the character so dissonant from its own. Nor are the petty rivalries of an hour allowed to interrupt that reciprocal esteem, which the very existence of a rivalry presupposes. The tendency of science is to liberalize the mind, and give an appreciation of excellence which it may not itself possess, and which indeed may occasionally come athwart its inclinations. History furnishes many examples of friendship, which has been formed by a union of opposite characters, like the union of positive and negative poles in electricity.

Not only the pervading tone of Aristotle's spirit, but also many expressions in his writings indicate, that he was not ungrateful nor inimical to Plato. He criticises often, and sometimes with severity, the theories of his teacher, but he does it without bitterness, and takes no occasion to asperse the character of the antagonist when he had the power, if he harbored the disposition, to defame. He writes in the spirit of a proverb, which has been said by some authors to have originated with him;¹ "*Amicus Plato, amicus Socrates, sed magis amica veritas.*" When in his *Nicomachean Ethics* he attempts to refute the Platonic Theory of Ideas or Archetypal Forms, he expresses his reluctance to say aught against it, because it was originated by men who were dear to him, *φίλους ἀνδρας*. "Yet," continues he, "it seems to be our duty, for the sake of preserving the truth to *sacrifice even our own families*, especially as we are philosophers."² Now such expressions as the preceding, made by so abstract a contro-

¹ *Opp. Om. Arist. pp. 45, 89.* The Ancient Translation, p. 57 states, that Aristotle in disagreeing with Plato harmonized with Plato's maxims, "*Quod magis oportet de veritate curare, quam de aliquo alio;*" and, "*Amicus quidem Socrates, sed magis amica veritas;*" and, "*De Socrate parum est curandum, de veritate multum.*"

² *Ethic. Nic. I. ep. 6.* Ritter in his *Hist. of the Ancient Philosophy* says, that Aristotle evinces at times a bitterness "in his attacks upon the system of Plato;" but must we not distinguish between bitterness against the system and ill will towards the person of a philosopher? See Morrison's Ritter, Vol. III. p. 7.

versalist, have a deeper meaning than if made by a writer of more exuberant sensibilities. It is a tacit and so much the more sincere disclosure of attachment to the character of one, with whom after all he could have but little inward communion. Nor does history refuse corroboration to our belief that the Stagirite cherished a feeling of friendship rather than enmity towards his old master. Pseudo-Ammonius, quoting from a life of Aristotle now lost, says that the pupil erected an altar to the memory of his teacher, with the following inscription;

This altar was erected by Aristotle to Plato,
A man whom it is not fitting for the bad to praise.

Buhle¹ has shown that the substance of this inscription appears to be made out of an elegy to Eudemus, and therefore to be improperly ascribed to Aristotle. Still this philosopher may have reared the marble for his teacher; he may have written an inscription of the same tenor with that above cited; there is as much reason for crediting the essential parts of this report in favor of the Stagirite, as for crediting the reports of an opposite character; it proves at least that the testimony of the Grecian story-tellers is divided, and that in the midst of their self-contradictions we must be influenced by the internal veri-similitude, or the want of it in their narratives.

Even if we admit that Aristotle entertained feelings of hostility to his teacher, we must regard it as very improbable that he should have manifested them as he has been accused of doing. He was so much younger than Plato and so much less favorably known in Greece, that he must have lost his characteristic shrewdness to have openly opposed the very idol of Athens. He was a foreigner at the seat of Grecian learning, and on that account must have been undervalued by the Athenians, who looked with contempt upon metics or aliens. How then could he have ventured to enter the lists of rivalry with the sage, who was not only a citizen of Athens but also related to some of her most illustrious men, as for example, the generals Chabrias and Timotheus.² It is not in

¹ Vid. Arist. Vit. per ann. dig. p. 90.

² This argument, employed by Pseudo-Ammonius, to prove that Aristotle never ventured upon the establishment of a school in opposition to Plato's, is set aside by Ritter, on the ground that Chabrias and Timotheus were deceased at the time of the Stagirite's residence in Athens. But a consanguinity with such men may often have more influence when the men are numbered with the dead, than while they are living.

keeping with the prudence and circumspection which are ascribed to the father of logic, that he should have hazarded the unequal contest between an obscure and alien pupil on the one hand, and a far-famed teacher as well as an aristocratic citizen on the other. While then it is not to be presumed that there existed an intimate confiding friendship, an inner commingling of the mind and heart between Aristotle and Plato, it is likewise not to be believed that there existed an open animosity between them, or any want of personal esteem. They were mutual well-wishers though not brothers. They lived neither in rancorous hatred nor in fervid love toward each other. They were kind opponents; and philosophical, controversial friends.

PERSONAL RELATIONS BETWEEN ARISTOTLE AND ISOCRATES.

The accounts of a personal feud between the Stagirite and the celebrated rhetorician, Isocrates, are liable to less objection than those which relate to Aristotle and Plato. Isocrates had not the authority nor the character which Plato possessed, he had far lower claims upon the esteem of the Stagirite, had exerted but little influence over him, and had imposed upon him no especial obligation. Hence we need not cross-examine the Grecian historians so rigidly, nor receive their narratives with so great reluctance in the present case, as in that to which we devoted the preceding section. Their narratives, besides, are not so discrepant from one another, nor from internal probability, as they are in the case which we last considered. They unite in the report that these celebrated rivals contended with one another, and exhibited a degree of excitement not easily reconcilable with the dignity of their station.

Isocrates was regarded by Aristotle and by other men of letters, as deficient in comprehensiveness of mind and power of thorough analysis. His mode of teaching rhetoric was thought to be empirical, he was accused of not understanding the principles of the science which he professed to explain, condemned for applying the rhetorical art merely to panegyric orations, and not to judicial speeches; for treating not so much of forensic and civil causes, as of mere elegance of speech.¹ When, therefore, Aristotle perceived that Isocrates attracted crowds to his lectures, that among his hearers were some of the nobility, as, for example, Timotheus the son of Conon, and that he was lauded by

¹ Vid. Cicero de Orat. VII. n. 35.

the multitude as the chief of the rhetoricians, the indignation of the young philosopher was roused. He applied to the rhetorician a verse from the *Philoctetes* of Euripides, a play now lost. The poet had said, "It is shameful to keep silence over the whole camp of the Greeks, and to let the barbarians speak." Aristotle modified the quotation thus, "It is shameful to keep silence, and let Isocrates speak." He therefore did not keep silence. He commenced a rival course of lectures on the art of rhetoric, although he had previously undervalued the art. He endeavored to supply the deficiencies of his opponent, by discussing the principles of eloquence philosophically and fundamentally. He also connected with his instructions a system of practical exercises. "Curavit, says Cicero,¹ et illustravit doctrinam illam omnem, re-rumque cognitionem cum orationis exercitatione conjunxit." It is probable also, that in this period he published the lost work on rhetoric, which has already been referred to, and that in this work he commented with severity upon the literary merits of Isocrates. He seems to have made some enemies to himself by these sallies against his rival, but still he displayed such force of mind in the contest as to establish his reputation for solidity and depth of genius. From a passage in Cicero de Oratore,² it would appear, that the efforts of Aristotle at this time attracted the notice of Philip, king of Macedon, and contributed to recommend the philosophical rhetorician to that monarch, for the office of tutor to Alexander the Great. Still, the spirit which Aristotle breathed in this controversy is said to have been violent and bitter, and his treatment of his antagonist not always candid. "Quorum uterque," says Cicero, speaking of the two rivals,³ "suo studio delectatus, contempsit alterum." Cephisodorus, or Cephisodotus, a pupil of Isocrates, appeared in defence of his master, and published a work in four books against Aristotle. He attacked the moral character of the Stagirite with great vehemence, and laid peculiar stress upon the fact that Aristotle had published a book of proverbs. The authorship of such a work he condemned as unseemly for a man of science. From the pertinacity with which he insists on this charge, we may infer the paucity of the materials which were at his disposal. If a man's innocence can be proved from the foolishness of the accusations which his enemies urge against him, then we need no better guaranty for the virtue of our philosopher than the fact that his accusers, when they wish-

¹ De Orat. VII. ch. 35.

