

Leonid Zhmud

5 The Papyrological Tradition on Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans

I begin my overview of the papyrological evidence on Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans not chronologically but from a *chreia* on Pythagoras the philosopher and grammar teacher, found on the school wooden tablet (41,5×13,5 cm) of the 3rd or the 4th cent. AD.¹ Published more than a century ago, the *chreia* received its second birth after David Sedley's brilliant paper, the first to interpret this text methodically.² The tablet contains two exercises set by a teacher (γραμματικός) of a Greek school in Egypt to his students: on the *verso*, to conjugate all the optatives and participles of νικάω, and on the *recto*, to decline in all cases and numbers, which is to say fifteen times, the following *chreia*:

T1.

ὁ Πυθαγόρας φιλόσοφος ἀποβὰς καὶ γράμματα διδάσκων συνεβούλευεν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναϊμόνων ἀπέχεσθαι.

Both exercises were performed with a lot of mistakes, although the student's cursory handwriting indicates that he was proficient enough in such matters.³ The origin of the exercise to decline a *chreia* (κλίσις χρείας) from the rhetorical *progymnasmata*, known to us first through Aelius Theon (1st cent. AD), was noticed soon after the tablet's publication.⁴ This kind of the morphological exercise was later taken over from the rhetoricians by the teachers of the previous level, the grammarians.⁵ Interestingly, our grammarian, strictly following the

1 *PBrLibr. Add Ms 37516.1* = Kenyon (1909) 29–30. Frederic G. Kenyon dated the tablet in the 3rd cent. AD, which was accepted until recently; see Criore (1996) no. 364. Sedley (1998a) 122 n. 1, relying on the suggestions of Guido Bastianini and Manfredo Manfredi, preferred the 4th cent. AD. He has been followed by Andorlini/Linguisti (1999) 681, Wouters (2007) 149, and Piano (2015) 382.

2 Sedley (1998a); for a shorter version see Sedley (1998b).

3 Mistakes: Weems (1981) 51, 54–55, 71–72, and 169–172; Lapini (2013) 3–7; Piano (2015) 385. Weems (1981) 74 and Sedley (1998a) 125 suggested that the student may have been of non-Greek origin, but see objections: Luzzatto (2004) 174; Wouters (2007) 151 n. 60; Lapini (2013) 9 n. 26. Handwriting: Weems (1981) 39–40; Criore (1996) 265 no. 364; Piano (2015) 382.

4 Brinckman (1910) 152–155.

5 Brinckman (1910) 153–155; Luzzatto (2004) 167–171; Wouters (2007) 147–152.

rules described in Theon's *Progymnasmata*,⁶ gave to his students to decline not the *chreia* on Pythagoras the philosopher, which was well-known in the rhetorical tradition,⁷ but what I believe to have been his own composition unattested elsewhere.⁸ It is his liberty in dealing with tradition that generated many disputes on the meaning of his *chreia*.

In the first interpretation of the text, Ronald Hock and Edward O'Neil⁹ translated it as follows: "Pythagoras the philosopher, once he had disembarked and was teaching writings, used to counsel his students to abstain from red meat."¹⁰ The verb ἀποβάς, then, was taken absolutely as referring to Pythagoras' arrival to Italy, and γράμματα as meaning "Pythagoras' own writings." Obviously, the witticism of the grammarian, who had Pythagoras teaching γράμματα, thus transforming him into his colleague, has gone unnoticed.¹¹

Sedley, having affirmatively answered the question "Did ancient grammarians (...) have a sense of humor?", offered several new interpretations of the *chreia*. According to him, its first part stated not that "the philosopher Pythagoras disembarked" – for this is unclear without context in a self-contained *chreia* – but that he "went off," presumably from his philosophical school. In the second part, Pythagoras becomes a grammar teacher, since γράμματα διδάσκων has an absolutely standard meaning "to be a school-teacher" (in the case of Pythagoras' own writings one would expect συγγράμματα).¹² Sedley rightly stressed that the grammarian intentionally alluded to his own profession, although Pythagoras as a school teacher is entirely unparalleled in the biographical tradition.¹³ The third part is complicated, for the words ἐναίμωνων ἀπέχεσθαι contain not the advice to his students "to abstain from blooded creatures," but, according to Sedley, a linguistic joke by a grammar teacher, originated from medical lexicography, namely, "to abstain from the word ἐναίμονες." This is because ἐναίμων, -οδος, third declension, is a *hapax legomenon* that occurs only in the Hippocratic

6 Theon 101.3–103.2 Spengel = 94–98 Hock/O'Neil (1986). Cf. Brinckman (1910) 153.

7 Πυθαγόρας ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐρωτηθεὶς πόσος ἐστὶν ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος, ἀναβάς ἐπὶ τὸ δωμάτιον παρέκλυψεν ὀλίγον, δηλῶν διὰ τούτου τὴν βραχύτητα (Theon 99.6–9 Spengel). See Hock/O'Neil (1986) 334–335.

8 Hock/O'Neil (1986) 335; Luzzatto (2004) 172–175; Piano (2015) 387–388.

9 Hock/O'Neil (1986) 335.

10 Cf. Weems (1981) 22: "The philosopher Pythagoras, having gone ashore and being engaged in teaching literature, advised his disciples to abstain from meat."

11 To be sure, in Hock/O'Neil (2002) 51–66 (still not taking into account Sedley [1998a] and [1998b]) "teaching writings" has been changed into "teaching literature" (62) and "teaching letters" (65).

12 Cf. the words γραμματοδιδασκαλεῖον, γραμματοδιδάσκαλος.

13 Sedley (1998a) 130–131.

treatise *De ossium natura* (9, p. 194.22 Littré); everywhere else the term ἔναϊμος, second declension, is used, so that the correct form would be ἐναίμων ἀπέχεσθαι. Sedley’s interpretation won wide acceptance,¹⁴ yet one could also hear the criticism of some of his points, to which I would like to add several arguments.

Sedley was first to notice that ὁ Πυθαγόρας φιλόσοφος is not in normal word order. It should be, and probably was originally, Πυθαγόρας ὁ φιλόσοφος – “Pythagoras the philosopher.”¹⁵ Indeed, this is how all such *chreiai* begin (Ἰσοκράτης ὁ ῥήτωρ, Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος, etc.) and this is what, I would add, the student expected to hear during the dictation,¹⁶ for in the first line he added the article ὁ at the left hand margin already after he had written Πυθαγόρας.¹⁷ But if this was an awkward attempt to correct his error caused by “his mediocre standard of Greek,” why did he retain it in the same position 14 more times? Sedley’s explanation that this was done for consistency is not convincing. On the contrary, as Bodnár noted, “if someone copies a somewhat non-standardly formulated *chreia* (...), it would be a quite common error to drop the unexpected article at the head of the sentence, which then later could be inserted as a correction, to where it belongs.”¹⁸ Therefore, the original and untraditional beginning of the *chreia* was ὁ Πυθαγόρας φιλόσοφος ἀποβάς. This finds further support in the fact that ἀποβαίνω, when used absolutely, does not mean “to go away,” “to go off,” but only “to disembark,” which, as was mentioned above, does not make much sense here. Besides, the otherwise unattested withdrawal of Pythagoras from his philosophical school or even from philosophy¹⁹ would not suite a self-contained *chreia* either.²⁰ Thus, though Sedley recommended resisting “the temptation to construe the sentence differently,” I cannot resist thinking that the most natural meaning of the first element, considered but rejected by him,²¹ is with φιλόσοφος taken predicatively: “Pythagoras having become (or turned out to be) a philosopher.”²² This would perfectly explain both the use of ἀποβάς and

14 Andorlini/Linguiti (1999) 682–684; Luzzatto (2004) 175; Wouters (2007) 149–150; Piano (2015).

15 Sedley (1998a) 129.

16 Dictation: Luzzatto (2004) 173; Piano (2015) 383.

17 Sedley (1998a) 129. See the image in Kenyon (1909) pl. V; Criboire (1996) 265 no. 364.

18 Bodnár (2016) 9. See also Luzzatto (2004) 173–174 and Lapini (2013) 12–13.

19 Wouters (2007) 151: “when he had abandoned (philosophy) and was teaching grammar.”

20 Lapini (2013) 11.

21 Sedley (1998a) 129 and n. 15.

22 Cf. ὁ δὲ Ἄλκιμᾶν οἰκέτης ἦν Ἀγησίδου, εὐφυῆς δὲ ἂν ἠλευθερώθη, καὶ ποιητῆς ἀπέβη (Arist. fr. 611 Rose); καὶ “ὁ ἐγγὺς κυρίου πλήρης μαστίγων” ὁ συνεγγίζων δηλονότι τῇ γνώσει κινδύνων, φόβων, ἀνιῶν, θλίψεων διὰ τὸν πόθον τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπολαύει: “υἱὸς γὰρ πεπαιδευμένος σοφὸς ἀπέβη, καὶ διεσώθη ἀπὸ καύματος υἱὸς νοήμων, υἱὸς δὲ νοήμων δέξεται ἐντολάς” (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 2.735); Ὡσπερ δὲ ἰὸς οὐκ ἂν εἶη βλαβερὸς ἐτέρῳ σώματι, ἀλλὰ τῷ δεχομένῳ μόνῳ,

the position of the article.²³ Pythagoras did not leave philosophy to become a school teacher, on the contrary, he became a philosopher, and teaching grammar, advised his students to abstain from ensouled creatures, which incidentally was his most famous tenet.

On the morphological level, the Egyptian grammar teacher wanted his students to decline both the aorist participle ἀποβάς and the present participle διδάσκων, thus making the exercise more advanced.²⁴ The usage of συνεβούλευεν, instead of the more usual ἔφη or εἶπεν in *chreiai* of this kind, may have served the same purpose²⁵ and, in any case, it caused the greatest difficulties for the student. On the didactic level, a bold link between philosophy and secondary schooling undoubtedly intended to make the latter intellectually more prestigious, which would better suite our non-standard teacher, “una persona colta e un bello spirito,” as Lapini puts it.²⁶ Indeed, his profession certainly needed it. Here it is worth recalling a similar historical episode though with the opposite moral. Aristoxenus, the first biographer of Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans, “says in his *On the Pythagorean Life* that he heard of it (the friendship of Damon and Phintias) from Dionysius the tyrant of Sicily when he had lost his kingdom and was teaching grammar at Corinth.”²⁷ Aristoxenus’ story of Damon and Phintias became famous, which helped to give wide currency to Dionysius’ miserable fate after his loss of power: it was mentioned among others by Philo of Alexandria, Porphyry, and the anonymous *Chronicon Oxyrhynchi*.²⁸ There was a special proverb “Dionysius in Corinth,” on which Demetrius commented in *On Style*,

οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἀποβάς κακὸς ἐαυτὸν βλάπτει, οὐκ ἄλλον (Hippol. *Frag. in Prov.* 16.1); καὶ ὁ ἐξ αὐτῆς γεννώμενος μάντις ἄριστος ἀπέβη (Artem. *Onir.* 4.67); Ἀλκιβιάδης μὲν οὖν ὁ Κλεινίου <...> καὶ ῥήτωρ ἀπέβη τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἀμείνων, τῆς οἰκείας δὲ φύσεως ἦττων (Choric. *Orat.* 8.1.16). See also Lapini (2013) 14 n. 42.

23 Lapini (2013) 10–14 (*Pythagoras, cum philosophus evasisset et magistri operam daret, discipulis suis persuasit etc.*) and Bodnár (2016) 9–10 also prefer this reading.

24 Luzzatto (2004) 175–176; Lapini (2013) 9 n. 26; Piano (2015) 382–384.

25 Hock/Neil (2002) 62; Luzzatto (2004) 175–176.

26 Lapini (2013) 15.

27 Ἐκ τε ὧν Ἀριστόξενος ἐν τῷ περὶ Πυθαγορικοῦ βίου αὐτὸς διακηκοῖναι φησὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ Σικελίας τυράννου, ὅτε ἐκπεσὼν τῆς μοναρχίας γράμματα ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἐδίδασκε (Aristox. fr. 31 Wehrli; transl. by G. Clark).

28 (...) Διονύσιος ὁ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ὃς Σικελίας μὲν τύραννος ἦν, ἐκπεσὼν δὲ τῆς ἡγεμονίας εἰς Κόρινθον καταφεύγει καὶ γραμματιστῆς ὁ τοσοῦτος ἡγεμὼν γίνεται (Phil. *De Joseph.* 133). καὶ ἐξ ὧν Ἀριστόξενος ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Πυθαγορείου βίου αὐτὸς διακηκοῖναι φησὶν Διονυσίου τοῦ Σικελίας τυράννου, ὅτ’ ἐκπεσὼν τῆς μοναρχίας γράμματα ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἐδίδασκεν (Porph. *VP* 59). Διονύσιος ὁ δεύτερος τῆς Σικελίας τύραννος ἐκπεσὼν τῆς ἀρχῆς κατέπλευσεν εἰς Κόρινθον καὶ ἐκεῖ κατέμεινε γράμματα διδάσκων (*POxy.* I 12 = *BNJ* 255 F 4).

using Aristoxenian material.²⁹ Therefore, the fact that Dionysius, after losing power became a grammar teacher was widely known, in the rhetorical tradition as well, and it is possible though not certain that the Egyptian teacher also knew it. His own *chreia*, however, does not imply any lowering of Pythagoras' social status.

The third part. The expression *ἐναίμων ἀπέχεσθαι* is not unique: it occurs not only in Sozomen's *Historia Ecclesiastica* (5th cent. AD), as Sedley thought,³⁰ but also in the Christian writer Palladius (c. 364–c. 420) and, what is more important, in the Great Magical Papyrus of Paris (4th cent. AD).³¹ All these texts, including the school tablet, belong to the same period and the same cultural area, Egypt and Palestine, and the formula *ἐναίμων ἀπέχεσθαι* means in them more or less the same as the traditional formula *ἐμψύχων ἀπέχεσθαι*,³² i.e. to abstain from meat (and sometimes from fish). If, then, the third part of the anecdote is connected with the Pythagorean tradition, there is no need to look for its original inspiration in medical lexicography. To put *ἐναίμωνων ἀπέχεσθαι* instead of *ἐναίμων ἀπέχεσθαι* would have probably been too exquisite a linguistic joke, even for a witty grammar teacher, let alone his audience. Instead, I believe this is a mistake made by the student, who made a lot of mistakes in both exercises. He could have easily misheard or misunderstood the rare and bookish word *ἐναίμος*, which occurs predominantly in medical or philosophical texts, and duplicated the syllable *on*, as *o* and *ω* were regularly interchanged at that time in Egypt, including by this very student.³³ Thus, however attractive Sedley's suggestion is, the former school teacher and headmaster in me regards the more mundane variant as being more plausible.

