bound up together, without indications of where one ended and another began. But the Rouses, p.34 n.55, doubt that this accounts for the situation as a whole.

268 (Dubious report concerning Theophrastus) *Light of the Soul B, Anthology* Chapter 9 On the Soul (ed. 1477² Farinator)

Here we have only the contracted form ‘The” for the author. We might consider Themistius, for he did write a commentary on, or rather paraphrase of, Aristotle’s *DA*, but that work survives and there is nothing in it corresponding to this, though he does discuss *Phaedo* 67B at 106-7, and *Timaeus* at 106, 107 22-3, and at 106.29 he does use the expression “most weighty arguments” (*logoi ... embrithestatoi*), which might be the equivalent of “most strong assertions” (*firmissimis assertionibus*) here, but Themistius is there dealing with the *Timaeus*, and the sense of his total remark²⁷ is not the same. 268 might be a thoroughly muddled account of all this.

The *LS* and many other medieval Latin writers frequently referred to Plato’s *Phedron*. This is understandable because they knew neither the *Phaedo*²⁸ nor the *Phaedrus*. Here the *Phaedo* is the more relevant work. There is frequent reference to a *Commentum* (or *Liber Commentorum* etc) *in De anima* (*Commentary on* (Aristotle’s) On the Soul) by Theophrastus in *LS* (See 265 no. 3). That title is not frequent in connection with other authors, and while this fact by itself does not prove that the author had a work with that title to hand, it must be considered a possibility. Whether, if he actually had it, it was in fact by Theophrastus is a separate question.

**Definition of the Soul**

269-72 Only 269 gives what is strictly a definition, and there is considerable doubt about the meaning of Iamblichus’ words here. 270 is rather an account of the structure of the soul, and Theophrastus’ name is only one of a list which starts with Aristotle himself, and is probably not

---

²⁷ “The greatest number and most weighty arguments which he raised about the immortality of the soul lead back to the intellect.”

²⁸ The *Phaedo* was translated into Latin by Henricus Aristippus about 1156, but it did not make a great impression. See Berschin (1988) 232-3.
based on any direct knowledge of Theophrastus. 271 contains actual quotations from Theophrastus by a reliable source, but raises some problems of interpretation. 272 may give genuine information, but cannot be connected with anything else we know.29

269 Iamblichus, On the Soul in Stobaeus, Anthology 1 49.32 (vol. 1 366.25-367.2 Wachsmuth)


Iamblichus’ On the Soul30 is lost, but we have considerable fragments of it preserved by Stobaeus, the fifth century anthologist. It included a doxographical section which covered a) the being (ousia) of the soul, and b) its activity (energeia) and functions (erga). This excerpt is from a) and Iamblichus says (365.6-7) that he will give in order all the opinions of earlier writers: his order is theoretical, not historical. Our passage follows one on Orpheus, which is an interpretation of Aristotle’s words about Orphism at DA 1.5 410b27-31, but Iamblichus’ emphasis is on the suggestion that there is a single external soul from which parts split off. Our present passage seems to continue the theme of a single original soul, and it is best to suppose that Iamblichus was more concerned with finding items to fit that slot than to give a full account of the views of, for example, Aristotle and Theophrastus.

That Aristotle in some works called the soul an endelecheia has been generally accepted for some time. Festugière 188 n.6 assembles the relevant evidence, and there is a long discussion by Untersteiner 269-75, on the passage of Cicero, Tusculan Disputations 1.22 which is part of what he regards as fragment 30 of Aristotle’s On Philosophy. This account of endelecheia has recently been questioned by Mansfeld

29 I thank Sharples for much help with the details of LS.
30 For a recent summary of what is known about Iamblichus see Blumenthal and Clark 1-3, and for Stobaeus see Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 196-271.