² I. Lib. VII. § 35. See also Instit. Quinct. Lib. I. § 1.

³ De Officiis I. I. § 4.

ed to calumniate him most forcibly, accused him of editing a collection of apothegms. Such apothegms are ever the delight of men, who love to reduce the varieties of truth to the most comprehensive generalizations. They are, says Lord Bacon, "not only for delight and ornament but for real businesses and civil usages; for they are, as he said, *secures aut mucrones verborum*, which by their sharp edge cut and penetrate the knots of matters and business; and occasions run round in a ring, and what was once profitable may again be practised, and again be effectual, whether a man speak them as ancient or make them his own." Aristocles Messenius and Numenius speak disparagingly of this work of Cephisodorus against Aristotle, but Athenaeus commends it, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus pronounces it *πάνθ θαυμαστόν*. It is probable, that so extended a comment on the Stagirite had reference not merely to his oral lectures and book of proverbs and treatise on rhetoric, but also to several other works which have not come down to us, but which he had given to the public before this altercation commenced. It is also probable that many other volumes were written against him at this time, and that many of the scandals relating to him originated from this contention. St. Croix alludes to a letter of Isocrates in which the orator endeavors to prejudice the mind of Alexander in favor of the study of rhetoric, and against that of logic, and this letter is supposed by that critic to be a secret attack upon Aristotle, and designed to injure his influence with the court of Macedon.

There has been some debate with regard to the time of this altercation between the younger and the older rhetorician. Buhle supposes¹ that it occurred during the period of Aristotle's second residence in Athens, but Isocrates had been dead at least three years before this period commenced. Consequently the rival school must have been established, while Aristotle was a pupil of Plato at the Academy. From a statement made by Diogenes Laërtius it should seem, that the latter part of our philosopher's first residence in Athens was the time of his contention with Isocrates, and we should infer that he was emboldened to engage in such a rivalry, by his success in the embassy on which he was sent by the Athenians to Philip. At this period, Isocrates must have been at least eighty years of age, for he died in the year 338 before Christ, at the age of ninety-eight, and Aristotle left Athens in the year 348, ten years previous to his rival's death. The Stagirite himself could have been not much more than thirty

¹ Vita Arist. p. 95.

years old at the time of this competition. It appears singular that one so young should have been so jealous of the fame of an octogenarian; and this is one reason which induces Buhle to assign a later date to the rivalry,—a period when Aristotle was about fifty years old, but when unfortunately the rival had been deceased at least three years.

DEPARTURE FROM ATHENS TO MYSIA.

Having resided twenty years at the academy, Aristotle left it in the thirty-seventh year of his age; in the year 348 B. C., which was the first quarter of the one hundred and eighth Olympiad. This was the time of Plato's death. Some suppose that he quitted Athens, because the demise of his teacher had removed the chief attractions of the place; others, that he left it in indignation because Speusippus, instead of himself, was appointed Plato's successor in the academy. Both of these accounts imply that no violent animosity had existed between the teacher and the pupil, for if Aristotle had contended with his master, as he is reported to have done, he could not have so long cherished the expectation of receiving from his injured foe the honor of succeeding him in an office, which, though not the most lucrative, was in many respects the most exalted in the literary world.

It is impossible to decide with confidence on the motives of Aristotle for leaving Athens, but we are authorized in rejecting the slander which some have circulated, that he was influenced by a desire of gratifying his sensual propensities at a foreign court. He had previously possessed ample means for satiating these propensities, if he had been disposed to deny himself the gratification, to him far more intense, of storing his capacious mind with the knowledge which it craved. He may have thought that he had remained long enough in one city, and that his education would be more complete, if he should change for a season his habits of thought and life. It was at this period that Philip was ravaging Greece; he had just laid Olynthus in ruins, and struck terror into the hearts of the men of Athens. Demosthenes was exerting his influence to rouse his fellow-citizens against the Lacedemonian conqueror. They were inflamed against Philip and against all who acknowledged his sway. They knew that he often employed his subjects as spies in foreign lands, and that his stratagems were as formidable as his arms. One of his subjects was Aristotle, the father of Aristotle was the intimate friend of

the father of Philip, and the son of Nicomachus was known to be a favorite of the son of Amyntas. This alien from Macedonia was also reported to mingle political discussions with his literary teachings. He had incurred the enmity of Isocrates, and of the numerous supporters of that venerable orator. Plato no longer lived to shield his illustrious pupil from popular suspicion. It is not at all improbable, that the Stagirite foresaw a storm of Grecian indignation rising against him, and that he fled before it to seek shelter in other lands. Or if he had no fear of popular violence, he might have been impelled by his patriotism to abandon a people, who were becoming almost frantic against his friend and sovereign. Be this as it may, he quitted Athens, accepted the invitation of his friend Hermias, governor of Atarneus, and took up his residence in that city, or according to Strabo in the neighboring city of Assos,¹ the birth-place of Cleanthes the Stoic. He was accompanied thither by his friend Xenocrates, the same who is said by Aelian to have assumed so hostile an attitude to him in the pretended controversy with Plato. This fact is another indication, that the severity of that contest has been exaggerated by partizan historians.

Atarneus and Assos were cities of Mysia in Asia Minor, on the shore of the Ægean sea, and opposite to the island Lesbos. They were in that part of Asia, hallowed beyond almost any other by classical recollection, and affording a delightful retreat to the student, be he a poet or a philosopher.

CHARACTER OF HERMIAS ; HIS CONNECTION WITH ARISTOTLE.

By his intimacy with Aristotle, Hermias was raised to an elevation in the literary world, which he would not have attained by his individual merits, great as these must have been. In this conspicuous position has he been "chattered at, and pointed at, and grinned at, by the whole rabble of satyrs and goblins" among the Greek biographers. Strabo and Demetrius of Magnesia, who are followed by Diogenes Laërtius, call him a Bithynian, a slave of Eubulus, and a eunuch. That the last appellation is not rightly applied to him, has been shown by Ilgen in the *Schol. Græcor.* p. 162, and is virtually contradicted by those historians, who affirm that his daughter became the wife of Aristotle. That he was no slave, in the proper sense of that term, may be readily admitted,

¹ As Atarneus and Assos were under the same government, the Stagirite may have resided in each of these cities alternately.

if we consider that every subordinate officer was often termed, by the Greeks, a slave of his superior in command. In an army, all who occupied subaltern stations were, in this sense, slaves of the commander in chief. Hermias was a friend of Eubulus, and as such was entrusted by him with many important offices.

That we know so little of Eubulus is matter of regret, for he was evidently no ordinary man. He evinced genius and tact. According to Strabo he was once a banker; he amassed great wealth, and acquired great influence over his fellow citizens. He is called by Suidas a philosopher,¹ and appears to have spent much time at Athens, in the society of her teachers and sages. By his affluence and intellectual vigor he obtained the government of Assos, Atarneus, and the circumjacent regions. Hermias, who had aided him in securing this elevation, was appointed by him to the government of one or both of these cities, Assos or Atarneus, and thus was he the slave, or subordinate general, of Eubulus.