Two basic elements of Pythagoras' *chreia*, biographical and doxographical, contain *in nuce* the features and peculiarities of the late Pythagorean tradition. Normally, Hellenistic biographies and *διαδοχαί*, as far as they are known to us, did not have the special doxographical sections, so familiar from Diogenes Laërtius, the only exception being Pythagoras' biographies, which, starting from the 1st cent. BC, tended to mix two earlier separate genres into

²⁹ παράδειγμα τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων πρὸς Φίλιππον· Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ· εἰ δὲ ἐξέτειναν αὐτό, Διονύσιος ἐκπεσὼν τῆς ἀρχῆς πτωχεύει ἐν Κορίνθῳ διδάσκων γράμματα, διήγημα σχεδὸν ἂν ἦν μᾶλλον ἀντὶ λοιδορίας (Demetr. *Eloc.* 241.7).

³⁰ Sedley (1998a) 137 n. 31: καὶ οἴνου πάμπαν καὶ ἐναίμων ἀπέχεσθαι (Sozom. *Hist. eccl.* 1.12.11).

³¹ Ἦτις ἐναίμων μὲν καὶ ἐμψύχων εἰς ἄκρον ἀπέσχετο, ἰχθύος δὲ καὶ λαχάνων μετ' ἐλαίου λαμβάνουσα ἐν ἑορτῇ, οὕτω διετέλεσεν ὄξυκράματι καὶ ξηρῷ ἄρτῳ ἀρκουμένη (Pallad. *Hist. Laus., Vit.* 57.2); Προαγνεύσας ζ' ἡμέρας τοῦ τὴν σελήνην πα[ν]σέληνον γενέσθαι ἐναίμων καὶ ἀνεψε[τρῶν] ἀπεχόμενος (...), Preisendanz/Henrichs (1974) no. 4, l. 63.

³² Thus Andorlini/Linguiti (1999) 684. See also Bodnár (2016) 6–7.

³³ διδάσκον instead of διδάσκων in l. 5. See Weems (1981) 59; Criatore (1996) 92.

one bio-doxography. This is true not only for Alexander Polyhistor's Διαδοχαὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων that included *Pythagorean Hypomnemata* or anonymous Neopythagorean bio-doxography preserved by Photius,³⁴ but also for Pythagoras' biography in Diodorus Siculus, which is based mainly on Aristoxenus and devoid of any Neopythagorean influence.³⁵ Yet the evidence of the Herculaneum papyri, deriving from the writings of the Epicurean Philodemus (c. 110–c. 35 BC), reflects rather the early Hellenistic tradition: it is, with one exception, biographical, not doxographical. Consequently, Pythagoras appears in Philodemus as a famous philosopher who did not have his own doctrines or writings. Before offering an explanation as to why this is so, I briefly comment on the testimonia individually.

It should be noted in advance that practically all Philodemean papyri mentioning Pythagoras are incomplete and/or damaged; often we lack their immediate context, which, given Philodemus' manner of quoting or paraphrasing all his opponents before refuting their arguments, further complicates interpretation of the text. This concerns specifically the group of evidence from Philodemus' lengthy treatise *On Rhetoric*,³⁶ in which he denied political and forensic rhetoric of the right to be called τέχνη. Here the Epicurean argued mainly against two kinds of opponents: on the one hand, rhetoricians claiming that rhetoric is absolutely indispensable in political matters and in any event more important than philosophy, and on the other, the Stoics, who believed that rhetoric, being a part of logic, can be best done by philosophers, in particular Stoic philosophers.³⁷ They insisted therefore, as, for instance, Philodemus' favorite adversary Diogenes of Babylon (c. 228–c. 140 BC) did, “that the Stoic sage is the only true politician and orator.”³⁸ To this the Epicurean in compliance with the tradition of his school objected that rhetoric does not belong to philosopher's business and that politicians effectively persuade common people thanks to their natural ability, which can be enhanced by practice and historical knowledge.³⁹

34 Alexander Polyhistor: Diog. Laërt. 8.24–35 (= *FGrHist* 273 F 140); Anonymus Photii: Phot. *Bibl.* 438b–441b (= Thesleff [1965] 237–242). See Zhmud (2012) 71 and (2019).

35 Diod. Sic. 10.3–11 (= Thesleff [1965] 229–234). See Zhmud (2012) 72 and Schorn (2013).

36 The only complete edition still remains that by Sudhaus (1892–1896). The best modern introduction can be found in Dorandi (1990). For an updated bibliography see Longo Auricchio/Indelli/Del Mastro (2012) 342–344.

37 Chrysippus: Diog. Laërt. 7.41–42 (= *SVF* II 295; cf. also *SVF* II 293 and III 698); Erbi (2009) 120–121.

38 Blank (2009) 76.

39 Blank (1995) 186–187 and (2009) 81–82; Erbi (2011).

Our first evidence concerns the dramatic episode in Pythagoras' life when he left Croton because of the Cylonian revolt. It is preserved in a fragment from Book 4 of *On Rhetoric*:⁴⁰

T2.

Ἀναξαγό[ρα]ς [ὄς μασ]τιγῶθεις τοὺς μώλω|πας ἐπεδείκνυεν | τοῖς δικ[α]σταῖς, καὶ Πυ|θαγόρα[ς, ὦ]ι Κύλων ὁ | Κροτωνιάτης ἐπα|γαγὼν πρ[ά]γματα τῆς | πόλεως ἐξέβαλε, τοῦ<ς> | δὲ μαθητὰς ἀθροοὺς | ἐνέπρησε, καὶ Σω[κρά]τ|της ὦι τὸ μὲν πρό[τε]ρον - - .⁴¹

(...) Anaxagoras, who having being whipped, showed the judges the welts, and Pythagoras, whom Cylon of Croton making troubles expelled from the city and [whose] disciples he burned alive together, and Socrates, whom [first] (...)

The tradition of juxtaposing Anaxagoras and Pythagoras (and their schools), which goes back to the 5th cent. BC, is for the first time attested in the *Dissoi Logoi*: “What is it the sophists teach, if not wisdom and virtue? And what were the Anaxagoreans and Pythagoreans, [if not teachers of these]?”⁴² The Sophist Alcidas, a student of Gorgias, presented in his *Φυσικός* (sc. *λόγος*) an impossible biographical combination: “Empedocles went to listen to Anaxagoras and Pythagoras, emulating the latter in dignity of life and bearing and the former in his study of nature” (Diog. Laërt. 8.56 = 14 A 5 DK). Aristotle quoted Alcidas' contention that “the wise are honored by all”: thus, the Italiots rendered heroic honor to Pythagoras, just as the Clazomenians revered Anaxagoras.⁴³ Unlike the early tradition, in *On Rhetoric* the conjunction of Anaxagoras and Pythagoras occurs in a context where philosophers are involved in political life, personally or via their students. Thus, in this fragment Pythagoras and Anaxagoras, accompanied by Socrates, figure as politically persecuted philosophers.⁴⁴ While Anaxagoras' tortures are unparalleled in the ancient tradition,⁴⁵ the story of Pythagoras' expulsion from Croton by Cylon and the burning of (almost) all his

⁴⁰ Phld. *Rhet.* 4, *PHerc.* 245, fr. 7 Sudhaus (1892–1896) II, 180 (= 59 A 20 DK).

⁴¹ Acosta Méndez/Angeli (1992) fr. 6. See also Vassallo (2015a) T3, 112–121, and *DAPR*, T7.

⁴² (...) τί μάν τοι σοφισταί διδάσκοντι ἄλλ' ἢ σοφίαν καὶ ἀρετάν; [ἦ] τί δὲ Ἀναξαγόρειοι καὶ Πυθαγόρειοι ἦεν; (90 C 6.7–8 DK).

⁴³ Πάριοι γοῦν Ἀρχιλόχον καίπερ βλάσφημον ὄντα τετιμήκασι, καὶ Χίοι Ὅμηρον οὐκ ὄντα πολίτην, καὶ Μυτιληναῖοι Σαπφῶ καίπερ γυναῖκα οὖσαν <...>, καὶ Ἴταλιῶται Πυθαγόραν, καὶ Λαμψακηνοὶ Ἀναξαγόραν ξένον ὄντα ἔθαιψαν καὶ τιμῶσι ἔτι καὶ νῦν (Arist. *Rh.* 2.23.1398b10–20 = 14 A 5 DK). Judging by the context, τιμῶσιν implies specifically heroic honour, paid to the famous σοφοί rather than simply their veneration. See Clay (2010) 427.

⁴⁴ Plutarch mentions the unjust condemnation of Socrates and Pythagoras, who was burnt alive by the Cylonians (*De Stoic. rep.* 1051A).

⁴⁵ Sider (2005²) 20 suggested that this episode may come from a comedy.

followers was reported by all the early biographers of Pythagoras.⁴⁶ By Philodemus' time it became a biographical vulgate that conflated two different events: the Cylonian conspiracy at the turn of the 5th cent. and the anti-Pythagorean revolt in the mid-5th cent., when many Pythagoreans were burnt in the house of Milo in Croton.

Elsewhere in the same book, referring to Aristotle who quoted the proverb that a hare cannot survive in a pack of dogs, Philodemus expresses the contention that philosophers are an easy prey: they easily become the victims of sycophants and enemies, as Anaxagoras did.⁴⁷ While *συκόφονται* certainly implies Anaxagoras and Socrates, who have been accused by malicious prosecutors and sentenced in a public trial, a more general word, *δυσμενείς*, is better suited to Pythagoras' case, in which neither philosophical ideas nor public trial were involved. Starting from Aristotle and Aristoxenus, the tradition is unanimous that the conflict between Pythagoras and Cylon was personal and political; this is also true of the anti-Pythagorean outbreaks of the mid-5th cent. BC.⁴⁸ In what way, if any, is Pythagoras related to political rhetoric in this evidence? Eduardo Acosta Méndez suggested that we have here, as in many other cases, a Philodemus' paraphrase of his adversary who aimed to demonstrate the superiority of rhetoric over philosophy, unable to help his adepts in the dramatic circumstances of their life.⁴⁹ Christian Vassallo, in this volume (p. 377), interprets the fragment as dealing with “the role of philosophy in relation to the rhetorician's education and probably to his ability to gain an audience,” since all three philosophers failed to convince the judges and the people of their innocence.⁵⁰ Both interpretations of the text imply that its author expected Pythagoras to rhetorically convince his political enemies, as if it were a court procedure or people's assembly, and further, that he did not know or ignored the classical tradition of Pythagoras as a powerful speaker, attested by Antisthenes (test. 187 Prince = fr. 51 Declava Caizzi), Dicaearchus (*FGrHist [cont.]* 1400 F 56 = fr. 40 Mirhady = fr. 33 Wehrli) and Timaeus (*ap. Just. Epit.* 20.4).⁵¹ Though both possibilities cannot be discounted, another context of

46 Aristox. fr. 18 Wehrli; Dic. *FGrHistCont* 1400 F 57a Verhasselt (= fr. 41a Mirhady = fr. 34 Wehrli); Neanth. *FGrHist* 84 F 30; Tim. *ap. Just., Epit.* 20.4.16–17. See Zhmud (2012) 97–102.

47 Phld. *Rhet.* 4, *PHerc.* 224, fr. 15.6–11 Sudhaus (1892–1896) II, 175: οἱ μὲν οὖν [φιλόσοφοι πανταχῇ τοιοῦτοι | φ]αίνονται· διὸ καὶ συκο[φάν]ταις καὶ δυσμενέσιν ἄ[γα]ν | εὐπρόσ[ι]τοι[ι] γείνοντα[ι, καθά]περ Ἄναξ[α]γόρας ῥοεῖλ[ι]. . . . For a new reading and analysis of this fragment, see Vassallo (2015a) 108–111.

48 Diog. Laërt. 2.46 (= Arist. fr. 75 Rose); Aristox. fr. 18 Wehrli. See Zhmud (2012) 97–102.

49 Acosta Méndez/Angeli (1992) 231; also Erbi (2010) 71 n. 34.

50 Cf. Vassallo (2015a) 112–114 and (2016) 11–13.

51 Zhmud (2012) 97–99. See also below, n. 104 on Timon of Phlius.

this fragment, similar to that of *PHerc.* 224, fr. 15,⁵² seems more plausible: Philodemus wanted to remind his readers what vicissitudes await philosophers when they are directly involved in politics.

Another fragment from the same book again puts Anaxagoras and Pythagoras side by side:

T3a.

ὡσπερ αἱ πολιτικὸν τὰ πολλὰ τῶν⁵ ἀνθρώπων ον |⁶ ν ἐπιεικ]
 ποιεῖν λόγον οἱ ποιηταὶ ἀλλ' ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ [ταῦτ' ἔμ]α-
 θε[ν· εἰ δ]έ φησιν , ὡς Περικλῆς ἐ[λέγετο ἀκού]ειν Α[ν]αξαγόρου καὶ
]το [latet nomen in -ης] Πυ[θ]αγόρου καὶ φυσικὰ
 κατὰ τῶν δ.⁵³

Relying on Sudhaus' tentative restoration of the very lacunose text, in which key notions are politics, rhetoric, poetry, and philosophy,⁵⁴ one could read it in the sense that philosophy is more useful for politicians than rhetoric, thus, Pericles is said to hear Anaxagoras, while some other person, whose name is lacking, Pythagoras. Though it is not easy to find among Pythagoras' disciples a suitable pendant for Anaxagoras' student Pericles, we have to bear in mind that the 5th-cent. tradition, preserved by Aristoxenus (frs. 18 and 43 Wehrli), made Pythagoras a teacher of the famous Italian legislators Charondas and Zaleucus.⁵⁵ This tradition is reflected in Philodemus' elder contemporary Posidonius.⁵⁶

In this volume, Vassallo proposes a new reading of this Herculean piece of evidence:⁵⁷

T3b.

desunt minimum versus 4

5] ὡσπερ αἱ <τῶν> πολιτικῶν
]· τὰ πολλὰ τῶν [.]
]γενου πρ[ὸς

⁵² See above, n. 47.

⁵³ Phld. *Rhet.* 4, *PHerc.* 1104, fr. 7 Sudhaus (1892–1896) II, 299.

⁵⁴ Cf. Phld. *Rhet.* 4, *PHerc.* 1007, col. 40a.3–8 Sudhaus (1892–1896) I, 220–221: the poets and even some of the philosophers are not inferior to the rhetoricians in their ability to praise (the gods?).

⁵⁵ Zhmud (2012) 114.

⁵⁶ “Zaleucus and Charondas (...) learned the legal justice they were to apply in Sicily and Greek Italy, then at the height of their powers, not in the public forum or legal office, but in the quiet holy retreat of Pythagoras” (Sen. *Ep.* 90.6 = fr. 284 EK, transl. by I. G. Kidd).

