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 ἑαυτῷ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων 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

---


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


⁴ Brinckman (1910) 152–155.

rules described in Theon’s *Progymnasmata*, gave to his students to decline not the *chreia* on Pythagoras the philosopher, which was well-known in the rhetorical tradition, but what I believe to have been his own composition unattested elsewhere. 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’Neil 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.” 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.

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). 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.

The third part is complicated, for the words ἐναιμόνων 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, -ονος, third declension, is a *hapax legomenon* that occurs only in the Hippocratic

---

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 γραμματοδιδασκαλείον, γραμματοδιδάσκαλος.
treatise *De ossium natura* (9, p. 194.22 Littré); everywhere else the term ἔναιμος, second declension, is used, so that the correct form would be ἔναίμων ἀπέβας. Sedley’s interpretation won wide acceptance, 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.” 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, for in the first line he added the article ὁ at the left hand margin already after he had written Πυθαγόρας. 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.” Therefore, the original and untraditional beginning of the chreia was ὁ Πυθαγόρας φιλόσοφος ἀποβάς. This finds further support in the fact that ἀποβάω, 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 philosophy would not suit a self-contained chreia either. 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, is with φιλόσοφος taken predicatively: “Pythagoras having become (or turned out to be) a philosopher.” This would perfectly explain both the use of ἀποβάς and

15 Sedley (1998a) 129.
19 Wouters (2007) 151: “when he had abandoned (philosophy) and was teaching grammar.”
21 Sedley (1998a) 129 and n. 15.
22 Cf. ὁ δὲ Ἀλκμάν οἰκέτης ἤν Ἀγησίδου, εὐφυής δὲ ὃν ἠλευθερώθη, καὶ ποιητὴς ἀπέβη (Arist. fr. 611 Rose); καὶ “ὁ ἔγχυς κυρίου πλήρης μαστίγων” ὁ συνεγγίζων δηλονότι τῇ γνώσει κινδύων, φόβων, ἀνίων, θλίψεων διὰ τὸν πόθον τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπολαύει: “μιγός γάρ πεπαιδευμένος σοφός ἀπέβη, καὶ διεσώθη ἀπὸ καύματος υἱὸς νοήμων, υἱὸς δὲ νοήμων δέξηται ἐντολάς” (Clem. Al. Strom. 2.7.35); Ὁσπερ δὲ ἱός οὖχ ἢ ἐπὶ βλαβερός ἔτερῳ σώματι, ἀλλὰ τῷ δεχομένῳ μόνῳ,
the position of the article. 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. The usage of συνεβούλευεν, instead of the more usual ἐφη or ἔπευ in chreiai of this kind, may have served the same purpose 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. 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.” 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. There was a special proverb “Dionysius in Corinth,” on which Demetrius commented in On Style,
using Aristoxenian material. 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, 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). 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, 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 ἐναιμῶν 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 ἔναιμος, 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. 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 ἕκτεσαν τῆς ἀρχῆς πτωχεύει ἐν Κορίνθῳ διδάσκων γράμματα, διήγημα σχέδου ἄν ἃν ἔνην μᾶλλον ἀντὶ λοιπόνος (Demetr. *Eloc.* 241.7).
32 Thus Andorlini/Linguiti (1999) 684. See also Bodnár (2016) 6–7.
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 Philodemene 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

37 Chrysippus: Diog. Laërt. 7.41–42 (= SVF II 295; cf. also SVF II 293 and III 698); Erb (2009) 120–121.
38 Blank (2009) 76.
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

\[\text{T2.} \]

Ἀναξαγόρας Ἰος Μαστιγωθές τοὺς μώλις ἐπεδείκνυεν τοῖς δικαίωτος καὶ Πυθαγόρας ὁ Κύλων ὁ Κροτωνιάτης ἐπεδίκησε τοὺς μάθητάς ἐνέπρησε, καὶ Σωκράτης τῆς ὥτι τὸ μὲν πρὸ τερεμὸν.41

(...)

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 Alcidamas, a student of Gorgias, presented in his Φυσικὸς (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 Alcidamas’ 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

42 (...) τί μάν τοῖς σοφοῖς διδάσκοντι ἄλλ’ ἢ σοφίαν καὶ ἀρετάν; ἢ τί δὲ Ἀναξαγόρειοι καὶ Πυθαγόρειοι ήμεν; (90 C 6.7–8 DK).
44 Plutarch mentions the unjust condemnation of Socrates and Pythagoras, who was burnt alive by the Cylonians (De Stoic. rep. 1051A).
45 Sider (2005) 20 suggested that this episode may come from a comedy.
followers was reported by all the early biographers of Pythagoras. 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. While συκόφανται certainly implies Anaxagoras and Socrates, who have been accused by malicious prosecutors and sentenced in a public trial, a more general word, δυσμενεῖς, 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. 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.