It has already been remarked, that Hermias attended the lectures which Aristotle delivered during his first residence at Athens. But he availed himself of other literary privileges, particularly of the instructions of Plato. He resided at Athens for the purpose not of mental acquisition merely, but also of superintending the extensive pecuniary concerns of Eubulus. That he was, during this period, on terms of intimacy with Aristotle and Xenocrates, appears probable from the fact of his subsequently inviting these philosophers to spend so long a time with him, at his residence in Mysia. He must have left the city some years before Plato's death. He may have been called away from the academy by the political agitations of his adopted land. Having united with Eubulus in the attempt to rescue a part of the Mysian territory from the Persian yoke, and having been rewarded with an honorable office for his success in this attempt, he certainly deserves great credit for persevering in his scientific predilections, and calling to his palace two of the most promising philosophers of his time. It has been conjectured that he wished their aid in draughting a code of laws for his subjects. This too is honorable to a governor raised but recently to his dignities, and by no means secure in their possession. He held his dominion amid great popular excitement and in defiance of the immense power of Persia. Although many of the cities of Asia Minor, as well as Egypt and Syria, had risen against Artaxerxes Ochus, yet was their struggle for freedom re-

¹ *Avi...*

sisted not merely by the Persians, but also by mercenaries from among the Greeks, who were under the skilful guidance of Memnon of Rhodes.¹ Eubulus fell at last a prey to violence. His death was probably the result of Persian intrigue. It has been ascribed by Demetrius of Magnesia, and after him by Diogenes Laërtius, to the treachery of Hermias; but this is mere slander. Hermias reigned in the stead of Eubulus, maintained his authority with consummate skill, until he was entrapped by the Persian general Mentor. He trusted the oath of that perfidious commander, and consented to a peaceful interview with him. The oath was violated, Hermias was seized, delivered over to Artaxerxes Ochus, and put to death by strangulation. Tertullian is supposed to relate, (in a passage, however, of doubtful genuineness,) that the death of this governor was occasioned by the treachery of Aristotle; a statement made not only without evidence, but against the united testimony of writers, who on this subject are far more deserving of credit than the author of such a calumny. The philosopher appears to have mourned the sudden exit of his friend. He reared to his memory a monument, or as some affirm a cenotaph at Delphi, and Diogenes Laërtius² has preserved its inscription: "Slain in sacrilegious violation of the sacred laws of the gods, by the tyrant of the bow-bearing Persians; not openly, with the spear, on the bloody battle-field, but by the treachery of a deceitful man." The Stagirite, on occasion of the death of Hermias, wrote an ode also, of which there have been several metrical translations into the Latin and German languages,³ and the following is an unmetrical version in the English. "Oh virtue (*Ἀρετή*, *virtus*), hard to attain by the race of men, but yet the fairest object of pursuit in life! For thy beauty, oh virgin, is it an enviable lot even to die in Greece, and to endure without fatigue the severest toils. Thou givest man the enjoyment of immortal fruit, which is better than gold and noble birth and soft sleep. For thy sake, in search of thine honor, toiled the divine Hercules, and the children of Leda. Longing after thee went Achilles also, and Ajax, down to Hades. On account of thy lovely form Hermias too, the nursling of Atarneus, deprived himself of the light of day. Therefore shall his exploits be renowned in song, and he shall re-

¹ Buhle says that Mentor was the leader, and not Memnon. All other biographers of Aristotle say Memnon. Vit. Opp. Om. p. 91.

² Arist. Vit. p. 7.

³ For the original of this ode, see Arist. Vit. Auct. Diog. Laërt. in Opp. Om. Arist. edit. Buhle, Tom. I. p. 8. See also p. 24 for a Latin version: Stahl's Arist. B. I. p. 80 for a German

ceive an immortal name from the muses, the daughters of memory, when they pay adoration to Jupiter as the Protector of the rights of hospitality (*Διὸς ἑστίου*), and bestow on faithful friendship its fit reward."

The whole style of this ode indicates a sincere veneration for its subject, as a man of moral not less than of mental excellence; and could not have been written by one who associated with Hermias as Aristotle is reported to have done, for the purpose of beastly self-indulgence. This is not the lamentation of one sensualist over the misfortunes of another, for it bespeaks a kind of respect which libertines rarely entertain for libertines. Although we should not infer from the abstract character of the Stagirite's genius, that he would have ever attempted a metrical composition, we are yet pleased to find that his sensibilities were so active as to seek an outflow in poetical effusions, and especially that his love to his friends poured itself forth in such a channel. True, he seems not to have been born a poet; but we admire him the more that he tried, it matters not with what success, to make himself one. He is said by Diogenes Laërtius¹ to have composed some epics as well as elegiacs; and thus he seems to have cultivated his mind not exclusively in its philosophical propensities, although these promised him the highest eminence.

But when a man has so far eclipsed his former rivals as Aristotle appears to have done, he cannot, even while suffering the pain of bereavement, escape their envy, but will be wounded in all circumstances in all his vulnerable points. For the ode in which he gave vent to his grief for Hermias, the philosopher was, some years afterward, prosecuted before the Areöpagus. He was denounced as having indited sacrilege and blasphemy. He was accused of paying to his friend the honors which are due to the gods only. It is true that he represented Hermias as receiving honor from superior natures, and receiving it at the same time with Jupiter Xenius; but he wrote in the language of feeling, and his words are not to be pressed to all the conclusions or implications which may logically be wrung from them. He wrote, moreover, after the fashion that was common among the Greeks of his time, and his scolium (for such rather than pæan is the true description of the ode,) was no more blasphemous than the scolia which were sung every week at banquets in Athens. He must indeed have lived a

¹ *Opp. Om. Arist. T. I. p. 24.* So likewise the anonymous biographer, *Vit. p. 65, 66.*

virtuous life, if all his enemies, after searching more than a quarter of a century for his foibles, could find nothing more reprehensible than his use of a few extravagant phrases, in a lamentation over a murdered friend. Even if we admit that the style of his ode was not logically or theo-logically conformable to the standards, still we cannot but find some apology for his surrender to the impulses of feeling, in the domestic relations which he was at this time assuming, and which will be detailed in the next section.

MARRIAGE OF ARISTOTLE.

At the time of penning the obnoxious ode to the memory of his friend, the Stagirite was cherishing an affection for Pythias, who was intimately connected with the departed Hermias. Some say that she had been the concubine of the governor of Assos ; others, that she was his sister ; a third party say, that she was his real daughter ; but the best authorities represent her as his adopted daughter, and, it is sometimes added, his sister also. Aristotle married her shortly after the death of Hermias ; but as his mourning for the adoptive father was the cause of fresh vituperations, so was his hymeneal bliss with the daughter disturbed by his enemies. He was so severely scandalized by the Greek tale-bearers, for his marriage with Pythias, that he felt himself obliged to explain, in a letter to his friend Antipater, his reasons for such a union. Aristocles, who knew the contents of the letter, gives the following explanation of the matrimonial engagement.

