

Leonid Zhmud*

What is Pythagorean in the Pseudo-Pythagorean Literature?

<https://doi.org/10.1515/phil-2018-0003>

Abstract: This paper discusses continuity between ancient Pythagoreanism and the pseudo-Pythagorean writings, which began to appear after the end of the Pythagorean school ca. 350 BC. Relying on a combination of temporal, formal and substantial criteria, I divide *Pseudopythagorica* into three categories: 1) early Hellenistic writings (late fourth – late second centuries BC) ascribed to Pythagoras and his family members; 2) philosophical treatises written mostly, yet not exclusively, in pseudo-Doric from the turn of the first century BC under the names of real or fictional Pythagoreans; 3) writings attributed to Pythagoras and his relatives that continued to appear in the late Hellenistic and Imperial periods. I will argue that all three categories of pseudepigrapha contain astonishingly little that is authentically Pythagorean.

Keywords: Pythagoreanism, pseudo-Pythagorean writings, Platonism, Aristotelianism

Forgery has been widespread in time and place and varied in its goals and methods, and it can easily be confused with superficially similar activities.

A. Grafton

Note: An earlier version of this article was presented at the colloquium “Pseudopythagorica: stratégies du faire croire dans la philosophie antique” (Paris, 28 May 2015). I would like to thank Constantinos Macris (CNRS) for his kind invitation. The final version was written during my fellowship at the IAS of Durham University and presented at the B Club, Cambridge, in Mai 2016. I am grateful to Gábor Betegh for inviting me to give a talk and to the audience for the vivid discussion. My thanks are due to Phillip Horky (Durham) and Stefan Schorn (Leuven) for their very helpful comments on this paper.

***Corresponding author: Leonid Zhmud**, Institute for the History of Science and Technology, Russian Academy of the Sciences, St. Petersburg, Russia, E-Mail: l.zhmud@spbu.ru

1 Two Waves of Pythagorean Pseudepigrapha

Controversy around the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha¹ has a long and venerable history going back to the time shortly after the disappearance of the Pythagorean school around 350 BC. The last third of the fourth century BC witnessed a rapid growth of Pythagoras' biographies (Aristoxenus, Dicaearchus, Neanthes) and other historical writings featuring him (Theopompus, Andron of Ephesus, Timaeus of Tauromenium, Duris), which gave an impetus to the fabrication of pseudepigrapha accompanying them. Ironically, the historian Neanthes of Cyzicus, the first author to mention a pseudo-Pythagorean text, namely, a letter of Pythagoras' son Telauges to Philolaus, considered it a forgery.² Thus, the history of the pseudo-Pythagorean writings started from a detected fraud, which has not in the least hindered them in becoming, over time, one of the most successful cases of systematic production of philosophical pseudepigrapha. To be sure, the key to success was found only in late Hellenism, after almost two centuries of producing various pseudepigrapha under the names of Pythagoras and members of his family. As for the early Hellenistic writings, not all of them were philosophical in content but those which were did not impress contemporary philosophers, who simply ignored them.³ We find them mentioned only in the remnants of the Hellenistic biography of the third-second centuries BC (see below, section 3), though some biographers, such as Sosicrates (fl. ca. 180 BC), duly stated that Pythagoras left no writings.⁴ In the first century BC Philodemus of Gadara, keenly interested in the history of philosophical schools, reported that, according to some experts, whom he seemed to trust, none of the works ascribed to Pythagoras himself (by his students?) really belongs to him.⁵ We may assume that Philodemus knew some of them but defied their efforts to look authentic.

At around the same time Philodemus' elder contemporary Posidonius (ca. 135–ca. 50 BC) formulated a solution that already in his lifetime revitalized the whole business of forging the Pythagorean philosophical literature. No work by Pythagoras is preserved, noted the Stoic, but going by what was written by some

1 They are cited, if not indicated otherwise, by page and line of Thesleff (1965).

2 *FGrHist* 84 F 26 = 189.13f. For a complete documentation, see Macris (2016a).

3 The only exemption seems to be Chrysippus' quotation of the one-line verse from what later became the *Golden Verses* (v. 54). He attributes it to "the Pythagoreans" (*SVF* 2.1000). Cf. Thom (2001).