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. 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 Decleva Caizzi), Dicaearchus (FGrHist [cont.] 1400 F 56 = fr. 40 Mirhady = fr. 33 Wehrli) and Timaeus (ap. Just. Epit. 20.4). Though both possibilities cannot be discounted, another context of

49 Acosta Méndez/Angeli (1992) 231; also Erb (2010) 71 n. 34.
51 Zhmud (2012) 97–99. See also below, n. 104 on Timon of Phlius.
this fragment, similar to that of PHerc. 224, fr. 15,\textsuperscript{52} seems more plausible: Philo-
demus 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 Pytha-
goras side by side:

\begin{quote}
T3a.

\footnotesize

\begin{Verbatim}
\textit{ὡσπερ αἱ πολιτικοὶ . . . . τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐν \[\textit{επεικὸν} . . . . \]} ποιεῖν λόγον . . . . . . οἱ ποιηταὶ . . . . . \textit{ἀλλ’ ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ταῦτ’ ἐμαθεὶς ἐφησον . . . . , ὡς Περικλῆς ἐ[λέγετο ἀκού̃ε̣ιν Ἀναξαγόρου καὶ το \[\textit{latet nomen in -ης} \textit{Πυθαγόρου}. . . . καὶ φυσικὰ . . . . . κατὰ τῶν δ.} \textsuperscript{53}
\end{Verbatim}
\end{quote}

Relying on Sudhaus’ tentative restoration of the very lacunose text, in which key
notions are politics, rhetoric, poetry, and philosophy,\textsuperscript{54} one could read it in the
sense that philosophy is more useful for politicians then 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 Pythag-
oras a teacher of the famous Italian legislators Charondas and Zaleucus.\textsuperscript{55} This
tradition is reflected in Philodemus’ elder contemporary Posidonius.\textsuperscript{56}

In this volume, Vassallo proposes a new reading of this Herculanean piece
of evidence:\textsuperscript{57}

\begin{quote}
T3b.

\footnotesize

\begin{Verbatim}
desunt minimum versus 4
\begin{Verbatim}
5 . . . . . \textit{ὡσπερ αἱ <τῶν} πολιτικῶν
. . . . . \textit{τὰ πολλὰ τῶν [. . . . ]} γενού πρὸς
\end{Verbatim}
\end{Verbatim}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{52} See above, n. 47.
\textsuperscript{53} Phld. \textit{Rhet. 4, PHerc. 1104, fr. 7 Sudhaus (1892–1896) II, 299.}
\textsuperscript{54} Cf. Phld. \textit{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?).}
\textsuperscript{55} Zhmud (2012) 114.
\textsuperscript{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).
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{DAPR, T5}, comm. \textit{ad loc.}
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 Damo we can note, however, that unlike Anaxagoras, he has not been accused of impiety but ostracized for his political activity, 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 E-mail of 24.07.2017.
As follows from Blank’s reading, Sudhaus’ restoration of ll. 22–23, ὡς Περικλῆς ἐ[λέ|γετο ἀκού̣ε̣ιν Ἀ[ν]αξαγόρου, is questionable, for Blank reads on l. 23 Ἀ[ν]αξαγόρου, whereas Vassallo’s conjecture καὶ Δάμωνος on l. 23 is longer than the maximum number of letters per line in this column (l. 22). 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, 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:

25 μὲν ἴσως παρέβα̣[λε, Στω̣[ικ̣ο]̣̣̣ς δ’ ο[ὐ]δάμ̣ως 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).
political orators, such as Demosthenes, is mentioned, confirm that he positively evaluated this education without considering it decisive for their success.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{66}

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

In \textit{PHerc.} 1004, containing Book 7 of Philodemus’ \textit{On Rhetoric},\textsuperscript{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


\textsuperscript{66} Dio Chrys. \textit{Or.} 49.7 (transl. by H. L. Crosby).