After the sudden discomfiture and death of Hermias, the treacherous Mentor sought to occupy with Persian troops the cities which had been subject to the Mysian commander. Aristotle and Xenocrates were obliged to save themselves by flight. If they had left Pythias in Mysia, she would have fallen into the hands of the Persians, and in all probability been slain. Unwilling that she should be thus sacrificed, and having previously entertained a high regard for her character as a "modest and amiable woman," *σώφρονα καὶ ἀγαθὴν*, the Stagirite took her for his wife, and by a rapid flight saved her from the enemy. He has been censured for the extravagance of his affection for Pythias, and accused not only of composing a hymn in honor of her father, as if he were a god, but also of presenting offerings to Pythias, as if she were a goddess, offerings like those presented by the Athenians to Ceres. Diogenes Laërtius¹ derived this tale from Lycon ; yet Lycon represents

¹ Opp. Om. Arist. ed. Buhle, p. 5.

our philosopher as paying these honors to his wife, not soon after her marriage, but soon after her death. Had not the envy of his inferiors been fertile in libels, Aristotle might easily have been suspected of coldheartedness in his conjugal relations; but such a suspicion is removed by the fact, that nearly all the charges against his domestic character are of the opposite complexion; and although we do not trust these calumnious details, we may yet regard them as indicating, in the general, that the philosopher's home affections were ardent rather than torpid, that he gave more occasion to the reproach of idolatry than to that of cruelty, and that Burke's oft-quoted description of a thorough-bred metaphysician cannot apply to the father of metaphysics. As he is not accused of indifference toward his wife or her adoptive father, but rather of an idolizing attachment, we may yield so much credit to his maligners as to concede, that he cherished full as much of the household tenderness as could be expected from the "inventor of syllogisms." That he cherished more, the readers of his *Logic* may believe hardly.

Aristocles, who is probably indebted for his information to the correspondence of Aristotle with Antipater, has described Pythias as worthy of her husband's love. Her affection for him was manifested in her request, that his bones after his death should be placed by the side of her own; a request which he noticed in his last will, and with which his surviving friends were ordered to comply. In such an incident does virtue assert itself, revealing its sway over the affections, although it had been nearly concealed by obloquy from the view of the world.

ARISTOTLE IN MACEDONIA, TEACHER OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

Having remained three years at the court of Atarneus or Assos, Aristotle fled to Mitylene, the capital city of Lesbos, and the birth place of Pittacus, Alcaeus, Sappho, Terpander, Theophanes, Hellenicus, and other illustrious authors. It is conjectured that Hermias left friends surviving in Mitylene, who would gladly receive and defend his former guest. How long the refugee remained in this city, and whether, as Buhle supposes, Xenocrates remained with him, we know not. He repaired thither in 345 B. C., but accepted in 343 B. C. a call to superintend the education of Alexander the Great at the court of Philip of Macedon. He was at this time forty-one years of age, and his pupil was in his thirteenth year.¹ Apollo-

¹ It is difficult to conceive of what grounds Ritter asserts that Alexander

orus says, that Alexander was at this time in his fifteenth year; but certainly he was born in 356 B. C., and commenced the government of Macedon in 336 B. C. when he was twenty years old, and died in 323 B. C., at the age of thirty-two years and six months. In the year 343 then, when he commenced his studies under the tutorship of Aristotle, he could not have attained the age specified by Apollodorus. If it be said, contrary to the most authentic records, that the Stagirite may not have commenced the instruction of Alexander until 341 B. C., it is replied that he had finished this instruction in 340, and it cannot be supposed that in a single year he had accomplished so much for his royal pupil, as he is represented to have done during his tutorship.

It has been already stated, that one of the reasons which induced Philip to select Aristotle as Alexander's tutor, may have been the early intimacy between the king and the Stagirite, when the two were boys together at the court of Pella; and another reason may have been that assigned by Cicero, the distinction which Aristotle acquired at the academy, particularly in his competition with Isocrates. The report of Hermippus, that Aristotle was sent by the Athenians on an embassy to Philip, and that he obtained for them the favors which they had desired; that he was also while at Athens in the habit of epistolary correspondence with the king, and had thereby rendered important services to his friends,—these and other circumstances indicate that the court of Macedon had been long disposed to honor the Stagirite. Aulus Gellius and Dio Chrysostom have preserved a letter, which the king is said to have written Aristotle, and from which the following is an extract. "I feel myself bound to thank the gods, not so much that a son is born to me, as that he is born in your day; for under your tuition he will become, I hope, worthy to succeed me in the government of Macedonia." St. Croix and other writers have denied the genuineness of this epistle; and some have supposed that if genuine, it is the letter by which Aristotle, thirteen years after the birth of Alexander, was invited to take immediate charge of the prince's education. But the whole style of the epistle evinces, that it was written in the early infancy of the prince. Why should Philip have announced to his friend, "Know that a son is born to me," when not only this friend must have known the fact thirteen years before, but even the whole nation and all

was but three years old at this time, such an assertion being contrary to the united testimony of other historians. See Morrison's Ritter, Vol. III. p. 8.

the surrounding countries must have been as familiar with the name of Alexander as with household words?

Why Aristotle was not actually employed in the education of the prince during the early childhood of the latter, we are not informed; but why he was not allowed to defer for a still longer period the duties, which had been proposed to him thirteen years before, may be more easily conjectured. The teachers of Alexander had now developed their incapacity to control him; and it thence became needful to secure some sagacious disciplinarian, who might save the boy from moral ruin. One of his former teachers was Leonidas, a near relative of Philip's wife Olympias, and a man of Spartan severity of manners. He was accustomed to search the prince's trunks and wardrobe, for the purpose of discovering any article of luxury or superfluity, that might be concealed amid his clothing; and when Ada, the queen of Caria, sent for his service some of her best cooks and bakers, he replied that "he had no need of them, for he had been supplied with better cooks by his tutor, Leonidas; a march before day, to to dress his dinner; and a light dinner, to prepare his supper." The influence of Leonidas tended to encourage a ferocity and roughness in the character of his pupil, and these faults, though buried for a season, were never entirely eradicated,¹ but sprung up again near the close of his life.

Lysimachus, the Acarnanian, had been another of Alexander's teachers. He was a flatterer, and offered the most ruinous adulation to his pupil. He was accustomed to call himself Phoenix; Alexander, Achilles; and Philip, Peleus. By such flatteries he succeeded in gaining the confidence of the court, but he contributed much to the strengthening of that self-willed and headstrong temper, that egotism and love of praise, by which the fame of the monarch has been so sadly tarnished. It is then not unnatural to surmise, that Philip perceiving the increase of his son's coarseness under the tutorship of the former teacher, and the increase of his son's obstinacy under the tutorship of the latter, felt the need of procuring without delay the services of the only man, who could control the imperious spirit of the prince.

No sooner was the Stagirite summoned to his high duties, than he gave a new proof of his amiable and benevolent tendencies. He exerted his influence with the court to procure the rebuilding of his native city Stagira, the restoration of the inhabitants who were in exile, and the redemption of those who had been

¹ Quint. I.

sold into slavery. It is thought by some, that he made the rebuilding of the city a condition of his accepting the tutorship proffered him by Philip. It is stated by others, that he obtained the desired favor not from Philip but from Alexander. This statement, however, is contrary to that of the most creditable authorities, and may be explained by the conjecture, that he was aided in his petitions to the father by the intercessions of the son. Valerius Maximus assigns this agency of Aristotle for the benefit of Stagira to a much later period, even to the old age of the philosopher; but Stagira was destroyed five years before Aristotle was invited to the tutorship of the prince, and why should he have neglected, during all his residence at Pella, the charity which, after the lapse of twenty years, must have lost so much of its interest to him? It is reported by some that Aristotle framed a code of laws for his native city, when it had been rebuilt; but it is so common for the ancients to ascribe the preparation of systems of law to such men as Aristotle, that we are not prepared to credit the report. Still it may be true. It seems probable that he established a school in the resuscitated city, and that his fellow citizens instituted a festival to his honor and called it, *Aristotelia*, after his name. They are also said to have assigned his name to one of the months of the year, perhaps the month of his birth, or according to Pseudo-Ammonius, that in which the festival occurred.¹ They denominated the month, *Ἀριστοσίτην*.