⁵⁷ *DAPR*, T5, comm. *ad loc.*

-]ημονου [.....
 .. τῶν] ἀνθρώπων ον[.....
 10]ν ἐπιεικ[.....
] ποιεῖν λόγον [.....
] οἱ ποιηταὶ [.....
], ἀλλ' ἐν φιλοσοφία[ι
] ἀθέ[ους δ]ὲ φησιν
 15], ὡς Περικλῆς ἐ[λέ-
 γετο ἀκού]ειν Ἀ[ν]αξαγόρου
 καὶ Δάμωνος]. τὸ Πυθαγόρου [.....
] καὶ φυσικὰ
 19] κατὰ τῶνδ[.....

Vassallo's new reading considerably enriches Philodemus' fragment; he takes its subject matter to be the role of philosophy in the educational process, which, if misused, can also lead to impiety as happened with Pericles, a student of Anaxagoras and Damon of Athens. With regard to Damon we can note, however, that unlike Anaxagoras, he has not been accused of impiety but ostracized for his political activity,⁵⁸ so that atheism does not seem the most likely topic.

A more conservative reading of *PHerc.* 1104, fr. 7 is offered by David Blank, who is preparing a new edition of Book 4 of Philodemus' *On Rhetoric* and generously shared a draft of this text with me:⁵⁹

T3c.

- desunt versus xi fere*
] ὡς περ αἰ πολιτικόν
] τὰ πολλὰ τῶν
] γενου πρ[.....
 15] ημονου
] ἀνθρώπων ον
] ν ἐπιεικ[.....
] ποιεῖν λόγον
] οἱ ποιηταὶ
 20] ἀλλ' ἐν φιλοσοφία(ι)
] αθε[.....] ε φησιν
] ὡς Περικλῆς ἐ[.....

⁵⁸ Siewert (2002) 459–460; Wallace (2004); Roskam (2009) 36.

⁵⁹ E-mail of 24.07.2017.

.....]σιν Ἀ[ν]αξαγόρ[ου
]το Πυθαγόρου
 25] καὶ φυσικὰ
]κατὰ τῶν δ[. .

As follows from Blank's reading, Sudhaus' restoration of ll. 22–23, ὡς Περικλῆς ἐ[λέ]γετο ἀκού]ειν Ἀ[ν]αξαγόρ[ου, is questionable, for Blank reads on l. 23]σιν Ἀ[ν]αξαγόρ[ου, whereas Vassallo's conjecture καὶ Δάμωνος] on l. 23 is longer than the maximum number of letters per line in this column (l. 22).⁶⁰ Still, it remains plausible that Anaxagoras figures here as Pericles' teacher and that an analogous role was intended for Pythagoras.

Anaxagoras and Pericles appear again in a similar context in the fragment of *On Rhetoric's* Book 3,⁶¹ where Philodemus paraphrases Diogenes of Babylon. Firmly believing that Stoic philosophy is necessary for a good rhetorician and a politician, Diogenes brought an example of Pericles who frequented Anaxagoras and other philosophers, on which Philodemus objects that none of them was Stoic:

20 Περ[ι]κλῆς τοίνυν, ὃν [ἐ]φη
 ἀνε[κ]τότατον γεγοῖναι
 τ]ῶν ἄλλων ῥητό[ρων, καὶ
 Ἀνα]ξαγόρου καὶ ἄ[λλων τι-
 νῶν] ἤκουσεν φι[λοσόφων, οἷς
 25 μὲν ἴσως παρέβλε, Στωϊ-
 κοῖς δ' ο[ὐ]δα[μ]ῶς κτλ.⁶²

Therefore, Pericles, who, [as he (sc. Diogenes of Babylon) said], was the most tolerable among rhetoricians, attended Anaxagoras and some [other] philosophers, of whom he probably was a disciple, but in no ways Stoics (...)

Generally, Philodemus believed that philosophy does not make a politician but it makes a good citizen and, therefore, a better politician.⁶³ Specifically, Philodemus' passages, where philosophical education of Pericles and other famous

⁶⁰ "Each of its columns contained ca. 26 lines, each line containing 17–22 (avg. 21) letters. My reconstruction follows these general guidelines" (D. Blank, e-mail of 24.07.2017).

⁶¹ Phld. *De rhet.* 3, *PHerc.* 1506, col. 21.20–26 Sudhaus (1892–1896) II, 226–227 (= Diog. Bab. *SVF* III 25).

⁶² Indelli (2002) 235 (= *DAPR*, T4).

⁶³ Phld. *Rhet.* 3, *PHerc.* 1506, cols. 11a.25–12a.3 Sudhaus (1892–1896) II, 267 (= Hammerstaedt [1992] 41); cols. 15.16–16.9 Sudhaus (1896) 271–272 (= Hammerstaedt [1992] 47).

political orators, such as Demosthenes, is mentioned, confirm that he positively evaluated this education without considering it decisive for their success.⁶⁴ Though Pythagoras figures in only one such evidence (T3), an instructive parallel to this tradition is to be found in Plutarch's short treatise *On the Fact that the Philosopher Must Primarily Consort with Rulers*. The work had as its goal the demonstration of the fact that the philosopher conversing with leading politicians makes them better and through them the whole society, for if he teaches privately, he creates calmness and quite only in one man,

but if these teachings take possession of a ruler, a statesman, and a man of action and fill him with love of honour through one he benefits many, as Anaxagoras did by associating with Pericles, Plato with Dion, and Pythagoras with the chief men of the Italiote Greeks.⁶⁵

Indeed, as mentioned above, Aristoxenus presented Pythagoras as a teacher of Charondas and Zaleucus (frs. 18 and 43 Wehrli), which was repeated by Posidonius (fr. 284 EK). According to Aristoxenus, until the mid-5th cent. BC the Pythagoreans belonged to the ruling élite of Magna Graecia and after that the Pythagorean Lysis fled to Thebes and became a teacher of Epaminondas (fr. 18 Wehrli). In an oration of Plutarch's contemporary Dion of Prusa a familiar pair of politically influential philosophers, Anaxagoras and Pythagoras, appears again, this time Pythagoras visibly overshadows Anaxagoras. Dion goes as far as to explain the successes of Philip II of Macedon through the influence of Epaminondas, whose teacher was Lysis, a direct student of Pythagoras, and declares that the Athenians benefited *inter alios*

from Pericles, the disciple of Anaxagoras; the Thebans from Epaminondas; the Romans from Numa, who, as some say, had some acquaintance with the philosophy of Pythagoras; and the Italian Greeks in general from the Pythagoreans.⁶⁶

It is very likely then that *PHerc.* 1104, fr. 7 reflects the very tradition which has been elaborated further by Plutarch and Dion.

In *PHerc.* 1004, containing Book 7 of Philodemus' *On Rhetoric*,⁶⁷ Margherita Erbi recently suggested the name of Pythagoras be read. It appears in the context of Philodemus' polemics concerning rhetoric with Diogenes of Babylon. While criticizing the rules of rhetoric as cunning tricks, the Stoic twice (cols. 57.8–13

⁶⁴ Indelli (2002), esp. *PHerc.* 1506, cols. 3.32–4.10 Sudhaus (1892–1896) II, 205–206; *PHerc.* 1078/1080, fr. 7.7–17, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 105.7–14 Sudhaus (1892–1896) I, 380. Cf. also *PHerc.* 1004, col. 56.5–13 Sudhaus (1892–1896) I, 350.

⁶⁵ Plut. *Max. cum princ.* 777A3–8, transl. by R. L. Fowler. See Roskam (2009) 163.

⁶⁶ Dio Chrys. *Or.* 49.7 (transl. by H. L. Crosby).

⁶⁷ Del Mastro (2012).

and 62.4–10) quotes Heraclitus in support of his opinion: rhetorical education (ἡ δὲ τῶν ῥητόρων εἰσαγωγή) is, according to the latter, κοπίδων ἀρχηγός – an accusation that another branch of tradition relates to Pythagoras.⁶⁸ In Diogenes’ quotations the name of Pythagoras is lacking, but it appears between them (col. 60) in Philodemus’ own text:

T4.

νῦν γε διαγ[.]
 φιλοσόφωι χ[.]
 5 πίστει πρὸς [Πυθ]αγόραν
 — τὸν φιλόσοφον. οὐ μὴν
 ἀλλ’ ἔτι ταῦτα πάνυ στοργ-
 γύλως ἐπισκόφομεν
 εἰ καὶ δι’ αὐτοὺς ἀναγκα-
 10 ζόμεθα καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς
 τα παραπλήσια παλιν-
 — λογεῖν.⁶⁹

Only five words in ll. 5–6 are related to Pythagoras, the *paragraphos* after l. 6 signifies the beginning of Philodemus’ recapitulation. Due to the lack of context it is very difficult to say what philosopher’s name is hidden in lacuna in l. 4⁷⁰ and what the phrase “because of the trust in the philosopher Pythagoras” means here (if the supplement is correct). It seems clear that this is not Philodemus’ own, but somebody’s else trust. Erbi’s interpretation is that a) Diogenes intentionally omitted Pythagoras’ name from Heraclitus’ quotation (col. 57); b) in Philodemus’ view the Stoic did this because of his “attitude of respect and consideration for Pythagoras and his doctrine.”⁷¹ This is extremely ingenious, and yet very difficult to prove. Given that Diogenes omitted Pythagoras’ name from Heraclitus’ quotation and Philodemus knew this, what could lead him to the idea the Stoic did this out of respect to Pythagoras and his doctrine?⁷² Except for Zeno’s Πυθαγορικά

⁶⁸ Schol. Eur. *Hec.* 131 (= Tim. *FGrHist* 566 F 132 = 22 B 81 [II] DK = fr. 18 [b] Marcovich): κοπίδας δὲ τὰς τῶν λόγων τέχνας ἄλλοι τε καὶ ὁ Τιμαίος οὕτως γράφων: “ὥστε καὶ φαίνεσθαι μὴ τὸν Πυθαγόραν εὐρ<ετῆν γεν>όμενον τῶν ἀληθινῶν κοπίδων μηδὲ τὸν ὑφ’ Ἡρακλείτου κατηγορούμενον, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸν <τὸν> Ἡράκλειτον εἶναι τὸν ἀλαζονεύμενον.”

⁶⁹ Phld. *De rhet.* 7, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 60 Sudhaus (1892–1896) I, 353 (= Erbi [2010] 70).

⁷⁰ Salvatore Cirillo proposed Χρυσίππωι, Diogenes’ teacher.

⁷¹ Erbi (2010) 71.

⁷² Timaeus of Tauromenium, while quoting the same passage (see above, n. 68), openly accused Heraclitus of lying about Pythagoras, whom the historian held in great esteem.

(Diog. Laërt. 74), of which nothing is preserved, Pythagoras the philosopher was as good as nonexistent in Stoicism of the 3rd and 2nd cent. BC. To be sure, Diogenes, again quoted by Philodemus, relates an anecdote of Pythagoras, but it does not show any sign of particular respect towards the latter.

Book 4 of Philodemus' polemical treatise *On Music*, reconstructed by Daniel Delattre, presents (cols. 1–54) and then refutes (cols. 55–142) the views on music of Diogenes of Babylon,⁷³ *inter alia*, the doctrine of a musical *ethos*, or the psychagogic and moral power of music, that was popular in Greek philosophy since Plato and Aristotle. For Philodemus, however, instrumental music, in contrast to rational emotions, was μέλος ἄλογον and thus in no way able to inspire, console, or soothe the soul. The much damaged col. 42 contains the remnants of a well-known anecdote about Pythagoras illustrating how music affects the soul by a slow and solemn spondaic tune. In the app. crit. of his edition Delattre suggests *exempli gratia* the following restoration, which he translates as follows:

T5.

Πυθαγόραν δὲ [. | εὐ]αγωγότερον [νεανίων | μεθυ]όντων καλέ[σαντα τι]να αὐλ[η]τρίδα ν[. ἐπὶ | τὸ τὰ]ναν[τία] πά[θη] ἐμποιεῖν |]ους τὸ σπ[ονδεῖον | μέλος] καὶ τοῦτον [.

Quant à Pythagore, [il réussit à obtenir un comportement] plus docile [de jeunes gens] qui étaient ivres, en invitant [une] joueuse d'*aulos* [à jouer] un air spondaïque [en vue de susciter en eux les affections contraires] <à celles que leur causait l'ivresse> (...) et celui-là (...) ⁷⁴

A fuller version of the anecdote, only with a male aulete accompanying the komasts, appears in Sextus Empiricus, who also criticized the theory of musical *ethos* and refuted the arguments of the Stoic adversaries they had in common with Philodemus:

First in order, let us begin with the things customarily babbled about music by the many (...). Thus Pythagoras, when he once observed how youths who had been filled with Bacchic frenzy by alcoholic drink differed not at all from madmen, exhorted the flute-player, who was joining them in the carousal, to play his aulos for them in the spondaic melos. When he thus did what was ordered, they suddenly changed and became as temperate as if they had been sober even at the beginning.⁷⁵

⁷³ Barker (2001).

⁷⁴ Phld. *De mus.* 4, *PHerc.* 1576, col. 42.39–45 Delattre (2007) I, 69. For a discussion of the anecdote, see Spinelli (2014) with bibliography.

⁷⁵ ὁ γοῖν Πυθαγόρας μερικάκια ὑπὸ μέθης ἐκβεβακχευμένα ποτὲ θεασάμενος ὡς μηδὲν τῶν μεμνηνῶτων διαφέρειν, παρήνεσε τῷ συνεπικωμάζοντι τούτοις αὐλητῇ τὸ σπονδεῖον αὐτοῖς ἐπαυλῆσαι μέλος· τοῦ δὲ τὸ προσταχθὲν ποιήσαντος οὕτως αἰφνίδιον μεταβαλεῖν σωφρο-

That Philodemus and Sextus Empiricus (perhaps, indirectly) used Diogenes' work *On Music* is all the more likely as they share three further examples (on Clytemnestra, Socrates, and military music of the Spartans), reveal similar vocabulary and treat a number of common topics related to music.⁷⁶ A different version of this anecdote appears in Cicero. Here, not wine but enthusiastic music causes erotic rage among the youths, the setting is more violent and the aulete is a man:

The story is told that one time certain youths became aroused by the music of the tibia, as can happen, and they were about to break in the door of a chaste woman. Pythagoras then admonished the tibia player to perform a spondaic melody. When this was done, the slowness of the tempo and the dignity of the performer caused the raging fury of these boys to subside.⁷⁷

Iamblichus relates the same version as Cicero, only in more detail (e.g. that the music was first performed in the Phrygian mode), whereas in Aristides Quintilianus the tale is replaced with Pythagoras' advices to his students to give preference to the lyre over the aulos, for while the first cares for our rational nature, the second serves our worse part.⁷⁸

From its first appearance in Diogenes, this anecdote illustrating how certain melodies can alter the disposition of the soul to the contrary has been used as an argument for the psychagogic and moral impact of music. But the theory of musical *ethos*, correct and incorrect modes and metres etc. was first formulated not by Pythagoras but by Damon of Athens⁷⁹ and evolved by many thinkers including Plato and Aristotle. It has been linked with Pythagoreanism much later,

πισθέντας ὡς εἰ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔνηφον (Sext. Emp. *Math.* 6.7–8, transl. by D. D. Greaves). Cf. criticism at 6.23. According to Basil of Caesarea (*De leg. gent. libr.*, 9), the *auletes* changed on Pythagoras' advice the *harmonia* to the Doric one (spondaic was a typically Doric rhythm), thus completely sobering a group of *komasts*. In Ammonius (*In Porph.* 13.24–28 Busse), Olympiodorus (*In Pl. Grg.* 5.4 Westerink) and Elias (*In Porph.* 31.11–13 Busse) Pythagoras simply advises the *auletris* to change the melody of the *aulos*, which relieves the youth of his erotic desire.