\textsuperscript{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. In Diogenes’ quotations the name of Pythagoras is lacking, but it appears between them (col. 60) in Philodemus’ own text:

T4.

 difficulté διαν. [          

φιλοσόφων. χ[          

τὸν φιλόσοφον. οὐ μὴν  

άλλη ἐτι ταύτα πάνυ στρογ-  

γύλως ἐπισκόπομεν  

εἰ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦς ἀναγκα-  

ζόμεθα καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς  

ta paraπλήσια παλιν-  

_λογείν.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. Erb’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.” 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? Except for Zeno’s Πυθαγορικά


70 Salvatore Cirillo proposed Χρυσόπουλος, Diogenes’ teacher.


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. 7.4), 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, 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 [ . . . . . . . ] εὐλαγωγότερον [νεανίων | μεθυόλοντων καλέσαντα τίνα αὐλήτριδα νί | τὸ τάναυντία] πάθη ἐμποιεῖν | . . . . ]οὺς τὸ σπονδεῖον | 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 (...)76

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

75 ὁ γοῦν Πυθαγόρας μειράκια ὑπὸ μέθης ἐκβεβακχευμένα ποτὲ θεασάμενος ώς μηδὲν τῶν μεμηνότων διαφέρειν, παρήγεε τῷ συνεπικωμάζοντι τοῦτος αὐλητῇ τὸ σπονδεῖον αὐτοῖς ἐπαυλήσαι 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. 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.

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’ advice 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.

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 Athens and evolved by many thinkers including Plato and Aristotle. It has been linked with Pythagoreanism much later,
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” (πραΰνομαι).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 πραΰνειν 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 (τῇ τάξει τε καὶ συμμετρίᾳ) assuages (πραΰνειν) 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.


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


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): ἐφὴ δὲ λέγεσθαι καὶ περὶ Κλεινίου τοιαῦτα τινα; fr. 131 Wehrli (on Cleinias); Diod. Sic. 10.4.1; Iambl. VP 239 (on Cleinias, from Aristoxenus).

⁸⁶ οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ καθάρσει ἐχρῶντο τοι μὲν σώματος διὰ τῆς ἱατρικῆς, 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.

not. There is no secure evidence that Aristoxenus believed in such effect himself 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?

Martianus Capella, whose source was Varro, a scholar heavily versed in Greek tradition, also preserved the tale with Damon and spondaic melos. 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, 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. Some rhythms are appropriate for μανία (3.400b2) and some for its opposite.

---

89 ἐπεὶ διὰ τί, πρὸς θεὸν, ἐρωτήσω γὰρ ἐτι τοῦτο τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Χρυσίππου, Δάμων ὁ μουσικὸς αὐλητρίδι παραγενόμενος αὐλούσῃ τὸ Φρύγιον νεανίσκοις τισὶν οἰνωμένοις καὶ μανικὰ ἄττα διαπραττομένοις εκέλευσεν αὐλήσας τὸ Δώριαν, οἱ δὲ εὐθὺς ἐπαύσαντο τῆς ἐμπλήκτου φοράς (fr. 168 EK, transl. by R. W. Wallace).
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 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 Pythagoras\(^94\) 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 addsuce as an example a list of four philosophers:

\(\text{T6.} \)

\[\text{Ἀρίστων το[[ν]]ν γεγραφώς Περὶ τοῦ | κο[υ]φίζ[ειν ὑ]περηφανίας \[κόντο|][κόν] τη[π]lid[ι]-
\[διν μὲν ἕσπαθὲν <τὴν> [τ]ό|[δι]ά τύχην ὑπερηφανίας [κατ]i[δ]ύων, οὐ μοί|νον διά
\]

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 (ὑπερηφανία, 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 βίου καὶ τοῦ σχήματος by Alcidamas and Dicaearchus103 than with his arrogance. The same σεμνοπρέπεια appears at 8.36 with a quotation from Timon of


103 On Alcidamas, see above, p. 117. Dicaearchus says: “He (sc. Pythagoras) arrived in Italy and appeared in Kroton, Dikaearchos 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. Reveal-ingly, in the earlier passage, to which Philodemus himself refers (ἀλλὰ καὶ δι’ ἀ προειπ[α]μεν ἄμεις), he defends philosophers from unjustified accusations of arrogance because of τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ τῆς ὄψεως καὶ τοῦ πάντος βίου (col. 6.19–21). 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 φιλόσοφοιαν.

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. As for Aristo, it is doubtful whether he meant Pythagoras among those maniacally hubristic people, who “believed to become gods from mortals.” 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.

A brief extract from Pythagoras’ biography has been found among the fragments of the P Herc. 1788 published by Crönert. He identified frs. 1–8 containing the

104 Τὴν δὲ σεμνοπρέπειαν τοῦ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Τίμων ἐν τοῖς Σίλλοις δάκνων αὐτὸν ὃμως οὐ παρέλιπεν, εἰπὼν οὕτως· Πυθαγόρην τε γόητας ἀποκλίνοντ’ ἐπὶ δόξας / θήρῃ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπων, σεμνηγορίης ὀαριστήν (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 (ὀλαζόνας) claimed that their dignity (σεμνότης) would collapse if they are really scared.
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, Phercydes, 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, yet recently some scholars have been inclined to ascribe PHer. 1788, frs. 1–8 to an unidentified work of Philodemus himself. Fr. 4 of this small bio-doxographical collection deals with Pythagoras, whose name, however, is missing in the text:

T7.