INFLUENCE OF ARISTOTLE OVER ALEXANDER.

The Stagirite found his pupil a rough and boisterous youth, more disposed to tame a Bucephalus than to cultivate letters, and fired with an ambition of conquest rather than a love for the arts of peace. But the keen-sighted philosopher had not studied the human mind in vain. He knew the sensibilities to which he could appeal for the introduction of a better discipline, and so skilfully did he adapt the influences of which he was master to the refining and humanizing of his pupil, that the spots of the leopard seemed for some time to have been nearly washed away. True, the improvement was not so radical as to be permanent, but a good, even if but temporary, is better than a continued evil. The crown-prince was so sensible of the benefits which he had received from the Stagirite, that he honored his teacher not less than he honored his father; for from Philip, he said, he received

¹ Vid. Arist. Vit. Auct. *Antiquitates* c. 1. § 1. p. 11. § 1. p. 11.

life, but from Aristotle he received all that gave value to life. The remarkable talents, with which the prince had been endued by nature, were now applied to objects worthy of them. He studied history, logic, rhetoric, ethical and political philosophy. To the physical sciences, the favorite studies of his teacher, he devoted himself with singular ardor. He was so enthusiastic in his attention to medicine, that he derived pleasure even from the practice of the art. He became attached to the society of philosophers, and took a deep interest in philological and scientific discussions. He was so precocious, that probably before he entered upon his seventeenth year, he became enamored of the higher metaphysics, even the esoteric or acromatic mysteries of Aristotle. Aulus Gellius and Plutarch have recorded, that when the hero was in his Asiatic campaign, and immersed in his efforts for the subjugation of Persia, he addressed a letter to Aristotle, in which he complained that the philosopher had published his esoteric lectures, and had thus made known to the many what the ambitious hero had desired to retain, as the distinction of the few. But his teacher endeavored to subdue his agitation by assuring him, that the lectures "were published and not published;" that they were indeed communicated to the people, but still could not be understood without the oral comments of their author.

We are authorized to believe that Aristotle composed some volumes expressly for the personal use of his pupil; as the work *περὶ βασίλειας*, of which Diogenes Laërtius and Pseudo-Ammonius speak. It is also probable that he wrote for the prince, the outline and general principles of many other works, particularly on education, rhetoric, ethics, and politics. This outline he filled up during his leisure at Athens, and then published in their complete form the systems which he had used in compends for his pupil.

He also took pains to interest Alexander in the writings of the Greek poets. There are many indications of his success in this design. When the hero was occupied with the destruction of Thebes, he gave orders that the house of Pindar should be spared; for he had been inspired, as we may suppose, by the Pindaric odes for his martial exploits, and felt a consequent reverence for their author. When he was in his Asiatic campaign, he commissioned Harpalus to send him not only the works of the historian Philistus, but also the tragedies of Euripides, Sophocles and Æschylus, and the dithyrambs of Telestes and Philoxenus. He preferred Euripides to all other tragedians, and had an enthusiastic admiration for Homer's Iliad. The exploits of Achilles

inspired him with new love of conquest. In his various campaigns he carried with him a copy of this Epic, which had been corrected for him by Aristotle himself. He placed it at night, according to Plutarch, by the side of his dagger under his pillow, and when it was disputed what use should be made of a splendid casket found among the spoils of Darius' camp, the conqueror ordered that it should be used as the depository of his favorite volume. Hence was this copy of the Iliad called *ἡ ἐκ τοῦ νάρθηκος ἔκδοσις*, or *διόρθωσις*.

To the art of music also was Alexander not altogether inattentive under the guardianship of Aristotle; yet he made at this period of his life but little progress in the art, and had but little inclination for it. It was one of the Stagirite's principles, that the mind of a young student should be relieved occasionally by music, but not much occupied with it.

Plutarch supposes, that in his project of subduing the world, Alexander received more aid from Aristotle's instructions, than from all the means of conquest left him by Philip. John Von Müller,¹ says, "It is not improbable that Alexander designed to unite all the subjugated nations of the earth in one Grecian empire, and to raise them to the rank of civilized humanity. For this purpose, he sought to establish colonies, to intermingle different races, and to assimilate their manners. He wished also to accustom the inhabitants of different countries to regard each other as fellow citizens; and for this end to diffuse a common religion and to establish commercial intercourse. As a disciple of the generalizing Aristotle, Alexander had more of inclination and ability than other conquerors to enact general laws." But it is objected that the Stagirite had advised Alexander to conduct himself as a *commander*, *ἡγεμονικῶς*, with the Greeks, but as a *despot*, *δεσποτικῶς*, with the barbarians; and that according to his work on politics,² all who are not qualified for freedom should be held in slavery. How then could he design to diffuse among mankind a feeling of their common interests and common citizenship? The reply may be, that Aristotle justified slavery only where men were not qualified for any other state, and he might consistently recommend that all nations be amalgamated and united by a bond of brotherly love, just so far, and so fast, as they were fitted for such an exaltation. It cannot, indeed, be satisfactorily determined that Aristotle exerted any direct influence, in exciting Alexander to his schemes for conquering the world. He seems

¹ Allg. Geschich. Bd. I. S. 160. ² ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΩΝ Β. 1. 1291. b. 1. 34.

indeed to have inflamed the ambition of his pupil, and not to have guarded sufficiently against the evils which might ensue, from an attempt to gratify this ambition at any sacrifice, and from the satiety of it when the world had been vanquished. Hence the pupil was left without resources, after he had subdued all nations to himself, and he sunk into debauchery from the pinnacle of earthly greatness. We must indeed lament, that Aristotle had not discovered more of those principles of education which were so clearly unfolded in Greece but a few centuries after his death;¹ still we find much to admire in the refining and ennobling influences which he exerted over the prince. Had there been no Aristotle, there would have been no Alexander the Great. The remarkable enterprise, sharp-sightedness and magnanimity displayed by the youthful hero, the features of a liberal and delicate spirit which he often manifested, his high sense of honor, his reverence for the arts and sciences, the prudence and sound judgment with which he governed the nations that he had subdued, his wisdom in calling around him the fittest counsellors, in detecting the peculiar characteristics of his associates, and making the best use of the various materials which his warriors and statesmen afforded him,—all these attainments in the youthful monarch, who had been predisposed to little more than rude and boisterous sports, seem to justify the quaint epigram of Owen,

Maximus hic regum, doctissimus ille Sophorum,
Magnus Alexander, Major Aristoteles,
Doctus Alexandrum meliorem reddidit ille,
Non hic majorem magnus Aristotelem.

Doubtless through this single pupil has Aristotle exerted an influence over the world; and had he been known merely as the teacher of Alexander, he would have shared the immortality of the hero. But he has a distinct immortality of his own. He was a conqueror in the kingdom of science, subjecting to himself the do-

¹ In particular must we lament the disposition of Aristotle to flatter his pupil, with the intention, as it should seem, of elevating his taste above sordid vices. Thus according to Ælian, he strove to allay the most wayward propensities of the prince, by exciting the feeling of superiority to others; by saying, "The indulgence of vehement passions, and especially of anger, is appropriate only towards higher natures, not towards equals. But you have no equals." It must not be supposed, however, that he indulged in such flatteries, to the extent which has been charged upon him by Lucian and others. See St. Croix, *Ex. Crit.* pp. 203, 204. His adulation seems to have been, designedly, utilitarian.

main of ancient literature, extending this domain in all directions, giving it metes and bounds, dictating laws which were obeyed for almost twenty centuries, and even now have not entirely lost their authority. The dominion of his pupil endured, perceptibly, but for a few days, and over only a few nations; it was a dominion over the bodies of his subjects, retained by the sword and spear, and the traces of it are now in a measure lost; while the dominion of the teacher is felt at this day, and on this continent; it has been more despotic over mind, than Alexander's over matter; and posterity, in every succeeding age, will probably reap more of advantage and less of detriment from Aristotle's works, than has been thence derived in ages gone by.