4 D. L. 8.6; Centrone (1992) 4189.

5 [Ιπυ]θαγόρου δ' αὐτοῦ γ' οὐδέν φασι τινε[ς] εἶναι τῶν ἀναφ[ε]ρ[ο]μένων παρὰ [τῶν μαθητῶν εἰς αὐτόν] (*De pietate* 3, fr. 10, p. 113 Schober = col. 4^b, p. 66 Gomperz). Cf. a similar verdict by Josephus Flavius: αὐτοῦ μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν ὁμολογεῖται σύγγραμμα (*Ap.* 1.163).

of his students, he held the same particular view on emotions in the soul as Plato and Hippocrates.⁶ One more fragment of Posidonius leaves no doubt that he was willing to infer about Pythagoras' doctrines from the writings of his students and followers in which Pythagoras figured as a predecessor of Plato and Aristotle.⁷ Posidonius' willingness doubtless reflected the general turn in philosophy of the first century BC (cf. below, section 4). Very soon the Graeco-Roman world saw a real flood of apocrypha written in pseudo-Doric and attributed to historical or alleged Pythagoreans – Archytas, Ocellus Lucanus, Timaeus Locrus and others. The principal aim of these writings, none of which can be safely dated before the first century BC, was to present Pythagoras and his school as the most important predecessors of the recently found or reestablished Platonic and Aristotelian *dogmata*. It is this second, more promising turn of fortune that has created the pseudo-Pythagorean literature as we know it today. In contrast to the early Hellenistic pseudepigrapha, surviving in a few fragments not longer than several lines, the preserved Doric treatises and extensive extracts from them constitute a sizable amount of what was considered by the writers of the Imperial time as the works of Pythagoras' students. No doubt this was due to the fact that they were taken at their face value, so that only Themistius openly expressed his suspicion concerning the authorship of the pseudo-Archytean treatise *On the Whole System*.⁸ When at the very end of Antiquity the Neoplatonic commentators Olympiodorus and his students David and Elias attempted for the first time to provide a classification of pseudonymous writings, the most noble reason to produce such works, namely, εὐγνωμοσύνην or εὐνοϊαν μαθητῶν πρὸς διδάσκαλον, was invariably ascribed to the Pythagoreans.⁹ Since Pythagoras decided to leave not a written, but an ensouled work, which is to say, his students, says Olympiodorus

6 Ποσειδώνιος δὲ καὶ Πυθαγόραν φησίν, αὐτοῦ μὲν τοῦ Πυθαγόρου συγγράμματος οὐδενὸς εἰς ἡμᾶς διασωζομένου τεκμαιρόμενος δ' ἐξ ὧν ἔνοι τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ γεγράφασιν (F 151 E.-K.). Cf. *Pythagorae igitur, quia nihil ipse scriptitaverit, a posteris quaerenda sententia est* (Claudianus Mamertus, *De statu animae*, 2.3).

7 “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” (Gal. *De plac. Hipp. et Plat.* 4.7.40 = Posid. F 165, tr. Kidd).

8 He suggested that its author was not Archytas the Pythagorean but rather “a Peripatetic ‘Archytas’ who tried to lend authority to a new work by means of an old name” (21.20–22.5 = Szlezák 1972, test. 4). It seems that Themistius had doubts about other writings of Archytas too: “I pass over Pittacus, Bias and Cleobulus, I pass over Archytas of Tarentum, men who busied themselves more with public affairs than treatises” (Them. *Or.* 17 = Huffman 2005, test A1e).

9 Olymp. *Proleg.* 13.36–14.4; David. *In Porph. Isag. comm.* 82.13–19; Elias. *In Porph. Isag. comm.* 10.11–17; id. *In Arist. Cat.*, 128.1–5. See Mueller (1969).

(cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 275d–276a), they out of love and kindness to the master attributed to him some of their writings. For this reason all the works circulating under Pythagoras' name are spurious, was the verdict. Revealingly, the authenticity of the writings of the Pythagoreans themselves was in no doubt.