⁷⁶ Greaves (1986) 24–26; Rispoli (1992); Spinelli (2014) 346 n. 31. Delattre (2006) argues that Sextus used Philodemus.

⁷⁷ Cic. *De cons. suis* fr. 3 (= *Op.* IV 3, p. 339 Müller), transl. by C. Bower. Cicero was the source of Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.10.32), Augustine (*C. Iul.* 5.23), and Boethius (*Inst. mus.* 1.1).

⁷⁸ Iambli. *VP* 112, followed by Syrianus (*In Hermog.* 22.3–10 Rabe); Aristid. Quint. *De mus.* 2.18, cf. Arist. *Pol.* 8.6.1341a21–24.

⁷⁹ See recently Wallace (2015), Almazova (2016), and A. Brancacci's paper in this volume. More skeptically Barker (2007) 47, 72–74, and 252. In *PHibeh* 13 an unknown author of the early 4th cent. BC, allegedly Alcidas (see Brancacci [1988]), attributes the idea that some melodies make men courageous, others cowardly, still others just, etc. to the so-called *harmonikoi*, a trend in musicology which opposed the Pythagoreans in almost everything. See Barker (1984) 183–185. Wallace (2015) 97–100 sees in these *harmonikoi* the followers of Damon.

in the pseudo- and Neopythagorean literature,⁸⁰ which makes the historicity of this tradition highly improbable.⁸¹ Earlier evidence is limited to two notices in Strabo,⁸² the Pythagoras anecdote and a similar story about the Pythagorean Cleinias told by Chamaeleon of Pontus, the Peripatetic of the first generation:

if it ever happened that he had difficulties because of anger, took up the lyre and played it. In response to those seeking the reason he used to say, “I am soothed” (πραΐνομαι).⁸³

Chamaeleon’s considerations on musical *ethos* were known to Diogenes (and via him to Philodemus),⁸⁴ so it is possible that the Pythagoras anecdote also derives from him. Several things, however, attest against this. Chamaeleon most probably borrowed the Cleinias anecdote from Aristoxenus, who authored a tale about Archytas tempering his anger and a number of other stories on Cleinias.⁸⁵ Aristoxenus’ contention that “the Pythagoreans used medicine to purify the body and music to purify the soul”⁸⁶ squares very well with the soothing-cathartic effect of music in the Cleinias anecdote. The same verb *πραΐνειν* occurs in Aristoxenus’ explanation of the reason why music was introduced at banquets:

as wine intemperately drunk weakens both the body and mind, so music by its harmonious order and symmetry (τῆ τάξει τε καὶ συμμετρίᾳ) assuages (πραΐνειν) and reduces them to their former constitution.⁸⁷

The expression *τάξις καὶ συμμετρία* was a beloved Pythagorean *topos* in Aristoxenus (frs. 33, 35, and 37 Wehrli), but the ethical effect of the opposite musical forms and instruments (e.g. lyre/aulos), as believed by Plato and Aristotle, was

80 Porph. *VP* 30, 32; Iambl. *VP* 64–65 and 110–114, from Nicomachus of Gerasa, who used ps.–Pythagorean treatises. Whereas Porphyry’s description is limited to the cathartic-therapeutic effects of music, mentioned already in Aristox. fr. 26 Wehrli (see below, n. 86), Iamblichus provides a full picture of Pythagoras as the initiator of education through music.

81 Zhmud (2012) 285–288; Wallace (2015) 194–200.

82 1.2.3 seems to refer to Strabo’s contemporaries, in 10.3.10 the Pythagoreans are attached to Plato.

83 Ath. 14.18.624F–625A (= Chamael. fr. 5 Martano).

84 Phld. *Mus.* 4, *PHerc.* 1576, cols. 46.45–47.11, 131.28–35 (= Chamael., frs. 6–7 Martano).

85 Aristox. fr. 30 Wehrli (on Archytas): ἔφη δὲ λέγεσθαι καὶ περὶ Κλεινίου τοιαῦτά τινα; fr. 131 Wehrli (on Cleinias); Diod. Sic. 10.4.1; Iambl. *VP* 239 (on Cleinias, from Aristoxenus).

86 οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ καθάρσει ἐχρῶντο τοῦ μὲν σώματος διὰ τῆς ἰατρικῆς, τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς διὰ τῆς μουσικῆς (fr. 26 Wehrli). Aristoxenus himself, according to Theophrastus, used aulos for curing psychic disorders: Apollon. *Mir.* 49 = Aristox. fr. 6 Wehrli = Theophr. fr. 726A FHS&G with comments in Wehrli (1967²) and Fortenbaugh (2011) *ad loc.* Cf. also fr. 720 FHS&G.

87 Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1147A2–5 (= Aristox. fr. 122 Wehrli), transl. by W. W. Goodwin.

not. There is no secure evidence that Aristoxenus believed in such effect himself⁸⁸ or that he ascribed it to the Pythagoreans, let alone Pythagoras himself.

Looking for the origin of the Pythagoras anecdote, one inevitably comes across a parallel version, quoted by Galen from Posidonius, where the protagonist is Damon:

For why by the gods – I’ll ask this too of Chrysippus’ followers – when Damon the musician was present when a female aulete was piping a Phrygian tune to some young men who were drunk and acting crazily, why did he order her to pipe a Dorian tune, and they immediately ceased their demented carrying on?⁸⁹

Martianus Capella, whose source was Varro, a scholar heavily versed in Greek tradition, also preserved the tale with Damon and spondaic *melos*.⁹⁰ This version is complete and, being closely connected with Damon’s teaching, has a greater chance of being original. The manic behavior of the youths was caused not by wine or music, as in two versions of the Pythagoras anecdote, but by their combined effect. Damon orders that the melody be changed from a Phrygian to a Dorian tune, which in the Pythagoras tale are attested separately (in Iamblichus and Basil). Now, it was Damon and his followers who assigned opposite qualities to the different musical forms,⁹¹ specifically, to Phrygian and Dorian modes. This is stated in the famous passage in Plato’s *Republic* (3.399a–400b), discussing good and bad *harmoniai*, metres, and rhythms and their opposite effects on human soul, which is commonly attributed to the influence of Damon.⁹² Some rhythms are appropriate for *μανία* (3.400b2) and some for its opposite.⁹³

88 For a nuanced analysis, see Barker (2007) 249–259 and Rocconi (2012). Philodemus criticizes Aristoxenus for ‘Damonian’ ideas (*Mus.* 4, *PHerc.* 1576, col. 109.29–39 Delattre [2007] II, 203).

89 ἐπει διὰ τί, πρὸς θεῶν, ἐρωτήσω γὰρ ἔτι τοῦτο τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Χρυσίππου, Δάμων ὁ μουσικὸς αὐλητρίδι παραγενόμενος αὐλούση τὸ Φρύγιον νεανίσκοις τισὶν οἰνωμένοις καὶ μανικὰ ἄττα διαπραττομένοις ἐκέλευσεν αὐλῆσαι τὸ Δώριον, οἱ δὲ εὐθὺς ἐπάυσαντο τῆς ἐμπλήκτου φορᾶς (fr. 168 EK, transl. by R. W. Wallace).

90 *Ebrios iuvenes perindeque improbius petulantes Damon, unus e sectatoribus meis, modulorum gravitate perdomuit; quippe tibicini spondeum canere iubens temulentae dementiam perturbationis infregit* (*De nupt.* 9.926). See Stahl (1971) 53–55. Martianus refers to Varro at 9.928.

91 See above, n. 79.

92 *Ethos* of *harmoniai* is discussed in 3.398c–399e7, *ethos* of rhythms in 3.399e8–400b. Since Damon is mentioned in 3.400b1, Wallace (2015) 141–144 and 179–181, relates to him only the second part, whereas the first “need not reproduce Damon’s views” (181). Thus also Barker (2007) 252 n. 29. The occurrence of Damon’s name in the middle of this discourse is not a decisive argument against his influence in the first part.

93 Before quoting the Damon anecdote, Posidonius refers to this very passage: “We shall prescribe for some a regimen of rhythms, modes and exercises of a certain kind, for others those of a different kind, as Plato taught us” (fr. 168 EK, transl. by I. G. Kidd).

If Damon was the protagonist of the original version, the tale has been transferred to Pythagoras⁹⁴ as a more prominent figure most probably in the rich biographical tradition of the 4th–3rd cent. BC. Diogenes of Babylon, well familiar with the Peripatetic biography, relates the Pythagoras anecdote but reserves the theory of musical ethics exclusively for Damon, presenting it as follows:

Moreover, when one asked if music incites all the virtues or just some of them, Damon, the musician, believed that [it will incite] the musician to all of them or nearly all. [For, he said] that the effect of singing and playing the kithara renders the child [not only more courageous and more temperate, but also more just (...)].⁹⁵

After the 1st cent. BC, when Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans began to be associated with the well-known ideas of the ethical influence of music, the Pythagoras anecdote replaces the original one. What we find in Diogenes and Philodemus is an intermediate stage: Pythagoras is a hero of the anecdote that illustrates ideas attributed to Damon.

In Book 10 (Περὶ ὑπερηφανίας) of *On Vices* Philodemus defines and criticizes different forms of arrogance.⁹⁶ The book consists of two parts: in the first (cols. 1–10) the Epicurean offers his own reflections on the topic, in the second (cols. 10–24) he summarizes and quotes the protreptic letter *On the Removal of Arrogance* by a certain Aristo. This writer is identified either with the Peripatetic Aristo of Ceos (by the majority of scholars) or with the Stoic Aristo of Chios,⁹⁷ both of the 3rd cent. BC. Introducing Aristo's writing, according to which the principal source of arrogance is τύχη, Philodemus notes that philosophy itself, as he mentioned before (col. 6), can also be a reason why some people may appear (justifiably or not) arrogant, and adduces as an example a list of four philosophers:

T6.

Ἀρίστων τοῖ[ι]νον [γ]εγραφὼς Περὶ τοῦ | κο[υ]φί[ζ]ειν ὑ]περηφανίας ἐπιστολι[κόν] τ[ι] ἴ-
διον μὲν ἔπλαθεν <τήν> [τ]ῶν δ[ι]ὰ τύχην ὑπερηφ[ά]νων [κατ]ιδ[ι]δόν, οὐ μό[νο]ν διὰ

⁹⁴ So Lasserre (1954) 62–63; Matelli (2004) 163 n. 38.

⁹⁵ Phld. *Mus.* 4, *PHerc.* 1576, col. 22.4–15 Delattre (2007) I, 36, transl. by L. H. Woodward. Restoration of the last lines relies on *PHerc.* 1578, col. 100.37–45 Delattre (2007) II, 194–195. Philodemus mentions Damon two more times: cols. 34 and 147–148, see Wallace (2015) 157–165.

⁹⁶ Phld. *Vit.* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, cols. 1–24 Ranocchia. The only complete edition: Jensen (1911); the second part: Ranocchia (2007); for the first part, see Indelli (2010). Critical discussion Tsouna (2007) 143–162; French translation: Tsouna (2010a). Bibliography: Longo Auricchio/Indelli/Del Mastro (2012) 350–351.

⁹⁷ For earlier literature, see Acosta Méndez/Angeli (1992) 208 nn. 34–35, for recent: Fortenbaugh/White (2006); Angeli (2007) 9–10. Ranocchia (2007), (2016), and (2017) argues for the Stoic Aristo.

τ[ι]ν' ἀπὸ ταύτης ὑπερηφ[α]νοῦ[ν]των, ἀλλὰ καὶ | δι' ἃ προεἶπ[α]μεν ἡμεῖς, καὶ | δῆ[τ]α
καὶ δι' αὐτὴν φιλοσοφί[αν] πολλῶν δοξάντων, | ὡς [Ἡ]ρακλείτου καὶ Πυθαγόρου
καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους καὶ | Σωκράτους καὶ ποιητῶν ἐνίωγ, οὓς οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν
κωμικοδογράφων ἐπεράπιζον.

Aristo, then, who has written an epistolary work *On Relieving of Arrogance*, was alone (?) in considering only that of those who become arrogant on account of (good) fortune, these being arrogant not only on account of circumstances deriving from that, but also on account of what we have mentioned earlier, and indeed many having given the impression of being arrogant on account of philosophy itself, such as Heraclitus and Pythagoras and Empedocles and Socrates and certain poets, whom the older comic poets used to censure.⁹⁸

Since Philodemus/Aristo specify why these philosophers are considered arrogant only in the case of Socrates,⁹⁹ while the rest seems to be mentioned elsewhere in Aristo's letter,¹⁰⁰ we have to turn to the biographical tradition on them and to what Philodemus previously said on philosophers' arrogance. As opposed to Heraclitus, Empedocles, and Socrates, each of whom has had a long history of being specifically accused of different forms of arrogance (ὑπερηφάνια, ἀλαζονεία, ὑπεροψία, ὕβρις, εἰρωνεία, etc.),¹⁰¹ Pythagoras figured in tradition as a person struggling with it rather than an object of censure. Following Wilhelm Crönert, the commentators referred to Diog. Laërt. 8.11 and 36 as to the examples of Pythagoras' arrogance,¹⁰² yet σεμνοπρεπέστατος (8.11) by itself does not have negative connotations, it agrees better with the early description of Pythagoras' σεμνότητα τοῦ τε βίου καὶ τοῦ σχήματος by Alcidas and Dicaearchus¹⁰³ than with his arrogance. The same σεμνοπρέπεια appears at 8.36 with a quotation from Timon of

98 Phld. *Vit.* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 10.11–25 Ranocchia = Jensen (1911) 16–17 = Acosta Méndez/Angeli (1992) fr. 4 = Fortenbaugh/White (2006) fr. 21a = Ranocchia (2007) 253. The restoration of the text's first part is disputable; I reproduce the text of the last critical edition and Ranocchia's translation; cf. Tsouna (2010b) 389.