DURATION OF ARISTOTLE'S TUTORSHIP; PLACE OF HIS RESIDENCE; HIS OTHER PUPILS; HIS DEPARTURE TO ATHENS; STATE OF HIS FAMILY.

The influence of Aristotle over his pupil appears the more remarkable, when we consider the shortness of the period in which it was exerted. He remained in Macedonia eight years, from 343 to 335 B. C. But in 340, Philip marched against Byzantium, and his son was called from his studies to conduct, for a time, the government of the empire. During this regency he was engaged in founding a city which was to bear his name, and also in subduing, by arms, the rebellion of some of his subjects. He could not, being a youth of sixteen, have combined philosophical researches with political engagements so important and absorbing. Soon afterwards we find him aiding Philip in the subjugation of Greece, fighting among the foremost at Chæronea. In 336 B. C. he ascended the throne of his deceased father; and having only reached his twentieth year, he cannot be supposed to have retained his literary habits, amid the excitement of his honors and especially his wars. Doubtless he often refreshed his mind by intercourse with his teacher, and enjoyed the benefit of Aristotle's general superintendence; but this is a different thing from a close and systematic attention to books and lectures. He could not have continued his regular application to study after the year 340 B. C., and therefore could not have received the systematic instructions of Aristotle more than four years; perhaps not much more than three.

Aristotle remained almost a twelvemonth in Macedonia, after his precocious disciple had ascended the throne. But before Alexander's march into Asia, in 335 or the spring of 334 B. C., he

had left the empire. It has been a matter of dispute, in what part of the kingdom he resided during, as well as after, his intimate connection with the crown-prince. Buhle conjectures that his home was at Stagira in the Nymphæum, and that this gymnasium was erected by Philip expressly for the residence of Aristotle and Alexander. The latter statement is favored by Plutarch; but still neither the city nor the Nymphæum were built when the Stagirite commenced the education of the heir-apparent; and we learn from an epigram of Theocritus of Chios, that Pella was the residence of Aristotle, some time at least after his departure from Mysia. This epigram describes the philosopher as in the academy at the mouth of the Borborus; and such was the name of a stream that flowed near the seat of the Macedonian court. Subsequently, however, when Stagira was rebuilt, Aristotle seems to have removed his residence thither. He would naturally desire to study and to teach in the retirement of such a gymnasium, rather than amid the tumults of the court. Plutarch informs us that in his own day the stone seats of Aristotle in the Nymphæum, and his shady walks were shown to the visitor. Aristotle himself, too, is thought by some to confirm the supposition, that he spent at least one part of this period in his native city; for he is quoted in the work of Tiberius de Elocutione, † 29, as saying, "I went from Athens to Stagira on account of the great king, and from Stagira to Athens on account of the great tempest."

At the same time with Alexander he instructed Theophrastus, Callisthenes, and Marsyas of Pella. The expression which Plato made in reference to the Stagirite and Xenocrates, that the former needed the bridle and the latter the spur, is also said to have been made by Aristotle in reference to Theophrastus and Callisthenes. The former was personally known and esteemed by Philip, and was greatly beloved by Aristotle. His native city, Eressus, when threatened by Alexander, was saved from ruin by the intercessions of the Stagirite.¹ Callisthenes was a relative of Aristotle. He accompanied Alexander in his marches, partly for the purpose of giving him advice when needed, and partly for the purpose of writing a history of the hero's exploits. Marsyas was brother of the king Antigonus, was both an author and a warrior. He composed a work on the education of Alexander, under whom he had served as a general. In this work, which is now lost, doubtless much was recorded of especial interest in relation to Aristotle.

After the heir-apparent had left the Nymphæum, he may have

¹ Diogenes Laërtius, *Opp. Om. Arist.* p. 47.

often visited his teacher at Stagira, but his teacher never seems to have visited him at Pella. Family dissensions had made the residence of the king unpleasant to a guest. Philip was soon assassinated; Alexander began to equip his forces for the conquest of Persia; Callisthenes had departed from Stagira, that he might share with his fellow pupil the hazards of war; and Aristotle sighed for the literary atmosphere of Athens. He was solicited by the Athenians to resume his residence in their city, according to the testimony of Diogenes Laërtius,¹ who adds that the Stagirite united with Xenocrates in the superintendence of the academy. This addition is doubtless false; but the report that the Athenians requested the philosopher's return to their city is not improbable. He had been their benefactor; and by his influence over the hero of Macedon, he might again promote their interests. It were natural for them to welcome within their walls the first philosopher of the age; and we accordingly find that this philosopher began his second residence at Athens in the year 335 B. C.

It is thought that some time during his residence in Macedonia, and perhaps near its close, Aristotle was called to mourn the death of Pythias. He was left with one daughter, who bore her mother's name, and survived both her parents. This daughter was thrice married; first, in compliance with her father's will, to Nicanor, the son of Proxenus and adopted son of Aristotle; secondly, to Proclus, a descendant of the Spartan king Demaratus, by whom she had two sons, Proclus and Demaratus, both eminent Peripatetics, and pupils of Theophrastus; and thirdly, to the physician Metrodorus, by whom she became the mother of a son, named Aristotle. After the decease of his wife, the philosopher lived with Herpyllis, formerly a slave of Pythias. In what relation he stood to her is doubtful. Some suppose it to have been the state of a left-handed marriage, such as was authorized by the laws of Greece between persons belonging to different kingdoms. This kind of marriage was called semi-matrimonium, and conjugium inaequale among the Romans, and was recognized as legal even so late as in the laws of Constantine and Justinian. But that the Stagirite was ever thus united with Herpyllis is not expressly stated by historians.² He is nowhere censured on account of his relationship with her, which seems to have been something accordant with the spirit of his age; and in his testament he honors

¹ Vit. Arist. Opp. Om. B. I. p. 47.

² She is called the *παλλακή* of Aristotle; and this term was often used in a sense not dishonorable, before the spread of Christianity.

her memory with the apparent consciousness of his own innocence in regard to her. She was the mother of his son Nicomachus, who was educated by Theophrastus, and to whose memory that philosopher ordered, in his last will, a statue to be erected. This son is said, by Aristocles, to have died young in war; but by others to have published some valuable philosophical works. Suidas ascribes to him six books on ethics, a fragment of which Diogenes Laërtius has preserved. Cicero pronounces him to be the author of the Nicomachean Ethics, which are, however, generally and correctly attributed to his father.

SECOND RESIDENCE OF ARISTOTLE IN ATHENS; HIS LITERARY OCCUPATIONS.

Speusippus having named Xenocrates as his successor and that of Plato in the academy, it became necessary for Aristotle to select a new position for his residence and school. He accordingly repaired to the Lyceum, in the vicinity of which had been, in former days, the parade-ground of the soldiers.