Thus, we have to discern between three categories in the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha, relying on a combination of temporal, formal and substantial criteria. The first category consists of treatises, poems and letters of various contents, which are a) ascribed to Pythagoras and his family members, b) written in Attic, Ionic or hexameter c) from the late fourth to the late second centuries BC and d) preserved only in a small number of fragments. It is only this category of the pseudo-Pythagorean texts which is reliably attested before the first century BC. To the second category belong a) philosophical treatises with a clear agenda b) written mostly but not exclusively in pseudo-Doric c) since the turn of the first century BC d) under the names of known, unknown and fictional Pythagoreans, e) many of which came down to us in full or excerpts. There is no reliable evidence that these texts existed before the first century BC. What is crucial for my (provisional) classification is the combination of criteria, and that is why I relate to the third, mixed category, the pseudepigrapha a) written in different dialects and b) attributed to Pythagoras and his relatives, c) which continued to appear in the late Hellenistic and Imperial periods and d) partly survived (in full or in fragments). The third category will not interest me much in this paper.¹⁰

2 Filling the Gap

As one may notice, this classification only partly coincides with H. Thesleff's classification of the pseudo-Pythagorean writings,¹¹ which preceded his very useful edition of them. Thesleff divided *Pseudopythagorica* into two general classes: 1) writings attributed to Pythagoras and members of his family, or concerning Pythagoras himself or his teaching;¹² with some exceptions they were written not in Doric; 2) writings ascribed to the Pythagoreans, known or unknown, and written mostly in Doric. Whereas the main difference between my first and

10 To this category belong, e.g., Pythagoras' *Hieros Logos* (164.1–165.27) and Bro(n)tinus' *De intellectu* (55.19–56.10), both in Doric, Pythagoras' speeches in Iamblichus (*VP* 37–57, 217–219 = 178.1–184.33), five letters of Pythagorean women, two of them in Doric (see below, section 4), various religious poems of Arignote, one more daughter of Pythagoras (50.25–51.10), etc.

11 Thesleff (1961) and (1971).

12 "Writing concerning Pythagoras himself or his teaching" is a rather fuzzy category to work with, it includes too diverse works, which are not related to those ascribed to Pythagoras.

second categories is chronological, in Thesleff it is geographical: class I was written in the East, class II in the West. Having postulated a direct link between the Doric-speaking Pythagorean community in Magna Graecia of the fourth century BC and the Doricized pseudepigrapha, Thesleff attempted to evenly distribute them between the fourth and second centuries BC; pseudepigrapha of the first class were written mostly in the same time. Relying mostly on linguistic criteria, Thesleff paid insufficient if any attention to the philosophical content of the material he edited,¹³ therefore his datings are mostly wrong and his conclusions were in the end rejected by most students of post-classical Pythagoreanism, among them W. Burkert, T. A. Szlezák, M. Baltes, A. Städele and B. Centrone.¹⁴

It is important to bear in mind, however, that his theory represents only one of many attempts to fill the gap between ancient Pythagoreanism (late sixth-mid-fourth centuries BC) and the preserved pseudo-Pythagorean literature of much later date. In the mid-19th century E. Zeller, having collected and studied most of the relevant sources, came to the conclusion that Pythagorean philosophy died in the fourth century BC and was only revived in first-century BC Alexandria as Neopythagoreanism, one form of which were the pseudo-Pythagorean treatises.¹⁵ His judgment was generally shared until the early 20th century,¹⁶ but later on several generations of scholars repeatedly tried to limit or deny it – without acknowledged success.¹⁷ The idea of M. Wellman, shared by W. Wiersma, that *Pythagorika Hypomnemata* transmitted by Alexander Polyhistor are a fourth-century source was rebutted by W. Theiler and then by A.-J. Festugière.¹⁸ The interpretation of Pythagoras' speeches in Iamblichus' *VP* as a fifth- or fourth-century source, suggested by A. Rostagni, supported by Thesleff and developed by C. de Vogel, has also been rejected.¹⁹ A. Delatte's influential book on the Pythagorean literature revealed his general tendency to date many Pythagorean apocrypha in the fifth-fourth centuries BC.²⁰ Theiler and later Burkert showed that

13 He explained this by his insufficient knowledge of Hellenistic philosophy and his contention that “the correct method in this case is not to use doctrines for dating the texts, but to use them, once the texts have been dated, for illuminating the history of Greek philosophy” (Thesleff 1961, 5).