99 Cols. 21–23 (= Acosta Méndez/Angeli [1992] fr. 5). Poets are represented by Euripides, col. 13.1–9.

100 Ranocchia (2007) 17; Angeli (2007) 12.

101 Heraclitus: Diog. Laërt. 9.1, 9.6, 9.15; Empedocles: Diog. Laërt. 8.66 (ὅπου δὲ ἀλαζόνα καὶ φίλαυτον ἐν τῇ ποιήσει), 8.70, 8.73; Socrates: Diog. Laërt. 2.25, cf. Pl. *Symp.* 219c7. See Indelli (2007) 279–283; Ranocchia (2007) 17–18, and in this volume.

102 Crönert (1906) 191 (s.v. *Herakleitos*); Acosta Méndez/Angeli (1992) 215; Ranocchia (2007) 18.

103 On Alcidas, see above, p. 117. Dicaearchus says: “He (sc. Pythagoras) arrived in Italy and appeared in Kroton, Dikaiarchos says, as a man who arrived with a lot of travel experience and was brilliant and well endowed by fortune as to his own natural disposition. With respect to his appearance, he was noble and great and had a lot of charm and beauty in his voice, in his character and in everything else” (*FGrHist [cont.]* 1400 F 56 = fr. 40 Mirhady = fr. 33 Wehrli; transl. by G. Verhasselt).

Phlius, who ridicules Pythagoras' solemnity of speech, σεμνηγορίη.¹⁰⁴ Revealingly, in the earlier passage, to which Philodemus himself refers (ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἃ προεἶπ[α]μεν ἡμεῖς),¹⁰⁵ he defends philosophers from *unjustified* accusations of arrogance because of τὴν σεμνότητα [κ]αὶ [τ]ῆς ὄψεω[ς] κα[ὶ] τοῦ π[αν]τὸ[ς] βίου (col. 6.19–21).¹⁰⁶ The real ὑπερήφανος is not he who possesses these characteristics, but he who appears contemptuous and despises people by his actions (col. 6.27–33). If Philodemus considered *gravitas* as the most appropriate characteristic of a philosopher *per se* (exemplified by the Epicurean sage), then, in his view, Pythagoras must have belonged to those who, unlike Heraclitus and Socrates, only appeared to be arrogant διὰ φιλοσοφίαν.

Philodemus' attitude to Pythagoras, as far as we can judge from the available evidence, was either positive or neutral, as opposed to his criticism towards Socrates.¹⁰⁷ As for Aristo, it is doubtful whether he meant Pythagoras among those maniacally hubristic people, who “believed to become gods from mortals.”¹⁰⁸ The context of this column, especially the figure of Xerxes, whose arrogance is mentioned in the previous sentence, suggests that apotheosis of Hellenistic kings, rather than of Presocratic philosophers, is implied here. In any case, Pythagoras, unlike Empedocles, did not claim to become a god.¹⁰⁹

A brief extract from Pythagoras' biography has been found among the fragments of the *PHerc.* 1788 published by Crönert.¹¹⁰ He identified frs. 1–8 containing the

104 Τὴν δὲ σεμνοπρέπειαν τοῦ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Τίμων ἐν τοῖς Σίλλοις δάκνων αὐτὸν ὁμως οὐ παρέλιπεν, εἰπὼν οὕτως· Πυθαγόρην τε γόητας ἀποκλίνοντ' ἐπὶ δόξας / θήρη ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων, σεμνηγορίης ἄριστήν (fr. 57 Di Marco). This refers to the tradition of Pythagoras' public speeches, cf. above, p. 118.

105 We take his cross-reference in col. 10 as referring to col. 6 as the only one in the previous text that directly discusses philosophers.

106 Ranocchia (2007) 289; Indelli (2010) 328; Tsouna (2010a) 618. “Such critics misunderstand the manner in which sages relate to other people, and also ‘the nobility both of their appearance and of their [whole] life’ (VI.19–21),” Tsouna (2007) 150. Cf. Aristoxenus' story on Damon and Phintias (fr. 31 Wehrli), where the associates of Dionysius the Elder mocking the Pythagoreans as braggarts (ἀλαζόνας) claimed that their dignity (σεμνότης) would collapse if they are really scared.

107 Acosta Méndez/Angeli (1992).

108 ἢ τὸ θεοὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων [έ]αυτοὺς γεγόνενα δοκεῖν (col. 16.24–25). See Ranocchia (2007) 322–323.

109 According to the story made up by Heraclides Ponticus, the first incarnation of Pythagoras' soul was Aetalides, who was considered to be son of Hermes, then Euphorbus, Hermotimus, and a fisherman Pyrrhus (Diog. Laërt. 8.4 = fr. 86 Schütrumpf = fr. 89 Wehrli); Zhmud (2012) 232 n. 115. This is rather a reverse apotheosis.

110 Crönert (1906) 147, cf. 19–20. Recently it has been re-edited by Vassallo (2017), whose work was unavailable to me when I wrote this paper.

names of Thales, Pherecydes, Leucippus, Democritus, Empedocles, Gorgias, and Stilpo as parts of the historiographical section of a polemical treatise by an unknown Epicurean. This opinion was widely accepted,¹¹¹ yet recently some scholars have been inclined to ascribe *PHerc.* 1788, frs. 1–8 to an unidentified work of Philodemus himself.¹¹² Fr. 4 of this small bio-doxographical collection deals with Pythagoras,¹¹³ whose name, however, is missing in the text:

T7.

ἐν δὲ Κρήτηι κατελθὼν εἰς] ||
 τὸ Ἰδαῖον ἄ[γ]τρων [μετὰ τοῦ Ἐ-
 πιμενίδου] καὶ τὰ περὶ θε[ῶν
 παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν] ἀπορρήτοις [μα-
 θῶν ἀπῆρεν] εἰς Κρότωνα [καὶ
 5 κατέστρεψεν ἐ]νενήκοντα [ἔτη
 βιοῦς καὶ ἐτά]φη ἐν Μετα[πον-
 τίωι ἐντίμως].

(...) [and having descended into the Idaean cave on Crete with Epimenides] and [having learned from him] the secret teaching about the gods, [he departed] to Croton [and died] at the age of 90 [and was buried] in Metapontum [with honors].

As is easy to see, Crönert reconstructed two thirds of the text¹¹⁴ relying on Diogenes Laërtius' biography of Pythagoras.¹¹⁵ One more parallel can be found in Porphyry's passage, εἰς δὲ τὸ Ἰδαῖον καλούμενον ἄντρον καταβάς (...) ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐπέβη καὶ ἐν Κρότῳ ἐγένετο (*VP* 17–18), which derives from the Hellenistic biographical handbook, similar or identical to that used by Diogenes Laërtius.¹¹⁶ Crönert' conjecture [μετὰ τοῦ Ἐπιμενίδου] has not been further supported,¹¹⁷ but the preserved part of the extract offers well known

111 See e.g. Dorandi (1982) 351; Indelli (2007) 285. Primavesi (2002) 186, and Obbink (2011), as quoted in Porter (2016) 186 n. 90, relate this treatise to the 2nd cent. BC.

112 Angeli (2003) 332–333; Vassallo (2015b) 102 n. 13, cf. Vassallo (2017).

113 = 14 A 13 DK = Timpanaro Cardini (1958) test. 13.

114 Dorandi (1982) 351 n. 32 speaks of “azzardate integrazioni.”

115 εἶτ' ἐν Κρήτη σὺν Ἐπιμενίδῃ κατήλθεν εἰς τὸ Ἰδαῖον ἄντρον. (...) καὶ τὰ περὶ θεῶν ἐν ἀπορρήτοις ἔμαθεν. εἶτ' ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς Σάμον, καὶ εὐρῶν τὴν πατρίδα τυραννομένην ὑπὸ Πολυκράτους, ἀπῆρεν εἰς Κρότωνα (8.3); εἰς Μεταπόντιον ὑπεξελεθῆν κάκει τὸν βίον καταστρέψαι (8.40); ὡς δ' οἱ πλείους, ἔτη βιοῦς ἐνενήκοντα (8.44).

116 Zhmud (2012) 75 n. 60.

117 It is mentioned in Diels' app. crit. (14 A 13 DK) and Timpanaro Cardini (1958) test. 13. The fragment was not included in the recent editions of Epimenides: Toye (2007); Bernabé (2007) 126–128.

facts from the Hellenistic biographies of Pythagoras: his visit to the Idaean cave on Crete (ἄγ[τ]ρον), initiation into secret rites and teachings (ἀπόρρητα), emigration to Croton and death in Metapontum at the age of 90. Among the possible sources of this information Timaeus of Tauromenium seems to be the most suitable candidate, for his Pythagoras traveled to Crete and Sparta (Just. *Epit.* 20.4), lived long enough to become Empedocles' teacher (*FGrHist* 566 F 14) and died in Metapontum venerated by the local citizens (*FGrHist* 566 F 131; Just. *Epit.* 20.4). Timaeus, however, sent Pythagoras to study the laws of Minos and Lycurgus,¹¹⁸ not to descend into the Idaean cave, so that a religious version of this journey with the secret rites, etc. is younger than him.

Whereas the other seven extant columns of *PHerc.* 1788 relate, in varying degrees, to philosophical ideas and/or works of the respective thinkers, the testimonium on Pythagoras is purely biographical. This may be a sheer accident, but against the background of all Philodemus' references to Pythagoras it would, on the contrary, appear to be a distinct tendency. Though Pythagoras the philosopher crops up in Philodemus' texts more often than Anaxagoras and not much less than Democritus,¹¹⁹ his ideas never come to the foreground. Philodemus' Pythagoras is a convenient example to use in a discussion (**T2**, **T3**, and **T4**), a character of anecdotes (**T5**), he often figures in the company of other philosophers (**T2**, **T3**, and **T6**). The Pythagoras of Philodemus' sources and opponents, Diogenes of Babylon and Aristo, is pretty much the same. Generally, the figure of Pythagoras as known to Philodemus belongs to the first two centuries of Hellenism, when he was a part of the biographical rather than the philosophical tradition. The demise of the Pythagorean school after 350 BC and the lack of Pythagoras' writings (or writings considered authentic) contributed to a situation where he turned out to belong to the distant philosophical past, hardly relevant to contemporary philosophers. In spite of Philodemus' deep interest in the history of philosophy he lets Pythagoras appear in a doxographical context only once,¹²⁰ in a long list of *theologoi*, historians, and philosophers from Thales to Diogenes

118 Timaeus *ap.* Just. *Epit.* 20.4: *inde regressus Cretam et Lacedaemona ad cognoscendas Minois et Lycurgi inclitas ea tempestate leges contenderat* (the same in Val. Max. 8.7 ext. 2); lambl. *VP* 25: καὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ δὲ καὶ ἐν Σπάρτῃ τῶν νόμων ἔνεκα διέτριψε. See Delatte (1922) 153.

119 See Vassallo's *IPPH* IV 12–20 (Anaxagoras); X 32bis–56 (Democritus); XXXV 161–173 (Pythagoras).

120 Cf. a desperately short fragment of Phld. *De rhet.* 10, *PHerc.* 473, fr. 5 Sudhaus (1892–1896) II, 303 [**T8**]: ἐπεὶ πᾶσ[α] | μὲν ἀρετῇ, [ο]ὐχ ἢ κατὰ | τοὺς ἥρωας ὑπῆρχε[ν, ἀλλ] | ἀ κατὰ Πυθαγόραν [καὶ] | τοὺς ἐπάνω (“Since all virtue, not that which was with the heroes, but that which according to Pythagoras and his predecessors [...]”). See the new reconstruction of the fragment in *CPH* XXXVI 172, with commentary.

of Babylon, whose ideas of the divine are summarily stated and criticized at the end of the so-called ‘first part’ of *On Piety*.

This theological doxography, following the framework established by Eudemus of Rhodes’ *Θεολογική ἱστορία* and Theophrastus’ *Φυσικῶν δόξαι*,¹²¹ was compiled by some Stoic philosopher; Philodemus borrowed it and provided criticism from Epicurean positions; in turn, his acquaintance Cicero used this part of *On Piety* for the Epicurean overview of theological ideas in *De natura deorum* (1.10.25–16.43).¹²² Thus, though only one sentence related to Pythagoras is preserved on the papyrus, we have a rare opportunity to get closer to the original through Cicero’s extract¹²³ and even learn the opinion of Alcmaeon of Croton, who preceded Pythagoras in *Nat. D.* 1.11.27:

Crotoniates autem Alcmaeo, qui soli et lunae reliquisque sideribus animoque praeterea divinitatem dedit, non sensit sese mortalibus rebus immortalitatem dare.

Alcmaeon of Croton, who attributed divinity to the sun, moon and other heavenly bodies, and also to the soul, did not perceive that he was bestowing immortality on things that are mortal.¹²⁴

Alcmaeon’s idea that the soul is immortal because of its constant circular movement similar to the movement of all divine heavenly bodies is attested in Aristotle and in Theophrastus’ *Φυσικῶν δόξαι* and due to this compendium became a common stock knowledge in Hellenistic philosophy.¹²⁵ Criticism of Alcmaeon’s views stems from Philodemus, as follows from the remains of the papyrus:

121 Eudemus (fr. 150 Wehrli) treated among *theologoi* Orpheus, Homer, Hesiod, Acusilaus, Epimenides, and Pherecydes (see Zhmud [2006] 130–133), all of which occur also in Philodemus: Henrichs (1972) 78 nn. 28 and 33. The order of the Presocratics in the philosophical part of doxography (see Obbink [2002] 196–197) closely corresponds to that in Theophrastus, where the Ionians Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Archelaus were followed by the Italians and Atomists Xenophanes, Parmenides, Leucippus, Democritus, Metrodorus (see Zhmud [2013] 164–165). Philodemus or his source omitted Archelaus and placed Alcmaeon and Pythagoras (not in Theophrastus) before Xenophanes, and Heraclitus after Democritus.

122 H. Diels *ap. DG*, 529–550 demonstrated the close relationship of *Nat. D.* 1.10.25–16.43 with *On Piety*, yet he believed that Cicero and Philodemus both copied from the Epicurean Phaedrus’ *Περὶ Θεῶν*. Cicero’s dependence on *On Piety* was suggested by Philippson (1939) 2462 and established by Obbink (2001) and (2002). For an overview of earlier theories, see Pease (1968) 39–42.