(...)[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 text relying on Diogenes Laërtius’ biography of Pythagoras. One more parallel can be found in Porphyry’s passage, εἰς δὲ τὸ Ἰδαῖον καλοῦμενον ἄντρον καταβὰς (...) ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐπέβη καὶ ἐν Κρότωνι ἐγένετο (VP 17–18), which derives from the Hellenistic biographical handbook, similar or identical to that used by Diogenes Laërtius. Crönert’ conjecture [μετὰ τοῦ Ἐπιμενίδου] has not been further supported, but the preserved part of the extract offers well known

114 Dorandi (1982) 351 n. 32 speaks of “azzardate integrazioni.”
115 εἰτ’ ἐν Κρήτῃ σὺν Ἐπιμενίδῃ κατηλθέν εἰς τὸ Ἰδαῖον ἄντρον (...)[καὶ τὰ περὶ θεῶν ἐν ἀπορρήτους ἐμαθεν. εἰτ’ ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς Ἴμος, καὶ εὑρὼν τὴν πατρίδα τυραννομένην ὑπὸ Πολυκράτους, ἀπῆρεν εἰς Κρότωνα (8.3); εἰς Μεταπόντιον ὑπεξελθεῖν κάκει τὸν βίον καταστρέψαι (8.40); ως δ’ οἱ πλεῖοι, ἐτη βιως 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 (ἄντρον), 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, 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, 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, in a long list of theologoi, historians, and philosophers from Thales to Diogenes.
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’ Θεολογικὴ ἱστορία and Theophrastus’ Φυσικῶν δόξαι, 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). 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 extract and even learn the opinion of Alcmaeon of Croton, who preceded Pythagoras in *Nat. D.* 1.11.27:

_Crotoniates autem Alcmaeo, qui soli et luna 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 semptternis 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 Α 12 DK): _παραπλησίως δὲ τούτοις καὶ λ. ἔοικεν ὑπολαβεῖν περὶ ψυχῆς· φησὶ γάρ αὐτὴν ἀθάνατον εἶναι διὰ τὸ ἑοικέναι τοῖς ἀθανάτοις· τούτο δ’ ὑπάρχειν
(...) 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. 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. Diogenes Laërtius most probably derives this opinion from the biographer Sosiai, as he says that it is an opinion generally accepted later becoming dominant.

---

126 Phld. Piet., PHerc 1428, fr. 10 Schober (1988) 113. The dipe 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).
129 According to Flavius Josephus, αὐτὸ ὡς ὁ οὐδὲν ὁμολογεῖ τῷ θείῳ πάντα συνεχῶς ἀεί, σελήνην, ἥλιον, τοὺς ἄστέρας καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἄστρων δίδων. Aet. 4.2.2: Α. φύσιν αὐτοκίνητον κατ’ ἀδιαβροκίνητον καὶ διὰ τούτῳ ἄθανατον αὐτὴν καὶ προσεμφέρῃ τοῖς τείχοις ὑπολαμβάνει. Cf. also Clem. Al. Protr. 5.66.
crates of Rhodes (fl. c. 180 BC), who may have been one of τίνες. 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. 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 commenantem, 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? 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. 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. 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.

---

130 ΄Ενιοι μὲν οὖν Πυθαγόραν μηδὲ ἐν καταλεπτῶν σύγγραμμά φασιν διαπεσόντες (8.6); see Centrone (1992) 4189.
132 Cic. Nat. D. 1.11.27–28 (transl. by H. Rackham). Cf. Id. Cato 78: Audiebam Pythagoram Pythagoreosque, incolas 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.
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.
Similarly, the *Pythagorean Hypomnemata* presenting a largely Stoic body of cosmological and physical doctrines\(^ {136} \) 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).