14 Burkert (1961) and (1971); Szlezák (1972); Baltes (1972) 20–26; Städele (1980); Centrone (2000); Centrone (2014).

15 Zeller (1919) 92–115. Zeller's hypothesis that small religious Pythagorean communities survived during Hellenism has not been confirmed. See Burkert (1961) 227–228.

16 See, e.g.: Praechter (1891); Wilhelm (1915) 163.

17 For a useful survey of different views, see Balch (1992).

18 Wellmann (1919); Wiersma (1941). Cf. Theiler (1926); Festugière (1945). For a history of its modern reception, see Laks (2013) 371–374.

19 Rostagni (1955); de Vogel (1966) 70–147. Cf. Burkert (1967); Zucconi (1970).

20 Delatte (1915).

the greater part of the Pythagorean texts examined by Delatte were late forgeries;²¹ the same can be easily demonstrated in respect to the rest of these texts, for example, the famous Pythagorean oath.²² (More critical was the approach of Delatte's son Lucien to three Pythagorean political apocrypha: he dated them in the first-second centuries AD.)²³ P. Corsen's attempt to show that the late Hellenistic work on Pythagorean *symbola* by a 'Pythagorean Androcydes' belongs actually to the fourth-century BC doctor failed to convince his colleagues.²⁴ The same is true in respect to G. Méautis' thesis, shared by B. L. van der Waerden and P. Kingsley, of "une tradition ininterrompue" linking ancient Pythagoreanism and Neopythagoreanism, J. Thom's dating of the *Golden Verses* in the fourth century BC,²⁵ and other related ideas. We have to admit the time gap of several centuries between the death of the Pythagorean school and the first *extant* Pythagorean pseudepigrapha.

I would suggest a simple rule concerning the preserved pseudo-Pythagorean writings: none of them was compiled before the first century BC.²⁶ The earliest of them, *Pythagorika Hypomnemata*, is distinct by its mixed nature:²⁷ 1) it is not written in Doric, but in koine, 2) it is not yet ascribed to any Pythagorean, but gives Pythagoras as an authority, and 3) it combines a typically Neopythagorean system of principles, Monad and Indefinite Dyad, with a largely Stoic body of cosmological and physical doctrines and religious prescriptions, coinciding partly with the Pythagorean (such prescriptions are very untypical for the Doric pseudepigrapha). Burkert's suggestion to date it in the third century BC by connecting it with a letter of Lysis did not gain much support, because Lysis' letter, written in Doric, appeared later than the *Hypomnemata*, most probably in the first century AD, and does not reveal any relation to this text.²⁸ Thus, if measured by the amount of preserved material the pseudo-Pythagorean writings of the third-second centuries BC are barely comparable with those which were written later. But they can still be reasonably compared in respect to their close-

21 Theiler (1926); Burkert (1961).

22 Zhmud (2012) 301–302.

23 Delatte (1942).

24 Corsen (1912). Cf. Burkert (1972) 167 n. 9.

25 Méautis (1922); van der Waerden (1965) 860–864; Thom (1995). On the *Golden Verses* cf. Flinterman (2014) 342.

26 Thus Zeller (1919) 123 n. 3. I cannot share Burkert's objections (Burkert 1961, 228–229), because they concern either lost writings of the first category or some texts of the second category, which he dated too early (see below, n. 28).

27 D. L. 8.23–33 = Alexander Polyhistor *FGrHist* 273 F 94; Long (2013).

28 Burkert (1961) 24–25. Cf. Städele (1980) 212–216; Du Toit (1997) 234. Cf. the overview: van der Waerden (1965) 840–850.

ness to the historically attested teachings of Pythagoras and ancient Pythagoreans. Which category contains more authentic material – the first, which was closer in time to ancient Pythagoreanism, or the second, which consciously imitated a distinct style and therefore presumably the ideas of the Pythagorean treatises written in Doric by Philolaus and Archytas? Anticipating my conclusions, I will argue that both categories of pseudepigrapha contain astonishingly little that is authentically Pythagorean and even that which is related for the most part not to the realm of philosophical or scientific theories and ideas.