This spot was called the lyceum from its proximity to the neighboring temple of the Lycean Apollo. It was surrounded with shady walks, *περίπατοις*; but it was not on this account, as some have imagined, that the followers of the Stagirite were called Peripatetics; for the ancient philosophers, in general, selected such dwelling-places as were surrounded with pleasure-grounds; and the lyceum was not, in this respect, distinguished from the academy. Neither did the name Peripatetic originate from the circumstance assigned by Diogenes, that while Aristotle was connected with Alexander, and the pupil was recovering from sickness, and needed the exercise of walking for the benefit of his health, the teacher imparted his instructions during the time of this exercise. But the origin of the name is that assigned by Cicero,¹ "Qui erant cum Aristotele Peripatetici dicti sunt, quia disputabant inambulantes in Lycio." Most teachers, though not all, were accustomed to deliver their instructions in a sitting posture; why Aristotle chose to walk backwards and forwards during his lectures, we know not. It is conjectured by some that his feeble health required such a movement to and fro. He met his pupils twice in the day, morning and evening. Aulus Gellius distinguishes the two lectures by the names morning and evening walk, *ἑωθινὸς* and *δελτινὸς περίπατος*.

¹ Academicor. I. 4. 17.

Our philosopher is said by Diogenes to have adopted in the lyceum the same practice, which Xenocrates had adopted in the academy, that of appointing one of the pupils to preside over the school for ten days, and then to be succeeded by another. Many surmise that the president (*ἀρχων*), thus selected, was obliged to defend some previously assigned thesis against all the objections, which were alleged by his fellow-pupils; and that after having been, for ten days, the single antagonist of the whole lyceum, he came down from his elevation, and united with his comrades in a similar contest with another president. We are aware that skill in debate was a favorite attainment in the school of the Stagirite, that he disciplined his pupils rigidly and systematically to the art of extemporaneous and independent thought; and hence it is by no means a groundless conjecture, that he adopted the above-named practice of disputation, a practice which was long preserved in the universities of Europe, and some remains of which exist at the present time. We are also aware that Aristotle, when lecturing in rivalry with Isocrates, held certain exercises with his pupils for the purpose of promoting rhetorical skill, and these may have been of the same kind with the discussions at the lyceum.

Still, we can pronounce no definite opinion with regard to the design of this system of rotatory presidency and self-government; nor can we decide whether it were adopted for all the pupils, or only, as some conjecture, for the more accomplished of them. It is well known that Aristotle, like other teachers of antiquity, divided his hearers into two classes, the more and the less advanced. The former attended him in his morning walk; all attended him in the evening. To the former he lectured on the deeper and more abstruse parts of science; to the latter, in the presence of the former also, he discoursed on the less difficult subjects of study. Hence he divided his philosophical books into the esoteric or acroamatic and the exoteric; the former defining the nature of things, and including the more fundamental parts of natural philosophy, of dialectics and theology; the latter delineating the circumstances and forms of truth, and embracing the simpler elements of logic, rhetoric, and politics.¹ The circle which heard the acroamatic instructions was, of course, smaller and more select than that

¹ Vid. Buhle, *De Libris Arist. Exot. et Acroamat.* Opp. Om. T. I. p. 152. Ritter supposes, that the acroamatic instructions of Aristotle were philosophical in their nature and arrangement; whereas, the exoteric were general, and designed chiefly to enable his pupils to form a judgment of learned works; see Ritter's *Hist.* Vol. III. p. 21.

which heard merely the exoteric, and was favored with some peculiar privileges.

One of these privileges was, that of enjoying the social entertainments which Aristotle often gave to his literary friends, and of interchanging their philosophical opinions with freedom and vivacity, amid the festivities of the table. The effect of such banquets was to humanize the manners, and develop the social affections of men, who without such an influence were prone to contract a coarse and cynical habit of feeling as well as acting. For these scholastic festivities, Aristotle, as also Xenocrates, issued formal written laws, (*νόμοι συμποτικοί*), which took cognizance of even the minutest details of etiquette. One of these codes is preserved by Athenaeus, and indicates the solicitude of the logician in reference to the demeanor of his pupils. Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor in the lyceum, bequeathed a sum of money for the purpose of defraying the expenses of such entertainments after his death. They were continued a long time at Athens; but at length lost their intellectual character and degenerated into scenes of debauchery.

Some assert, that Aristotle discarded altogether from the lyceum the method of teaching by question and answer, and introduced that of systematic and formal lectures. Buhle supposes, that the regular lecture was delivered in the morning, and the Socratic plan adopted for the evening. It should seem, however, that the conversational mode were better fitted for the select circle, than for the promiscuous evening assemblage. It may indeed be doubted, whether the Socratic method were entirely abandoned either in the exoteric or esoteric instructions. That method was so harmonious with the Grecian character, was so inspiring to a pupil who loves to have an independent activity in his search of truth, that it may have been to some extent intermingled with the new plan of Aristotle. We cannot suppose that this philosopher adopted the *ex cathedra* style of modern professors; a style which has indeed its advantages, but tends to allay the inquisitiveness of the youthful mind, and to make a copyist of one who was intended for an investigator. The want of talent for extemporaneous discussion is one of the apologies for the modern system, when adopted to the exclusion of the Socratic; but it is an apology which was seldom heard of among the ancient sages, and probably no such want was felt by Aristotle.

The second residence of our philosopher in Athens, commencing with the second year of the one hundred and eleventh Olympiad,

piad, ended with the third year of the one hundred and fourteenth. During this period he published the greater part of his works. He was essentially aided, in his search as well as communication of truth, by the munificence of his pupil Alexander. This prince is said by Athenæus to have given Aristotle eight hundred talents, nearly a million of dollars. Such a report would appear improbable, did we not know, that by his conquest of Persia Alexander came in possession of treasures, from which it would be a relief rather than a sacrifice to impart so large a sum to his instructor. By such funds, united with those bequeathed him by his father, and with those which he may have earned by his lectures, Aristotle was enabled to procure a literary apparatus unequalled in his day. He purchased a library, which opened to him sources of information inaccessible to his predecessors. It breathed into him a literary spirit, which a secluded student can seldom attain. His was a systematizing genius, and this extensive collection of the works of others presented the materials for compact and well-ordered sciences. Without his familiarity with the false as well as true theories of preceding scholars, he could not have constructed those substantial systems of philosophy, which have been text-books for so many centuries. And without the benefactions of his affluent pupil, he could not have obtained access to such a collection of literary treasures. For the writings of Philolaus alone Plato was obliged to pay a hundred minae, or according to another account, three Attic talents, that is, either about 2000 or about 3500 dollars. Such a library then as Aristotle's, is a monument of the indebtedness of literature to the beneficence of affluent men.

Nothing, however, gives us a loftier idea of the advantages which learning derives from wealth, than the aid which Aristotle received from his pupil in prosecuting his investigations in physics and natural history. The elder Pliny informs us,¹ that Alexander, himself an enthusiastic student of nature, ordered some thousands of men to give their aid to Aristotle, *summo in omni scientia viro*, and bring before him specimens of all the animals, which they could find by hunting, fishing, fowling; of all which were preserved in parks, fields, ponds, aviaries and apiaries; so that nothing which was to be found in the whole world should be unknown to him. Thus were amassed the materials for almost fifty volumes, which according to Pliny he published concerning animals. The difficulty of communication, at that early period,

¹ *Plin. Nat. Hist.* VIII. 17

between Athens and the remote regions from which these specimens were brought, must have swelled the expenses of the transportation more than we can easily estimate.