123 Caution is needed, as Cicero changed his source for his own purposes: McKirahan (1996).

124 Transl. by H. Rackham. Cf. Cic. *Resp.* 6.15: *iisque (sc. hominibus) animus datus est ex illis sempiternis ignibus quae sidera et stellas vocatis, quae globosae et rotundae, divinis animatae mentibus, circulos suos orbesque conficiunt celeritate mirabili.*

125 Arist. *De an.* 1.2.405a29–b1 (= 24 A 12 DK): παραπλησίως δὲ τούτοις καὶ Ἄ. ἔοικεν ὑπολαβεῖν περὶ ψυχῆς· φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὴν ἀθάνατον εἶναι διὰ τὸ εἰοικέναι τοῖς ἀθάνατοις· τοῦτο δ’ ὑπάρχειν

T9.

— θεωρεῖτα[ι· φαίνε-
ται οὖν τὸ [θεῖον ἀ-
νασκευάζ[ων. Πυ-

γ

θαγόρου δ' αὐτοῦ γ'

- 5 οὐδέν φασί τινε[ς
εἶναι τῶν ἀνα[φε-
ρ]ομένων παρὰ [τῶν
μαθητῶν εἰς αὐτόν.¹²⁶

(...) theorizes; therefore, he obviously destroys the divine. As for Pythagoras himself, some say that none of the writings ascribed to him by (his students?) belongs to him.

Starting with Aristoxenus, Alcmaeon often appears as the Pythagorean and even as a direct student of Pythagoras.¹²⁷ As a natural philosopher, Alcmaeon owes almost nothing to Pythagoras, however, his belief in the immortal soul is close to Pythagoras' teaching of the immortal soul moving in a circle of rebirths. The order of names in Philodemus' source, Alcmaeon/Pythagoras/Xenophanes, is peculiar. In the Hellenistic philosophical *diadochai* Pythagoras opens the Italian succession and Xenophanes follows the Pythagorean school, which included Alcmaeon. In Theophrastus' doxography Xenophanes appears as the first Italian philosopher, while Pythagoras, being not a *physikos*, is absent and the place of Alcmaeon is unknown: he did not have the specific *archai* and thus did not figure in the more or less chronologically organized chapter *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* that opened the *Φυσικῶν δόξαι*.¹²⁸

Πυθαγόρου δ' αὐτοῦ γ' emphasizes the contrast between the student, who authored a treatise from which his doxa comes, and the teacher, who did not have authentic works. Philodemus, or his sources, cautiously refers to τινές, though by his time this seemed to be a widespread opinion later becoming dominant.¹²⁹ Diogenes Laërtius most probably derives this opinion from the biographer Sosi-

αὐτῆι ὡς ἀεὶ κινουμένη· κινεῖσθαι γὰρ καὶ τὰ θεῖα πάντα συνεχῶς ἀεὶ, σελήνην, ἥλιον, τοὺς ἀστέρας καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὅλον. Aët. 4.2.2: Ἄ. φύσιν αὐτοκίνητον κατ' αἰδίον κίνησιν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀθάνατον αὐτῆν καὶ προσεμφερῆ τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπολαμβάνει. Cf. also Clem. Al. *Protr.* 5.66.

126 Phld. *Piet.*, *PHerc* 1428, fr. 10 Schober (1988) 113. The *diple* after l. 3 indicates transition from Alcmaeon to Pythagoras. See the new reconstruction with commentary of this Herculanean passage by Ch. Vassallo in this volume (*DAPR*, T17).

127 Zhmud (2012) 121–124.

128 Zhmud (2013) 159–166. See also Dyck (2003) 90.

129 According to Flavius Josephus, αὐτοῦ μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν ὁμολογεῖται σύγγραμμα (*Ap.* 1.163).

crates of Rhodes (fl. c. 180 BC),¹³⁰ who may have been one of τινές, Sosicrates' fellow native of Rhodes, Posidonius, representing the Stoic tradition, also noticed that “no work by Pythagoras is preserved for us” (fr. 151 EK). Less probable is Diels' suggestion that Philodemus refers here to the story told by the biographer Satyrus (late 3rd cent. BC) about Pythagoras' three books published by Philolaus and bought by Plato for a hundred minas.¹³¹ Pythagoras' *tripartitum* was ignored by Hellenistic philosophy and barely existed outside the biographical tradition. Skipping the question of Pythagoras' writings, Cicero presents his doctrine that has an unmistakably Stoic origin:

Nam Pythagoras, qui censuit animum esse per naturam rerum omnem intentum et commean-tem, ex quo nostri animi carperentur, non vidit distractione humanorum animorum discerpi et lacerari deum (...) quo modo porro deus iste, si nihil esset nisi animus, aut infixus aut infusus esset in mundo?

As for Pythagoras, who believed that the entire substance of the universe is penetrated and pervaded by a soul of which our souls are fragments, he failed to notice that this severance of the souls of men from the world-soul means the dismemberment and rending asunder of god (...). Moreover, if the Pythagorean god is pure soul, how is he implanted in, or diffused throughout, the world?¹³²

Pythagoras himself offered no physical doctrine of the soul, only the religious one, and every Pythagorean philosopher had his own views on the soul different from the others.¹³³ The theory of the divine world-soul, however, is not attested in ancient Pythagoreanism. It was ascribed to Pythagoras in course of his Stoicization during the Hellenistic period, when the Stoic school was dominant force in philosophy.¹³⁴ Evidently, the compiler of the Stoic theological doxography experienced difficulties in finding a suitable source on Pythagoras' views on the divine and, by analogy with Alcmaeon's concept of the immortal soul, attributed to his teacher a familiar doctrine of the soul as a part of the divine world-soul.¹³⁵

130 Ἦνιοι μὲν οὖν Πυθαγόραν μηδὲ ἔν καταλιπεῖν σύγγραμμά φασιν διαπεσόντες (8.6); see Centrone (1992) 4189.

131 Diog. Laërt. 8.6; 8.9; 8.15. Hence Diels' supplement τῶν ἀνα[φερ]ομένων παρὰ [τὰ τρία ἐκεῖνα βιβλία] (“except for those three books”).

132 Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.11.27–28 (transl. by H. Rackham). Cf. Id. *Cato* 78: *Audiebam Pythagoram Pythagoreosque, incolae paene nostros, qui essent Italici philosophi quondam nominati, numquam dubitasse quin ex universa mente divina delibatos animos haberemus*; *Tusc.* 5.38: *Humanus animus, decerptus ex mente divina, cum alio nullo nisi cum ipso deo, si hoc fas est dictu, comparari potest.*

133 Zhmud (2012) 387–394.

134 Pythagoras' doxography in the *Vetusta placita*, especially the chapter on *archai* (Aët. 1.3.7), is another result of this process. See Zhmud (2016) 320.

135 On the world-soul in Stoicism, see Long/Sedley (1987) II, 319–321.

Similarly, the *Pythagorean Hypomnemata* presenting a largely Stoic body of cosmological and physical doctrines¹³⁶ characterizes soul as “a detachment (ἀπόσπασμα) of *aether*, both the hot and the cold (...) it is immortal since that from which it is detached is immortal.”¹³⁷ Another parallel comes from Sextus Empiricus’ discussion of the dogmatists’ theological views:

In fact Pythagoras and Empedocles and the rest of the Italian crowd say that we have a certain commonality not only toward one another and toward the gods, but also towards the non-rational animals. For there is one breath reaching through the whole world like a soul, which also unites us with them.¹³⁸

Thus, in the only case where Philodemus presents Pythagoras’ philosophical view this view turns out to be Stoic.

Returning to Pythagoras’ pseudonymous writings mentioned by Philodemus and Posidonius, we have to take into account that these close contemporaries had in mind different types of literature and, respectively, that their positions were opposed. Philodemus indicates the need for caution in dealing with the works ascribed to Pythagoras and does not seem to use any of them. Posidonius admits that though none of Pythagoras’ writing has been preserved, to judge by what was written by some of his students, he held the same particular view on emotions in the soul as Plato.¹³⁹ One more fragment leaves no doubt that Posidonius was obviously willing to infer Pythagoras’ doctrines from the writings of his students and followers in which the latter figured as a predecessor of Plato and Aristotle:

Not only Aristotle and Plato held such views but still earlier there were others, and in particular Pythagoras. Posidonius too says that he, Pythagoras, was the first to hold the view, while it was Plato who worked it out and made it more complete.¹⁴⁰

To understand what kinds of writings Philodemus and Posidonius had in mind, we have to recall that the first part of the 1st cent. BC witnessed the general turn

¹³⁶ Cf. above, n. 34. See recently Long (2013); Laks (2013); Zhmud (2019).

¹³⁷ Diog. Laërt. 8.28 (transl. by A. A. Long). Cf. Diogenes’ Stoic doxography: ζῶον ἄρ’ ὁ κόσμος. ἔμψυχον δέ, ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τῆς ἡμετέρας ψυχῆς ἐκείθεν οὔσης ἀποσπάσματος (7.143).

¹³⁸ *Adv. math.* 9.127 (transl. by R. Bett).

¹³⁹ Ποσειδώνιος δὲ καὶ Πυθαγόραν φησίν, αὐτοῦ μὲν τοῦ Πυθαγόρου συγγράμματος οὐδενὸς εἰς ἡμᾶς διασωζομένον τεκμαιρόμενος δ’ ἐξ ὧν ἔνιοι τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ γεγράφασιν (fr. 151 EK). Cf. Claud. Mam. *De st. an.* 2.3: *Pythagorae igitur, quia nihil ipse scriptitaverit, a posteris quaerenda sententia est.*

¹⁴⁰ οὐ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλης μόνον ἢ Πλάτων ἐδόξαζον οὕτως ἀλλ’ ἔτι πρόσθεν ἄλλοι τέ τινες καὶ ὁ Πυθαγόρας, ὡς καὶ ὁ Ποσειδώνιος φησιν ἐκείνου πρώτου μὲν εἶναι λέγων τὸ δόγμα, Πλάτωνα δ’ ἐξεργάσασθαι καὶ κατασκευάσαι τελεώτερον αὐτό (fr. 165 EK; transl. by I. G. Kidd).

in Greek philosophy,¹⁴¹ which involved, *inter alia*, the revival of dogmatic Platonism and Aristotelianism and the birth of Neopythagoreanism, philosophy of which constituted a mixture of Platonism and Aristotelianism with additional Stoic views.¹⁴² The 1st cent. BC became a watershed between two categories of the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha, the traditional and the Neopythagorean ones.¹⁴³ To the first category belong the texts ascribed to Pythagoras and his family members and written in Attic, Ionic or hexameter in the late 4th to 2nd cent. BC; they are preserved only in a small number of tiny fragments, often only their titles are known. Not all of them were philosophical in content but those which were did not impress contemporary philosophers, who mostly ignored them. The second category comprises philosophical treatises with a clear agenda written in or after the 1st cent. BC mostly but not exclusively in ps.-Doric under the names of known, unknown, and fictional Pythagoreans. Many of them came down to us in full or in excerpts, constituting the bulk of Thesleff's edition.¹⁴⁴ The principal aim of these treatises was to present Pythagoras and his school as the most important predecessors of the recently found or reestablished Platonic and Aristotelian *dogmata*.¹⁴⁵ Now, Posidonius discerning in Pythagoras a precursor of Plato and Aristotle, clearly referred to this newly appeared literature attributed to the Pythagoreans, whereas Philodemus and his source had in mind the pseudepigrapha of the first category, ascribed to Pythagoras himself. This is why Philodemus, as we have seen, did not regard Pythagoras as philosopher whose theories could be accepted or disputed seriously; his interest was predominantly antiquarian and biographical. In the available corpus of Philodemus' texts there is no clear trace of his use of the Neopythagorean pseudepigrapha, and he did not mention by name any Pythagorean (except for Alcmaeon, reconstructable from Cicero).¹⁴⁶ This has an important implication for the question of the origin of the Neopythagorean pseudepigrapha: their most plausible birthplace is neither Southern Italy, nor Rome, but Alexandria.¹⁴⁷

The following two passages from the anonymous commentary in Plato's *Theaetetus* (1st cent. AD) preserved in a 2nd-cent. Graeco-Egyptian papyrus

141 See e.g. Sedley (2003).

142 Centrone (2014).

143 Cf. Zhmud (2019).

144 Thesleff (1965).

145 See e.g. the *Anonymus Photii*: Ὅτι ἕνατος ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου διάδοχος γέγονέ φησι Πλάτων Ἀρχύτου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου μαθητῆς γενόμενος, δέκατος δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης (2375–7 Thesleff).

146 There is one reference, rather critical, to the Πυθαγόρειοι in Phld. *De mus.*, *PHerc.* 1497, col. 145.16–19 Delattre (2007) II, 301.

147 Southern Italy: Thesleff (1961) 30–32. Rome: Burkert (1961) 245. Alexandria: Zhmud (2019).

reflect the next stage of the Pythagorean tradition, when Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans have been already richly endowed with all sorts of Platonic and Aristotelian doctrines and Plato was widely believed to be Pythagoras' student and follower. Discussing the so-called growing argument, i.e. a logical puzzle about the identity of a person undergoing change over time, the commentator offers the following genealogy: the argument was first discovered by Pythagoras, then borrowed by Epicharmus, an acquaintance of the Pythagoreans, and later used by Plato, obviously due to his Pythagorean background:

T10.

τὸν δὲ | [περ]ὶ τοῦ αὐξομένου | [λ]όγον ἐκίνησεν | [μ]ὲν πρῶτος Πυθα[γό]ρας, ἐκίνησεν | [δὲ] καὶ Πλάτων, ὡς ἐν | [το]ῖς εἰς τὸ Συμπόσιον | [ὕ]πεμνήσαμεν.

The argument about that which grows was first posed by Pythagoras, but was also posed by Plato, as we noted in our commentary on the *Symposium*.¹⁴⁸

T11.

Ἐπίχαρμος ὀ[μυλή]σας τοῖς Πυθα[γορείοις,] | ἄλλα τ[έ] τινα εἶ[δέ]ιδασ[κ]εν δ[ρά]ματ[α], καὶ τὸ | περὶ τ[ο]ῦ αὐξομ[ένου], δ[ὲ] | λ[όγω] ἐφοδ[ικῶ] καὶ πι[σ]τ[ῆ] ἐπ[έ]ρα[ινε].

Epicharmus, having been acquainted with the Pythagoreans, successfully put on stage a number of dramas, and in particular the one about the growing man, which he treated with a systematic and reliable argument.¹⁴⁹

Recently Luigi Battezzato proposed a new reading of **T11** that solves several difficulties of the original restoration:

T11a.