3 Early Hellenistic *Pseudopythagorica*

Let us start with the first category, the texts which are attested in the early Hellenistic period and attributed to Pythagoras²⁹ and the fictitious members of his family – his wife Theano, his sons Arimnestus and Telauges as well as his father-in-law Bro(n)tinus, who happened to be a real Pythagorean. To this list we may provisionally add two Pythagoreans: Hippasus, a student of Pythagoras, and Lysis, a contemporary of Philolaus, but strike off Lycon, Myia, Milon, Metrodorus and others, who figure in Thesleff's class I,³⁰ but either are not Pythagoras' relatives (Milon),³¹ or not Pythagoreans at all (Lycon),³² or we do not possess sufficient evidence that their writings existed in the period under review (Milon, Arignote, Myia)³³ and can be regarded as close in time to historical Pythagoreanism. It should be noted that to most members of Pythagoras' family Doricized treatises and/or letters are assigned which are late and belong to the third, not to the first category.³⁴

What is known about the writings of Pythagoras' relatives is not very impressive. A letter of Telauges, biographical in character, is mentioned by Neanthes (*FGrHist* 84 F 26), a two-line epigram of Arimnestus is quoted by Duris of Samos

29 Cf. Centrone (2014) 316–318, who includes in this category also *Pythagorika Hypomnemata* and *Hieros Logos*.

30 Thesleff (1961) 27–28.

31 Milon figures as the husband of Myia (who is *not* said to be Pythagoras' daughter) only once, in the catalogue of the Pythagorean women (Iambl. *VP* 267, p. 147.1–2), which dates from the Imperial period. Anyway, it is by no means certain that a fragment of *Physika* ascribed to a certain Milon (122.24–123.3) is a pseudepigraphon (the more so a Hellenistic one) or that its author was meant to be Milon of Croton.

32 Zhmud (2012) 72 n. 48, 119.

33 Suda's entry on Arignote refers to her *Bakhika*, *Hieros Logos* and *Initiates of Dionysus* (p. 51.3–5). Clement of Alexandria was the first to mention one of them (*Strom.* 4.121.4). No fragments remain. On Myia's letter see below, section 4.

34 See above, n. 10 and below, section 4.

(*FGrHist* 76 F 23); Hippobotus (ca. 200 BC) refers to the writings of Theano (fr. 14 Gigante) without giving any detail.³⁵ A Hellenistic grammarian Epigenes ascribed to Bro(n)tinus two Orphic poems, *Peplos* and *Physika* (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.21.131 = 17 A 4), yet this cannot be more than a guess, as is the case with all such attributions starting with Ion of Chios' claim (36 B 2) that Pythagoras ascribed some of his poems to Orpheus.³⁶ The situation with two Pythagoreans provisionally included in our list is even worse. In a section of Pythagoras' biography Diogenes Laertius twice refers to the opinions of the Hellenistic biographers on Pythagoras' disputed works. First, according to an anonymous authority, a certain unnamed work attributed to Pythagoras was in fact written by Lysis (D. L. 8.7). Whatever work is in question,³⁷ this is obviously a pure guess, in no way guaranteeing that this writing really circulated under Lysis' name. Secondly, Heraclides Lembus (first part of the second century BC) in his *Epitome* of Sotion's *Successions of Philosophers*, having enumerated several writings of Pythagoras, makes a very similar remark: but a Μυστικός λόγος belongs (not to Pythagoras but) to Hippasus and was written by him with the aim of discrediting Pythagoras. There were also many other books composed by (otherwise unknown) Aston of Croton, and attributed to Pythagoras (D. L. 8.7). We are again in the middle of a dispute on Pythagoras' genuine and spurious works and again deal most probably with a conjecture. The existence of this shadowy Μυστικός λόγος outside of biographer's fancies is questionable.³⁸ We have to conclude, then, that secure traces of the early Hellenistic pseudepigrapha attributed to Pythagoras' students and followers are not to be found. Those mentioned by Posidonius must have belonged to the second category and been in circulation before 50 BC.

Now, Pythagoras himself. The biographer Satyrus (late third – early second century BC) tells the story that Plato bought from Philolaus “three Pythagorean books” published by him, containing the previously unavailable teaching of

35 Von Fritz (1934) 1380 suggested that the oldest apophthegms attributed to Theano go back to the turn of the fourth century BC but do not contain anything specifically Pythagorean. For a complete documentation on Theano, see Macris (2016b) at 825–833 (apophthegms) and 833–837 (writings).

36 “That the poems were actually anonymous, and that no one really knew who composed them is clear” (Linforth 1941, 351).

37 For different interpretations, see Diels (1890) 451 n. 1; Delatte (1922) 163; Burkert (1961) 24–26; Centrone (1992) 4189–4190.

38 Demetrius of Magnesia (ca. 50 BC) says Hippasus left no writings (D.L. 8.84). According to Apollonius' of Tyana *Life of Pythagoras*, Ninon, a political opponent of the Pythagoreans, compiled a Ἱερὸς λόγος, a pamphlet accusing Pythagoras in conspiracy (Iamb. *VP* 257– = *FGrHist* 1064 F 2). Hippasus appears here as Ninon's ally and the work in question is probably the same. See Burkert (1972) 207 n. 78; Zhmud (2012) 100 with n. 65.

Pythagoras (D. L. 3.9). This famous *tripartitum* in Ionic prose included the following books: Παιδευτικόν, Πολιτικόν, Φυσικόν.³⁹ Diogenes Laertius quotes the opening words of the Φυσικόν: “Nay, I swear by the air I breathe, I swear by the water I drink, I will never suffer censure on account of this work” (8.6).

Sotion adds to the list of Pythagoras’ works two poems, *On the Universe* (Περὶ τοῦ ὄλου) and Ἰερὸς λόγος, as well as *On the Soul*, *On Piety*, *Helothales*, *The Father of Epicharmus of Cos*, and *Croton* (8.7). It is tempting to connect *On the Universe* with an astronomical poem which, according to Callimachus, was falsely ascribed to Pythagoras.⁴⁰ One more pseudepigraphon, entitled Κοπίδες (8.8), reminds us of Heraclitus’ invective against Pythagoras as κοπίδων ἀρχηγός.⁴¹ Cato (*Agr.* 157) and Pliny (*HN* 24.156–159) relied on a forgery known as *On the Effect of Plants* (174.25–176.20).

The subject matter of diverse writings fabricated under Pythagoras’ name before the first century BC ranges widely from religion and magic to natural philosophy and history, and though what is available from them is mostly the titles (some of which do not inspire much confidence) we can still obtain some information about their origin and content.⁴² First, the origin. Callimachus, most probably Satyrus, Sotion and Heraclides Lembus, mentioning Pythagoras’ writings, all worked in Alexandria.⁴³ Bolus of Mendes, the possible author of Pythagoras’ treatise on magical plants,⁴⁴ also comes from Egypt. It follows then that the writings assigned to Pythagoras most probably began to be fabricated in Alexandria in the third century BC.⁴⁵ Those ascribed to his sons appeared slightly earlier and are not connected with Alexandria.

What is Pythagorean, then, in the scattered remains of these texts? The quotation from the *tripartitum* says that after 207 years in Hades Pythagoras has returned to the land of the living (D. L. 8.14).⁴⁶ This may come from the biographi-

39 D. L. 8.6; 9; 15. Van der Waerden (1965) 847–848; Schorn (2013) 226–233.

40 Burkert (1972) 307.

41 22 B 81 DK = Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 132. See Diels (1890) 455–457.

42 Burkert’s ingenious but intricate reconstruction of Pythagoras’ book (ca. second cent. BC) on the harmony of the spheres (Burkert 1961, 28–43; cf. van der Waerden 1965, 857–858) was not supported by Thesleff, who rightly points out that “the system, or systems, were not necessarily produced in a pseudepigraphon under the name of Pythagoras” (Thesleff 1965, 186 n.).

43 Schorn disputes, but does not rule out the possibility that Satyrus lived in Alexandria (Schorn 2006, 5–6, 12–13, cf. 13 n. 50).

44 Burkert (1961) 239; Węcowski (2012).

45 Diels (1890) 452 n. 4, 461.

46 See Rohde (1925) 599–600. Burkert (1972) 140 n. 110 and Thesleff (1965) 171.21 correct 207 to 216 (6³). Cf. a parallel tradition going back to Pythagorean apocrypha (Androcydes) and Hellenistic biography: *Theol. ar.* 52.8.

cal tradition, eagerly exploiting the subject of metempsychosis, for it was the best known religious teaching of Pythagoras. Again in the *tripartitum* the life of a man is divided into four parts of twenty years – a child, an adolescent, a youth, and an adult – which corresponds to the four seasons (8.8–10). This derives from Aristoxenus' *Pythagorean Precepts* (fr. 35), and though in this work Pythagorean material is mixed with Platonic, this particular division may well go back to Aristoxenus' Pythagorean teachers.⁴⁷ Pythagoras' censure of drunkenness and sexual indulgence in the *tripartitum* (D. L. 8.9–10) stems from the same "famous compendium of Pythagorean *Lebensweisheit*",⁴⁸ as Diels called it.⁴⁹ Note that in the *Precepts* Aristoxenus always referred to the Pythagoreans, not Pythagoras. The opening line of the Ἱερὸς λόγος, ὧ νεοί, ἀλλὰ σέβεσθε μεθ' ἡσυχίας τάδε πάντα' (D. L. 8.7) might point to Pythagorean silence and secrecy, favorite topics of the biographical tradition, which are not reliably attested in the classical sources.⁵⁰ This is more or less everything in terms of ideas and customs which can be extracted from what is left of the Pythagorean apocrypha of the third-second centuries BC.⁵¹

The result is not unexpected. Pythagoras wrote nothing and the forgers did not possess a corpus of authoritative texts which they could have imitated as in the case of Hesiod, Epicharmus or Plato. Nor were they interested in looking for reflexes of Pythagoras' teaching in the authentic treatises of his followers. What would be then their possible sources for philosophical or scientific doctrines of Pythagoras? From Democritus (68 A 33.1) to Zeno of Citium (D. L. 7.4) many philosophers wrote books on Pythagoras or things Pythagorean, among them Heraclides Ponticus, Speusippus, Xenocrates, Aristotle and Aristoxenus, but it is only the latter whose influence is traceable in the early Hellenistic pseudepigrapha. Although Aristoxenus was good as the first biographer of Pythagoras and his followers, their philosophy did not interest him much, except for their moral

47 An analogous passage is to be found in Anonymus Diodori (second-first century BC), a biography of Pythagoras in Diodorus Siculus (233.8–11 = 10.9.5), which is based chiefly on Aristoxenus (Zhmod 2012, 72 n. 47; Schorn 2014, 311–314). *Pace* Thesleff, it has to be excluded from the *Pseudopythagorica*.

48 Aristox. fr. 19 W. Cf. parallels with the Anonymus Diodori (10.9.4). Sexual abstinence was practiced by Pythagorean athletes: Zhmod (2012) 353 n. 21–22.

49 Diels (1890) 467. See also Wilhelm (1915) 163.

50 Zhmod (2012) 150–158. Other 'fragments' of the *Hieros Logos* collected by Thesleff are late. The motive of moral self-examination expressed in fr. 2 (Porph. *VP* 40 = 159.1f Thesleff) appears as Pythagorean in the first century BC (Flinterman 2014, 348). See also Burkert (1972) 218–220.

51 Delatte and Rostagni suggested Ἱερὸς λόγος as the source of Pythagoras' speech in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, see van der Waerden (1965) 854–855. Yet Hardie (1995) 206 persuasively demonstrated that Ovid borrowed mostly from Empedocles, due to the absence of Pythagoras' authoritative religious text.

teaching.⁵² In the first century BC his role becomes even more prominent. Plato's students also gained their significance as sources on Pythagorean philosophy at the end of the Hellenistic period. This happened, however, only when in the philosophical milieu there appeared a demand for Pythagorean philosophy, which is not noticeable before.

Before leaving the early Hellenistic period I would like to draw attention to one more interesting detail. The two most reliable biographers, Aristoxenus and Dicaearchus, say nothing on Pythagoras' family. The fabrication of a family biography for Pythagoras began immediately after them: Theano first occurs in Hermesianax (fr. 7.85 Powell), the names of his sons in Neanthes and Duris; Timaeus of Tauromenium reports that in her maidenhood Pythagoras' daughter was the first among the Crotonian maidens and later first among the women.⁵³ As a result, Pythagoras turned out to be the only Presocratic, whose wife, sons and daughters were not only known but became prominent in the pseudepigraphical tradition. This reflects not the alleged membership of women in the Pythagorean societies, for which no early evidence exists, but the fact that Pythagoras was the first Greek philosopher who turned his benevolent attention to women. From the fifth century on there was a persistent tradition about his speeches addressed to various groups of Crotoniates, including women.⁵⁴ Their content is first reported by Timaeus: Pythagoras taught women modesty of behaviour and obedience to their husbands, he persuaded them to renounce expensive clothes and adornments and to lead a simple life (cf. Aristox. fr. 38). Since the Pythagorean way of life implied the denial of luxury, excess and immoderation,⁵⁵ there is a good chance that Pythagoras' admonition to women was a genuine feature of his moral teaching. With time such and similar counsels were put in the mouths of his wife, daughters and female followers.

⁵² Zhmud (2011). For a different view, see Huffman (2006).

⁵³ *FGrHist* 566 F 131 (note that Timaeus does not give their names); in F 17 Timaeus mentions "divine names" given to women by Pythagoras: Virgins, Brides, and Mothers. Cf. also the comedies of Alexis and Cratinus the Younger Πυθαγορίζουσα (DK 58 E 1, 3). Neanthes was the first to introduce the figure of a Pythagorean woman (Timycha: *FGrHist* 84 F 31). The Athenian historian Philochorus had already written Συναγωγή ἡρωίδων ἥτοι Πυθαγορείων γυναικῶν (*FGrHist* 328 T 1).

⁵⁴ Antisthenes (fr. 51 = V A 187 SSR); Dicaearchus (fr. 33); Timaeus (*ap. Iust.* 20.4.1–13).

⁵⁵ Zhmud (2012) 352 n. 19.

4 Doric Pseudepigrapha ascribed to the Pythagoreans

We can now safely turn to the second category of the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha. In the first century BC the general situation in philosophy has changed dramatically, the most important events being 1) the revival of dogmatic Platonism, 2) the no less spectacular revival of Aristotelianism, which occurred mostly due to the finding and publishing of the Aristotelian corpus, and 3) the newly found *symphonia* between Plato and Aristotle, allowing the explanation of the first through the second. The same century witnessed 4) the birth of Neopythagoreanism, the philosophy of which constituted a mixture of Platonism and Aristotelianism with additional Stoic views⁵⁶ and whose principal means of dissemination became pseudepigrapha, written in Doricized Greek and ascribed not to Pythagoras, but to his students, in the first instance to Archytas. We should bear in mind that the first known Neopythagoreans publishing under their own names came into view only from the mid-first century AD (Apollonius of Tyana, Moderatus of Gades). Nigidius Figulus, extolled by Cicero (*Tim.* 1) for his revival of Pythagoreanism, and Anaxilaus of Larissa, expelled by Augustus from Rome for his involvement in magic, did not leave any texts which could be qualified as Pythagorean.⁵⁷

The best way to illustrate the new philosophical constellation is to quote the beginning of the Neopythagorean biography of Pythagoras known as Anonymus Photii:⁵⁸ Ὅτι ἔνατος ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου διάδοχος γέγονέ φησι Πλάτων Ἀρχύτου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου μαθητῆς γενόμενος, δέκατος δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης (237.5–7). In this peculiar perspective Plato appears as an acknowledged *diadochos* in the Pythagorean school, doubtless due to his apprenticeship with Archytas, and Aristotle as the last representative of the Pythagorean *diadoche*.⁵⁹ Though this perspective has nothing in common with the views of the Old Academy, which contrary to Burkert did *not* project Platonic ideas onto Pythagoras or Pythagoreans, it is very much related to Aristotle's presentation of the Pythagoreans as direct predecessors of

56 Centrone (2014) 336–339. On Aristotelianism in the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha, see Moraux (1984) 605–686; Bonazzi (2013).

57 Flinterman (2014) 343–350.

58 Dörrie/Baltes (1990) 261–262, relate this biography to the first century BC – first century AD. Burkert (1998) 304: “frühkaiserzeitlich”.

59 Cf. an interesting (if late) parallel: Τρεῖς σοφίης πολυίστορος ