Aëtius *Placita* 2.22

Περὶ σχήματος ἧλιον

**Witnesses**

Ps.Plutarch 2.22, Eusebius 15.25, Ps.Galen 64, Ḍuṣṭा Ibn Lūqā 2.22, *Scholia Platonica* ad R. 498a

Stobaeus 1.25.11dgīh

Theodoret 4.22

Cf. Achilles 19

**Analysis**

1. The next theme in the series on the sun concerns its shape, i.e. moving from a quantitative to a qualitative aspect in the sequence of categories. The same sequence is found on the moon (2.26–27), whereas in the case of the cosmos and the earth the doxographer moves directly from nature/essence to shape (2.2, P 3.10).

2. P presents us with four doxai:

χβ. Περὶ σχήματος ἧλιον

P2.22.1 Ἀναξιμένης πλατὺν ὡς πέταλον τὸν ἧλιον.

P2.22.2 Ἡράκλειτος σκαφοειδῆ, ὑπόκυρτον.

P2.22.3 οἱ Στοικοὶ σφαιροειδῆ, ὡς τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἄστρα.

P2.22.4 Ἐπίκουρος ἐνδεχεσθαὶ τὰ πρεσβυμένα πάντα.

Again there is no divergence on the title. As elsewhere E tends to greater compactness, leaving out τὸν ἧλιον in the first doxa. The Heraclitean doxa σκαφοειδῆ, ὑπόκυρτον (‘bowl-like, somewhat convex’) gives rise to problems in the later sources. G alters to φακοειδῆ, ‘lentil-like’ (if the reading is correct).\(^{392}\) Q derives σκαφοειδῆ from σκάφος instead of σκάφις and translates ‘Gestalt wie diejenige eines Schiffes ist.

---

\(^{392}\) The same word is used of the phenomenal appearance of the moon at Plu. *Mor.* 288b. Remarkably Aristotle uses it in a discussion of alternative shapes of the cosmos at *Cael.* 2.4 287a20; cf. the parallels to ch. 2.
The doxa is correctly preserved in a scholion on Plato R. 498a.394

3. The doxai in S must once again be disentangled:

1.25 title Περὶ οὐνας ἥμιον καὶ μεγέθους σχήματός τε καὶ τροπῶν καὶ ἐκλείψεως καὶ σημείων καὶ κινήσεως

1.25.1c S1 Ἀναξιμένης
—πλατύν δ’ εἶναι τῷ σχήματι.

1.25.1g S2 Ἡράκλειτος (καὶ Ἐκαταῖος)
—σκαφοειδῆ δ’ εἶναι, ὑπόκυρν.

1.25.1h S3 Ἀλκμαιῶν πλατύν εἶναι τὸν ἥμιον.

1.25.1i S4 οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι σκαφοειδῇ τὸν ἥμιον.

It appears that S is somewhat careless in this chapter but does preserve extra material. The views of Anaximenes and Heraclitus are included in their respective clusters of doxai. In the former the words ὡς πέταλον found in P are not recorded. Alcmaeon on the other hand is listed separately, since this is the only place where his name-label occurs in the chapters on the sun. His doxa is the same as that of Anaximenes. The doxa of the Pythagoreans follows on directly from Alcmaeon. It is an abbreviated version of the Stoic doxa in P, which has been replaced by the excerpt on Chrysippus at 1.25.5. As we argued earlier, this text is most likely taken from AD. Because the doxai are the same, it is very likely that S’s method has resulted in the original double name-label being split up. The combination οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι οἱ Στοιχοί is a bit awkward. It is possible that P has substituted the school name for an individual philosopher as occurred in ¶20 (Cleanthes), but there is no way of knowing. The final Epicurean doxa in P is not found in S. This differs from his procedure in the previous chapter, where at 1.24.10 he did include a similar ‘modal’ doxa. The omission is perhaps due to carelessness, or he may have felt that the formulation ‘all the preceding affirmations’ did not suit the build-up of his coalesced doxai.

393 Again Daiber gives no comment on this.
394 Scholia Platonica ad R. 498a, p. 240 Greene (cf. T442, 1181 Mouraviev). Rightly cited by Diels in the apparatus to his P column, since it is no doubt derived from the tradition of P. Greene reads σκαφοειδὲς without comment, whereas Diels printed σκαφοειδή. See further on 2.24.
395 See ch. 20 sect. 3, n. 351.