Ἐπίχαρμος, οἴ[α] ὀμυλή]σας τοῖς Πυθα[γορείοις] | ἄλλα τ[έ] τινα εἶ[δέ] [ἀπέδω]κεν δ[όγ]ματ[α] καὶ τὸν | περὶ τ[ο]ῦ αὐξομ[ένου] | λ[όγον] ἐφοδ[ικῶ] καὶ πι[σ]τ[ῆ] ἐπ[έ]ρα[ι]νε[.]

Epicharmus, since he was a pupil of the Pythagoreans, explained well a number of philosophical opinions, and brought to completion the argument about the growing man in a systematic and reliable way.¹⁵⁰

The puzzle about the growing man, implied in Plato and directly linked with Epicharmus by Chrysippus,¹⁵¹ originally occurs in a fragment of his comedy featuring a debtor refusing to pay to the creditor under the pretext that today they

148 *PBerol.* inv. 9782, col. LXX.5–12 (= Bastianini/Sedley [1995] 454 and 456), transl. by D. N. Sedley.

149 *PBerol.* inv. 9782, col. LXXI.12–18 (= Bastianini/Sedley [1995] 458 = Epich. fr. 136 *PCG*), transl. by L. Battezzato after the Italian translation in Bastianini/Sedley (1995).

150 Battezzato (2008) 15; see also Álvarez Salas (2017) 180–181.

151 Pl. *Th.* 152e; Plut. *Comm. not.* 1083A (= Chrysipp. *SVF* II 762). Plato was accused of plagiarizing Epicharmus by a certain Alcimus (Diog. Laërt. 3.9 = 23 B 1 DK = fr. 275 *PCG*).

are not the same persons as yesterday.¹⁵² He first appeals to the pebble-arithmetic of the Pythagoreans:¹⁵³

(A.) αἰ πὸτ ἄριθμόν τις περισσόν, αἰ δὲ λῆις πὸτ ἄρτιον,
ποτθέμειν λῆι ψᾶφον ἢ καὶ τᾶν ὑπαρχουσᾶν λαβεῖν,
ἦ δοκεῖ κά τοί γ' <ἔθ'> ωὐτός εἶμεν; (B.) οὐκ ἐμὶν γὰ κα.

Debtor: If you wish to add a pebble to an odd number – or to an even one if you like – or if you take one away that is there, do you think it is still the same number? Creditor: Of course not.¹⁵⁴

This, of course, by no means makes Epicharmus a student of the Pythagoreans,¹⁵⁵ and Pythagoras the inventor of the argument. But first, did Epicharmus really mean Pythagorean theoretical arithmetic and not just practical computations, as some scholars believe? The answer is that practical arithmetic does not need and, thus, does not know odd and even numbers. It is Epicharmus' fragment, where ἄρτιος and περισσός in their mathematical meaning first occur in Greek literature, whereas the practical and computational mathematics of Mesopotamia and Egypt did not have special terms for odd and even numbers.¹⁵⁶ But occasional playing with the Pythagorean concepts does not make anybody a Pythagorean, the Pythagoreans walked only in groups, and since there was no Pythagorean community in Sicily at that time, Epicharmus did not have the opportunity to become a Pythagorean. He does not figure in Aristoxenus' catalogue of the Pythagoreans (Iambl. *VP* 267) and no other author before 300 BC calls him a Pythagorean.

The process of his Pythagoreanization took a long time.¹⁵⁷ The first move was made by Pythagoras himself, who, according to the biographer Sotion (fl. c. 200 BC), wrote a book (a letter to or a dialogue with) *Helothales the Father of Epichar-*

152 Diog. Laërt. 3.11 (= 23 B 2 DK = fr. 276 *PCG*). See Sedley (1982). Kassel/Austin consider this fragment inauthentic: cf. Battezzato (2008) 11–16; Horky (2013) 131–137.

153 See Zhmud (2012) 272–273 and 409–411.

154 Epich. fr. 276 *PCG* (transl. by J. Barnes).

155 Cf. Horky (2013) 131–137, who exploits this possibility.

156 Jens Høyrup, e-mails of 17.09.2016: "(...) to my knowledge there were none – which of course does not necessarily mean there were none, but at least suggests that they were not so important as to have been understood and noticed by Assyriologists." "I fully agree that the work on odd and even is not traditional Mesopotamian or Egyptian. It is something which grows out of 'theoretical' reflection (in the original meaning), quite likely on *psephoi* – just as the figurate numbers."

157 Epicharmus as Pythagorean: Plut. *Num.* 8; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.14.100; Diog. Laërt. 8.78; Iambl. *VP* 241 and 266.

mus of Cos (Diog. Laërt. 8.7), known only by its title. In its turn, a ps.-Epicharmean λόγος πρὸς Ἀντήνορα considered Pythagoras a citizen of Rome.¹⁵⁸ Since Diogenes Laërtius, who relied in his biography of Pythagoras only on the Hellenistic sources, says that Epicharmus “heard” Pythagoras and included his ‘biography’ into the Pythagorean Book 8, we can be sure that by the 1st cent. BC this process had been finished. Starting at the biographical level, it then took on philosophical forms, so that in the commentary to *Theaetetus* Epicharmus develops the Pythagorean argument that is later used by Plato.

The last text to which I would like to draw attention is the famous medical papyrus *Anonymus Londiniensis* (*PBrLibr.* inv. 137) of the 1st cent. AD.¹⁵⁹ The central part of the papyrus contains a doxographical compendium of the 4th cent. BC covering some twenty theories of the origins of disease. Interestingly, the Pythagoreans Hippon and Philolaus are the only Presocratics to figure in this medical doxography (cols. XI and XVIII); all the other individuals mentioned here, except for Plato, were doctors. Such a choice is certainly related to the fact that since the 6th cent. BC the Pythagoreans had strong connections with medicine (including sportive medicine) and physiology. It is enough to note the names of Democedes, Alcmaeon, and Iccus, a trainer and doctor.¹⁶⁰ Though for us this aspect of Pythagoreanism is usually obscured by a thick curtain of number doctrine which Aristotle presents as the official philosophy of the Pythagoreans, for the early Lyceum it was quite relevant, as were the views of the Pythagorean botanist Menestor reviewed by Theophrastus in his works on plants (DK 32).

Since the late 19th cent. it was generally believed that the author of doxography was Menon, a student of Aristotle, for Galen testifies that it is agreed that a special medical doxography, Ἱατρικὴ συναγωγὴ ἢ Μενώνεια, similar to Theophrastus’ Φυσικῶν δόξαι, will be written by Aristotle’s student Menon, though it is attributed to Aristotle,¹⁶¹ as this was the case with the author of *Anonymus Londiniensis*. More recently,¹⁶² however, many scholars tend to write on ‘Aristotelian doxography,’ on ‘Aristotle,’ ‘Aristotle-Menon’ or ‘Aristotle or Menon.’ Why

158 Plut. *Num.* 8 (= 23 B 65 DK = Thesleff [1965] 84).

159 Editions: Diels (1893); Manetti (2010); Ricciardetto (2014).

160 Zhmud (2012) 347–374.

161 Gal. *In Hippoc. Nat. hom.* 15.25.14–26.5 Kühn: εἰ τὰς τῶν παλαιῶν ἱατρῶν δόξας ἐθέλοις ἱστορῆσαι, πάρεστί σοι τὰς τῆς ἱατρικῆς συναγωγῆς ἀναγῶναι βιβλούς, ἐπιγεγραμμένας μὲν Ἀριστοτέλει, ὁμολογουμένας δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μένωνος, ὃς ἦν μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ, γεγράφθαι, διὸ καὶ Μενώνεια προσαγορεύουσιν ἔνιοι ταυτὶ τὰ βιβλία. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ ὁ Μένων ἐκεῖνος, ἀναζητήσας ἐπιμελῶς τὰ διασφωζόμενα κατ’ αὐτὸν ἔτι τῶν παλαιῶν ἱατρῶν βιβλία, τὰς δόξας αὐτῶν ἐκείθεν ἀνελέξατο. Cf. καὶ μὴν ἔν γε τοῖς Μενωνείοις (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 733A9).

162 Especially after important and influential studies by D. Manetti, e.g. Manetti (1999).

do I think that the choice of Hippon and Philolaus as philosophers, whose medical theories deserve special attention, attests against Aristotle's authorship? The fact is that Aristotle preferred not to mention these Pythagoreans by name, as was the case with Philolaus, whose astronomical system he ascribed to some anonymous Pythagoreans.¹⁶³ Hippon was mentioned only twice, both times very briefly and with disdain,¹⁶⁴ whereas his views and arguments, as many scholars suggested, were attributed by Aristotle to Thales and vice versa.¹⁶⁵ Thus, we find in Aristotle no traces of an attentive interest to the opinions of Hippon and Philolaus, which the author of doxography amply demonstrates, expounding them accurately and in detail. He took the trouble to read two books by Hippon, he correctly refers to Hippon's *arche* as "moisture" (ὕγρότης, τὸ ὑγρόν),¹⁶⁶ while Aristotle's transforms it into Thalesian "water" and never reveals that Philolaus' *archai* were ἄπειρα and περαίνοντα (44 B 1–3.6 DK), not πέρασ and ἄπειρον. Hence, there is much more reason to believe in Menon the student of Aristotle than in Aristotle the medical doxographer who was concerned about the Pythagoreans.

References

- Acosta Méndez/Angeli (1992): Eduardo Acosta Méndez and Anna Angeli, *Filodemo: Testimonianze su Socrate*, Naples.
- Almazova (2016): Nina Almazova, "Daktylus und Enhoplios in Damons Rhythmuslehre", in: *Hyperboreus* 22, 94–126.
- Álvarez Salas (2017): Omar Álvarez Salas, "Philosophy on Stage and Performance in Argument: Epicharmus vis-à-vis Western Greek Intelligentsia", in: Heather L. Reid *et al.* (eds.), *Politics and Performance in Western Greece*, Sioux City, 163–192.
- Andorlini/Linguiti (1999): Isabella Andorlini and Alessandro Linguiti, "91. Pythagoras *", 2T", in: *CPF* 1.1***, 681–684.
- Angeli (2003): Anna Angeli, "Carlo Gallavotti e la papirologia Ercolanese", in: Mario Capasso (ed.), *Contributi alla storia dell'Officina dei Papiri Ercolanesi*, vol. 3, Naples, 301–390.

163 Arist. *Cael.* 2.13.293a18–b16. On the sole occasion when Aristotle names Philolaus, he cites his saying "there are thoughts which are stronger than us" (*Eth. Eud.* 2.8.1225a30).

164 Ἴππωνα γὰρ οὐκ ἄν τις ἀξιώσειε θεῖναι μετὰ τούτων διὰ τὴν εὐτέλειαν αὐτοῦ τῆς διανοίας (Arist. *Metaph.* 1.3.984a5); τῶν δὲ φορτικωτέρων καὶ ὕδωρ τινὲς ἀπεφίηναντο, καθάπερ Ἴππων (De an. 1.2.405b2).

165 The argument that the semen of all living creatures is moist, which Aristotle (*Metaph.* 1.3.983b22–26) and Theophrastus (fr. 225 FHS&G) attribute to Thales was in fact Hippon's (38 A 3 DK).

166 Manetti (1992) 461.

- Angeli (2007): Anna Angeli, “Aristone, *Epistola sull’alleggerirsi della superbia*: Le tecniche espositive della κεφαλαίωσις filodemea (Philod., *Vit.* x coll. x 30–xxiv 21) e le metodologie della trattatistica sui caratteri”, in: *SEP* 4, 9–39.
- Auvray-Assayas/Delattre (2001): Clara Auvray-Assayas and Daniel Delattre (eds.), *Cicéron et Philodème : La polemique en philosophie*, Paris.
- Barker (1984): Andrew Barker, *Greek Musical Writings*, vol. 1, Oxford.
- Barker (2001): Andrew Barker, “Diogenes of Babylon and Hellenistic Musical Theory”, in: Auvray-Assayas/Delattre, 353–370.
- Barker (2007): Andrew Barker, *The Science of Harmonics in Classical Greece*, Cambridge.
- Bastianini/Sedley (1995): Guido Bastianini and David N. Sedley, “Commentarium in Platonis «Theaetetus» (PBerol inv. 9782)”, in: *CPF*, Parte III: *Commentari*, Florence, 227–562.
- Battezzato (2008): Luigi Battezzato, “Pythagorean Comedies from Epicharmus to Alexis”, in: *Aevum(ant)* 8, 139–164.
- Bernabé (2007): Alberto Bernabé, “Epimenidis testimonia et fragmenta”, in: *OFI* 3, 105–168.
- Blank (1995): David Blank, “Philodemus on the Technicity of Rhetoric”, in: Dirk Obbink (ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*, Oxford/New York, 178–188.
- Blank (2009): David Blank, “Philodemus on the Impossibility of a ‘Philosophical Rhetoric’”, in: Frédérique Woerther (ed.), *Literary and Philosophical Rhetoric in the Greek, Roman, Syriac, and Arabic Worlds*, Hildesheim/Zurich/New York, 73–94.
- Bodnár (2016): István M. Bodnár, “Pythagoras the Philosopher and Grammar Teacher (PBrLibr. Add. Ms 37516 recto)”, unpublished manuscript.
- Brancacci (1988): Aldo Brancacci, “Alcidamante e *PHibeh* 13 ‘De musica’: Musica e retorica della musica”, in: Aldo Brancacci et al. (eds.), *Aristoxenica, Menandrea, Fragmenta philosophica*, Florence, 61–84.
- Brinckman (1910): Adolf Brinckman, “Aus dem antiken Schulunterricht”, in: *RhM* 65, 149–155.
- Burkert (1961): Walter Burkert, “Hellenistische Pseudopythagorica”, in: *Philologus* 105, 16–43; 226–246.
- Centrone (1992): Bruno Centrone, “L’VIII libro delle ‘Vite’ di Diogene Laerzio”, in: *ANRW* II 36.6, 4183–4217.
- Centrone (2014): Bruno Centrone, “The Pseudo-Pythagorean Writings”, in: Carl A. Huffman (ed.), *The History of Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge, 315–340.
- Clay (2010): Diskin Clay, “The Hero Cult of Greek Philosophers”, in: Michael Gagarin (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*, Oxford, 427.
- Criboire (1996): Raffaella Criboire, *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta.
- Crönert (1906): Wilhelm Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, Leipzig.
- Delatte (1922): Armand Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce*, Bruxelles.
- Delattre (2006): Daniel Delattre, “Présence de l’épicurisme dans le *Contre les grammairiens* et le *Contre les musiciens* de Sextus Empiricus”, in: Joëlle Delattre (ed.), *Sur le Contre les professeurs de Sextus Empiricus*, Lille, 47–65.
- Delattre (2007): Daniel Delattre, *Philodème de Gadara : Sur la musique, Livre 4*, 2 vols., Paris.
- Del Mastro (2012): Gianluca Del Mastro, “Il *PHerc.* 1004: Filodemo, *De rhetorica* VII”, in: *ZPE* 182, 131–133.
- Diels (1893): Hermann Diels, *Anonymi Londiniensis ex Aristotelis latricis Menoniis et aliis medicis eclogae*, Berlin.
- Dorandi (1982): Tiziano Dorandi, “Note eraclitee: In margine al *Symposium Heracliteum*, 1981”, in: *Elenchos* 3, 347–353.