\(^{139}\) Ποσειδώνιος δὲ καὶ Πυθαγόραν φησίν, αὐτοῦ μὲν τὸν Πυθαγόραν συγγράμματος οὐδένος εἰς ἡμᾶς διασωζομένου τεκμαίρομενος δ’ ἐξ ὃν ἐνοι τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ γεγράφασιν (fr. 151 ΕΚ). Cf. Claud. Mam. De st. an. 2.3: *Pythagorae igitur, quia nihil ipse scriptitavert, a posteris quaerenda sententia est.*

\(^{140}\) οὐ γάρ ἀριστοτέλης μένον ἢ Πλάτων ἐδόκεαν οὕτως ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ πρόσθεν ἄλλοι τέ τινες καὶ ὁ Πυθαγόρας, ὡς καὶ ὁ Ποσειδώνιος φησιν ἔκεινον πρώτου μὲν εἶναι λέγων τὸ δόγμα, Πλάτωνα δ’ ἐξεργάσασθαι καὶ κατασκευάσας τελεώτερον αὐτὸ (fr. 165 ΕΚ; transl. by I. G. Kidd).
in Greek philosophy,\textsuperscript{141} which involved, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{142} The 1st cent. BC became a watershed between two categories of the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha, the traditional and the Neopythagorean ones.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{dogmata}.	extsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{147}

The following two passages from the anonymous commentary in Plato’s \textit{Theaetetus} (1st cent. AD) preserved in a 2nd-cent. Graeco-Egyptian papyrus

\textsuperscript{141} See e.g. Sedley (2003).
\textsuperscript{142} Centrone (2014).
\textsuperscript{143} Cf. Zhmud (2019).
\textsuperscript{144} Thesleff (1965).
\textsuperscript{145} See e.g. the \textit{Anonymus Photii}: Ὅτι ἐνατὸς ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου διάδοχος γέγονε φησὶ Πλάτων Ἀρχύτου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου μαθητὴς γενόμενος, δέκατος δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης (237.5–7 Thesleff).
\textsuperscript{146} There is one reference, rather critical, to the Πυθαγόρειοι in Phld. \textit{De mus.}, \textit{PHerc.} 1497, col. 145.16–19 Delattre (2007) II, 301.
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.


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 ὁμιλήσας τοῖς Πυθα[γορείοις,] | ἄλλα τῇ τινα εὗ ἔδιδασκέν δράματα καὶ τὸ περὶ τοῦ αὐξομένου, δὴ | λόγῳ ἐφοδιακῷ καὶ πιστῷ ἐπέρανε.

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.


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, originally occurs in a fragment of his comedy featuring a debtor refusing to pay to the creditor under the pretext that today they

151 Pl. Tht. 152e; Plut. Comm. not. 1083a (= Chrysipp. SVF II 762). Plato was accused of plagiarizing Epicharmus by a certain Alcimus (Diog. Laêrt. 3.9 = 23 B 1 DK = fr. 275 PCG).
are not the same persons as yesterday.\textsuperscript{152} He first appeals to the pebble-arithmetic of the Pythagoreans:\textsuperscript{153}

(A.) αἰ πὸτ ἀριθμόν τις περισσόν, αἰ δὲ λῆς πὸτ ἄρτιον, ποτθέμειν λῆ ψάφον ἢ καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν λαβεῖν, ἢ δοκεῖ κα τόι γ’ <ἔθ’> ωτὸς εἰμεν; (B.) οὐκ ἐμίν γά 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.\textsuperscript{154}

This, of course, by no means makes Epicharmus a student of the Pythagoreans,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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. \textit{VP} 267) and no other author before 300 BC calls him a Pythagorean.

The process of his Pythagoreanization took a long time.\textsuperscript{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) \textit{Helothales the Father of Epichar-}


\textsuperscript{154} Epich. fr. 276 \textit{PCG} (transl. by J. Barnes).

\textsuperscript{155} Cf. Horky (2013) 131–137, who exploits this possibility.

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{psephoi} – just as the figurate numbers.”

\textsuperscript{157} Epicharmus as Pythagorean: Plut. \textit{Num.} 8; Clem. Al. \textit{Strom.} 5.14.100; Diog. Laërt. 8.78; Iambl. \textit{VP} 241 and 266.
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. 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. 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, Ιατρικῆ συναγωγή or Μενώνεια, similar to Theophrastus’ Φυσικῶν δόξαι, will be written by Aristotle’s student Menon, though it is attributed to Aristotle, as this was the case with the author of Anonymus Londiniensis. More recently, however, many scholars tend to write on ‘Aristotelian doxography,’ on ‘Aristotle,’ ‘Aristotle-Menon’ or ‘Aristotle or Menon.’ Why

---

159 Editions: Diels (1893); Manetti (2010); Ricciardetto (2014).
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. Hippon was mentioned only twice, both times very briefly and with disdain, whereas his views and arguments, as many scholars suggested, were attributed by Aristotle to Thales and vice versa. 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 archē as “moisture” (ὑγρότης, τὸ ὑγρόν), while Aristotle’s transforms it into Thalesian “water” and never reveals that Philolaus’ archai were ἄπειρα and περαιὸντα (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.
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