In reducing to system the immense mass of materials which the royal bounty had thus laid at his feet, Aristotle may have availed himself of foreign aid, particularly that of Theophrastus, of some other pupils in the lyceum, and of his educated slaves. Still he must himself have superintended their labors, corrected their processes, verified their results. His industry seems to have equalled his genius; for these extensive researches were made in conjunction with diversified duties in other departments of science, and with the management of the most important school then in the world. In the short space of thirteen years, and with a feeble bodily constitution were these exploits achieved, and their results given to the public. The scholar too, who thus toiled, had been an inmate of the most splendid courts on earth, and might have lived in affluent ease, had he not chosen to endure the severities of original research.

It must of course be understood, that many of the volumes, which Aristotle published during this period, had been the subject of severe previous study. He had expended much labor while in Macedonia on his *History of Animals*. He received, as *Ælian* relates, large sums of money from Philip for the promotion of physical science. This money was partly expended in completing the philosopher's museum of natural history. The time which he passed in Stagira, after Alexander had left him, is thought to have been devoted to the examining and the perfecting of this museum; and he had at this time so much power over the heart and the treasury of Philip, that he allowed no interest of science to suffer through want of gold. Still, all the labors which he performed at this early period must have undergone a revision, and received their finish at Athens, when the liberality of Alexander had surpassed even that of his father in enlarging the apparatus for scientific research.

The first half of Aristotle's second residence at Athens was the culminating point of his life. No philosopher, perhaps, either before or since his day, has attained so high a degree of relative prosperity. With a consciousness of possessing a creative talent, and almost universal learning, he united the assurance that he should want no means of scientific progress, which regal generosity could present to him. The value of this assurance can be well estimated by the literati in a republic from their experience

of the want of it. His fame had now extended over the whole learned world. Among his pupils was one to whom the nations paid homage, and who in his turn, cast many of his honors at the feet of the sage, who had transformed him from a boisterous rioter into a friend of philosophy. For a long time had this sage been the victim of envy, but now he was raised above the reach of his inferiors. He had been obnoxious as a Macedonian to the men of Athens; but now the Macedonian party was triumphant, and he enjoyed the smiles of popular approbation. At the centre of Grecian refinement, he was surrounded with pupils who revered him as their father, and his lyceum was the resort of scholars from all quarters of the civilized world.

ARISTOTLE IN SOCIETY.—HIS HABITS OF CONVERSATION.

We have already spoken of the symposium, which our philosopher instituted for his pupils and literary friends. At this feast of reason were often assembled his acroamatic disciples, such as Theophrastus, Eudemus the Rhodian, Phantias, Aristoxenus of Tarentum, Dicaearchus, Theodectes, Clearchus, Jerome of Rhodes, Heraclides Ponticus, Meno, Echechratides, Adrastus of Macedon, Eurytheus, Pasocrates, and others. Interesting indeed were such interviews, especially if Xenocrates, Diogenes, Demosthenes and other illustrious contemporaries ever blended their fascinations with those of the master of the feast. It has been surmised, that what with Aristotle's laboring accent, and what with his abstractness of mind, he was but a sorry member of a conversing club. Many, who consider his intellect to be the greatest which a man ever received from his Maker, think also that it absorbed all other portions of his being, except a withered body; that it changed him into a kind of exsiccated monster, a petrification of an enthymeme. But an enlarged view of human nature shows us that monsters have their dwelling-place in our prejudices, oftener than in the outward world. There is sterling truth in the remark of Lady Montague, who said that she had travelled much among the nations, and found that all of our race are men and women. The father of metaphysics was not bereft of his social sensibilities, but appears to have been as popular in his address and even convivial in his habits, as is seemly for a doctor in the schools. We have seen that he was censured by Plato for loquacity; and Ælian charges the same fault upon him. But freeness of speech, in a man of his various reading and observation, must be more useful

to the listeners than disgraceful to the talker. Plutarch, in his comparison between Aristides and Cato, commends the eloquence of the latter, and adds, "For Antipater bestowed the same encomium upon Aristotle the philosopher, in what he wrote concerning him after his death, that among his other qualities he had the very extraordinary one of persuading people to whatever he pleased." Also in his life of Coriolanus, Plutarch gives the following extract from Antipater's letters; "That great man (the Stagirite) besides his other extraordinary talents, had the art of insinuating himself into the affections of those he conversed with."

From the style in which Aristotle wrote, one might infer that the character of his conversation was apothegmatical; exhibiting not so much an easy flow of remark, as a condensed energy, raciness, pith. The subjoined quotation from Diogenes Laërtius illustrates the idea, which the writings of our philosopher would give of his private converse. The expressions which are here ascribed to him were probably reported by his earlier biographers. Some of them, however, are found in his existing works. "Many of the finest apothegms," says Diogenes,¹ "are traced back to his authorship. Being asked, What is the gain derived from mendacity, he answered, That of not being believed when one speaks the truth. He was once reproved for bestowing alms on a bad man, and he retorted, I showed him favor, not because he was bad; but because he was a man. [This translation does not give the spirit of the original, οὐ τὸν τρόπον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἠλέησα. A similar paronomasia occurs in another retort, given by Aristotle on a like occasion, οὐ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἔδωκα, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ.—Tr.] Among his friends and disciples and wherever he was, he was wont to say, As the eye receives light from the circumambient air, so does the mind from learning. Often, contending against the Athenians,² he observed, They have both wheat and laws; the wheat they make use of, the laws not. He remarked of education, Its roots are bitter; its fruits sweet. Being asked, What soon grows old? Gratitude, was his reply. To the question, What is hope, he answered, The dream of a man awake. Diogenes once offered him a fig, and had prepared a pithy retort for him, in event of his declining to accept it. Aristotle, apprized of the design, took the fruit, saying, Now has Diogenes lost both his retort and his fig. At another time when the cynic offered a

¹ Arist. Vit. pp. 15—19.

² He disliked the democracy of the Athenians, and often expressed his disapproval in such innuendoes.

fig to him, he took it in his hand, held it up as a child would do, cried out, Great Diogenes, and then returned it to the giver. Three things, he remarked, are needful for becoming a learned man, talents, instruction, practice. Having heard that he had been reviled by a certain one, he exclaimed, Let them scourge me, while I am absent from them.—When asked, What is the difference between the learned and the unlearned, he replied, The same as between the living and the dead. In prosperity, he said, is learning an ornament; in adversity, a refuge. To the question, What is a friend? he answered, One soul dwelling in two bodies. Some men, he remarked, live as sparingly as if they were never to die, others, as prodigally, as if they were to live no longer. To the question, Why do we love to converse with beautiful persons, he replied, It is the question of a blind man. What good have you received from philosophy? was once asked him, and he responded, I have learned to do of my free will, what others do through dread of the laws. How may learners make the greatest progress, was another question which he answered thus, By following those who go before, and not waiting for those who come after. To a loquacious man who had poured forth many words in his presence, and then inquired, Have I not wearied you, he replied, *Mà Ai'* no, I have not been listening to you.—To the query, How ought we to treat our friends, his response was, As we wish them to treat us." The last is one among the many *morceaux* of this heathen sage, in which he feebly anticipates the wisdom of an after time.

[To be concluded in the next Number of the Review.]

ARTICLE III.

INTERPRETATION OF THE NUMBER 666 ($\chi\zeta\epsilon$) IN THE APOCALYPSE (13: 18)
AND THE VARIOUS READING 616 ($\chi\iota\epsilon$).

By Ferdinand Bonyar, Professor of Theology in the Frederic-William University, Berlin.
Translated from the "Zeitschrift für speculative Theologie," 1836. Vol. I. Part II. By Rev.
Henry Boynton Smith, West Amesbury, Ms.

AFTER the almost innumerable interpretations and applications which the "*number of the beast*," ($\alpha\rho\iota\theta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$) has received since the earliest Christian antiquity, from Irenæus to our own