- Dorandi (1990): Tiziano Dorandi, “Per una ricomposizione dello scritto di Filodemo sulla Retorica”, in: *ZPE* 82, 59–87.
- Dyck (2003): Andrew R. Dyck, *Cicero: De Natura Deorum I*, Cambridge.
- Erbì (2009): Margherita Erbì, “Il retore e la città nella polemica di Filodemo verso Diogene di Babilonia (*PHerc.* 1004, coll. 64–70)”, in: *CErc* 39, 119–140.
- Erbì (2010): Margherita Erbì, “Eraclito e l’inganno della retorica in Filodemo (*PHerc.* 1004, coll. 57–63)”, in: *CErc* 40, 65–74.
- Erbì (2011): Margherita Erbì, “La retorica nell’Epicureismo: Una riflessione”, in: *CErc* 41, 189–206.
- Fortenbaugh (2011): William W. Fortenbaugh and Dimitri Gutas (eds.), *Theophrastus of Eresus: Commentary: Sources on Ethics*, vol. 6.1, Leiden/Boston.
- Fortenbaugh/White (2006): William W. Fortenbaugh and Stephen A. White (eds.), *Aristo of Ceos: Text, Translation, and Discussion*, New Brunswick/London.
- Greaves (1986): Denise D. Greaves, *Sextus Empiricus: Against the Musicians*, Lincoln/London.
- Hammerstaedt (1992): Jürgen Hammerstaedt, “Der Schlussteil von Philodems drittem Buch über Rhetorik”, in: *CErc* 22, 9–118.
- Henrichs (1972): Albert Henrichs, “Toward a New Edition of Philodemus’ Treatise *On Piety*”, in: *GRBS* 13, 67–98.
- Hock/O’Neil (1986): Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O’Neil, *The chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, vol. 1: *The Progymnasmata*, Atlanta.
- Hock/O’Neil (2002): Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O’Neil, *The chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, vol. 2: *Classroom Exercises*, Leiden.
- Indelli (2002): Giovanni Indelli, “Testimonianze su Pericle nei papiri di Filodemo”, in: *CErc* 32, 233–238.
- Indelli (2007): Giovanni Indelli, “Filodemo ed Empedocle”, in: Giovanni Casertano (ed.), *Empedocle tra poesia, medicina, filosofia e politica*, Naples, 277–288.
- Indelli (2010): Giovanni Indelli, “Le colonne I–X 10 di *PHerc.* 1008 (Filodemo, *I vizi*, libro X)”, in: *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology*, Ann Arbor, 323–334.
- Jensen (1911): Christian Jensen, *Philodemi Περὶ κακίῳν liber decimus*, Leipzig.
- Kenyon (1909): Frederic G. Kenyon, “Two Greek School-tablets”, in: *JHS* 29, 29–30.
- Laks (2013): André Laks, “The Pythagorean *Hypomnemata* reported by Alexander Polyhistor in Diogenes Laertius (8.25–33): a Proposal for Reading”, in: Gabriele Cornelli *et al.* (eds.), *On Pythagoreanism*, Berlin, 371–384.
- Lapini (2013): Walter Lapini, “Pitagora maestro di scuola (P.Br.Lib. Add. Ms. 37516, 1)”, in: Id., *Testi frammentari e critica del testo: Problemi di filologia filosofica greca*, Rome, 3–21.
- Lasserre (1954): François Lasserre, *Plutarque: De la musique*, Olten/Lausanne.
- Long/Sedley (1987): Antony A. Long and David N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- Long (2013): Anthony A. Long, “The Eclectic Pythagoreanism of Alexander Polyhistor”, in: Malcolm Schofield (ed.), *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC: New Directions for Philosophy*, Cambridge, 139–159.
- Longo Auricchio/Indelli/Del Mastro (2012): Francesca Longo Auricchio, Giovanni Indelli and Gianluca Del Mastro, “Philodème de Gadara”, in: *DPhA V* 1, 334–359.
- Luzzatto (2004): Maria T. Luzzatto, “L’impiego della ‘chreia’ filosofica nell’educazione antica”, in: Maria S. Funghi (ed.), *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, vol. 2, Florence, 157–187.
- Manetti (1992): Daniela Manetti, “Hippo Crotoniates”, in: *CPF*.1.1**, 455–461.

- Manetti (1999): Daniela Manetti, “‘Aristotle’ and the Role of Doxography in the *Anonymus Londiniensis*”, in: Philip J. van der Eijk (ed.), *Ancient Histories of Medicine: Essays in Medical Doxography and Historiography in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden, 95–142.
- Manetti (2010): Daniela Manetti, *Anonymus Londiniensis: De medicina*, Berlin.
- Matelli (2004): Elisabetta Matelli, “Musicoterapia e catarsi in Teofrasto”, in: *BICS* 47, 153–174.
- McKirahan (1996): Richard D. McKirahan, “Epicurean Doxography in Cicero, *De natura deorum*, Book I”, in: Gabriele Giannantoni and Marcello Gigante (eds.), *Epicureismo greco e romano*, 3 vols., Naples, II, 865–878.
- Obbink (2001): Dirk Obbink, “Le livre I du *De natura deorum* de Cicéron et le *De pietate* de Philodème”, in: Auvray-Assayas/Delattre, 203–225.
- Obbink (2002): Dirk Obbink, “All Gods are True in Epicurus”, in: Dorothea Frede and André Laks (eds.), *Traditions of Theology: Studies in Hellenistic Theology, its Background and Aftermath*, Leiden/Boston/Cologne, 183–222.
- Obbink (2011): Dirk Obbink, “Empedocles and Hellenistic Editions of the Presocratics”, Unpublished talk, Fondation Hardt, Geneva, 14 October 2011.
- Pease (1968): Arthur S. Pease, *M. Tulli Ciceronis “De natura deorum” libri III*, Cambridge.
- Philippson (1938): Robert Philippson, “Philodemos (5)”, in: *RE* XIX 2, 2444–2482.
- Piano (2015): Valeria Piano, “Chr. 4 T.Br.Lib. Add Ms 37516, 1”, in: *CPF* II.2. *Sentenze di Autori Noti e «Chreiai»*, Florence, 381–390.
- Porter (2016): James I. Porter, *The Sublime in Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Preisendanz/Henrichs (1974): Karl Preisendanz and Albert Henrichs (eds.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, vol. 1, Stuttgart.
- Primavesi (2002): Oliver Primavesi, “Lecteurs antiques et byzantins d’Empédocle : De Zénon à Tzétzès”, in: André Laks and Claire Louguet (eds.), *Qu’est-ce que la Philosophie Pré-socratique?*, Villeneuve d’Ascq, 183–204.
- Ranocchia (2007): Graziano Ranocchia, *Aristone: Sul modo di liberare dalla superbia nel decimo libro De vitiis di Filodemo*, Florence.
- Ranocchia (2016): Graziano Ranocchia, “Diogene di Babilonia e Aristone nel *PHerc.1004* ([Filodemo], [Sulla retorica], Libro incerto): Parte prima”, in: *LPh* 4, 95–130.
- Ricciardetto (2014): Antonio Ricciardetto, *L’Anonyme de Londres : Un papyrus médical grec du I^{er} siècle après J.-C.*, Liege.
- Rispoli (1992): Gioia M. Rispoli, “Sesto Empirico e Filodemo contro i musici”, in: Abdallah H. S. El-Mosalamy (ed.), *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Papyrology*, 2 vols., Cairo, I, 213–248.
- Rocconi (2012): Eleonora Rocconi, “Aristoxenus and Musical Éthos”, in: Carl A. Huffman (ed.), *Aristoxenus of Tarentum: Discussion*, New Brunswick/London, 65–90.
- Roskam (2009): Geert Roskam, *Plutarch’s Maxime cum principibus philosopho esse disserendum: An Interpretation with Commentary*, Leuven.
- Schober (1988): Adolf Schober, “Philodemi *De Pietate* pars prior”, in: *CErc* 18, 67–125 [= Id., *Philodemi περὶ εὐσεβείας libelli partem priorem restituit A. Schober*, Diss. ined. Königsberg 1923].
- Schorn (2013): Stefan Schorn, “Die Pythagoreer im zehnten Buch der *Bibliothek* Diodors: Quellen, Traditionen – und Manipulationen”, in: Monica Berti and Virgilio Costa (eds.), *Ritorno ad Alessandria: Storiografia greca e cultura bibliotecaria: tracce di una relazione perduta*, Tivoli, 179–259 [= Id., *Studien zur hellenistischen Biographie und Historiographie*, Berlin/Boston 2018, ch. 6].

- Sedley (1982): David N. Sedley, “The Stoic Criterion of Identity”, in: *Phronesis* 27, 255–275.
- Sedley (1998a): David N. Sedley, “Pythagoras the Grammar Teacher and Didymon the Adulterer”, in: *Hyperboreus* 4, 122–137.
- Sedley (1998b): David N. Sedley, “Pythagoras the Grammar Teacher (PBrLibr Add Ms 37516, 1)”, in: *Papiri filosofici: Miscellanea di Studi* II, Florence, 167–181.
- Sedley (2003): David N. Sedley, “Philodemus and the Decentralisation of Philosophy”, in: *CErc* 33, 31–41.
- Sider (2005): David Sider, *The Fragments of Anaxagoras*, Sankt Augustin (1st ed. Meisenheim am Glan, 1981).
- Siewert (2002): Peter Siewert, *Ostrakismos-Testimonien I: Die Zeugnisse antiker Autoren, der Inschriften und Ostraka über das athenische Scherbengericht aus vorhellenistischer Zeit (487–322 v. Chr.)*, Stuttgart.
- Spinelli (2014): Emidio Spinelli, “Sesto, Pitagora, la musica”, in: R. Loredana Cardullo and Daniele Iozzia (eds.), *Κάλλος και ἀρετή: Studi in onore di Maria Barbanti*, Rome, 335–347.
- Stahl (1971): William H. Stahl, *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*, New York.
- Sudhaus (1892–1896): Siegfried Sudhaus, *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica*, 2 vols. with *Supplementum*, Leipzig.
- Thesleff (1961): Holger Thesleff, *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo.
- Thesleff (1965): Holger Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo.
- Timpanaro Cardini (1958): Maria Timpanaro Cardini, *I Pitagorici: Testimonianze e frammenti*, vol. 1, Florence.
- Toye (2007): David L. Toye, “Epimenides (457)”, in: *BNJ* s.v.
- Tsouna (2007): Voula Tsouna, “Philodemus on Emotions”, in: *BICS Suppl.* 94, *Greek and Roman Philosophy 100 BC–200 AD*, vol. 1, 213–241.
- Tsouna (2010a): Voula Tsouna, “Philodème : L’arrogance”, in: Daniel Delattre and Jackie Pigeaud (eds.), *Les Épicuriens*, Paris, 617–629, 1269–1275.
- Tsouna (2010b): Voula Tsouna, Rev. of Ranocchia (2007), in: *CR* 60, 387–389.
- Vassallo (2015a): Christian Vassallo, “Testimonianze su Anassagora e altri Presocratici nel libro IV della *Retorica* di Filodemo: *Presocratica Herculanensia V*”, in: *LPh* 3, 81–146.
- Vassallo (2015b): Christian Vassallo, “On the Supposed Monism of Thales in *PHerc.* 1788 (= *VH²* VIII 60, Fr. 6): *Praesocratica Herculanensia I*”, in: *Hermes* 143, 101–118.
- Vassallo (2015c): Christian Vassallo, “Die Überlieferung des Fr. 18 Marcovich Heraklits (= DK 22 B 81) in *PHerc.* 1004 (Philodemi *De rhetorica, Liber VII*): *Praesocratica Herculanensia II*”, in: *Mnemosyne*, 68, 185–209.
- Vassallo (2017): Christian Vassallo, “*P.Herc.* 1788 ([*Philodemi*] [*Philosophorum historia?*]): Introduction, Edition, and Commentary”, in: *AnPap* 29, 7–56.
- Wallace (2004): Robert W. Wallace, “Damon of Oa: A Music Theorist Ostracized?”, in: Penelope Murray and Peter J. Wilson (eds.), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City*, Oxford, 249–267.
- Wallace (2010): Robert W. Wallace, “Ethos and Greek Meter”, in: Maria S. Celentano (ed.), *Ricerche di metrica e musica greca per Roberto Pretagostini*, Alessandria, 77–90.
- Wallace (2015): Robert W. Wallace, *Reconstructing Damon: Music, Wisdom Teaching, and Politics in Perikles’ Athens*, Oxford.
- Weems (1981): Sarah M. Weems, *Greek Grammatical Papyri: The School Texts* (PhD Dissertation), University Microfilms Int., Ann Arbor.

- Wehrli (1967): Fritz Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*, vol. 2: *Aristoxenos*, Basel/Stuttgart (1st. ed. 1945).
- Woodward (2010): Linda H. Woodward, “Diogenes of Babylon reading Plato on Music”, in: *BICS Suppl.* 107, 233–253.
- Wouters (2007): Alfons Wouters, “Between the Grammarian and the Rhetorician: The κλίσις χρείας”, in: Veronika Coroleu Oberparleiter, Ingrid Hohenwallner and Ruth E. Kritzer (eds.), *Bezugsfelder: Festschrift für Gerhard Petersmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, Salzburg, 137–154.
- Zhmud (2006): Leonid Zhmud, *The Origin of the History of Science in Classical Antiquity*, Berlin.
- Zhmud (2012): Leonid Zhmud, *Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreans*, Oxford.
- Zhmud (2013): Leonid Zhmud, “Die doxographische Tradition”, in: *GGPh* 1.1, 150–174.
- Zhmud (2016): Leonid Zhmud, “Greek Arithmology: Pythagoras or Plato?”, in: Almut-Barbara Renger and Alessandro Stavru (eds.), *Pythagorean Knowledge from the Ancient to the Modern World: Askesis, Religion, Science*, Wiesbaden, 311–336.
- Zhmud (2019): Leonid Zhmud, “What is Pythagorean in the Pseudo-Pythagorean Literature?”, in: *Philologus* 163.1, 72–94.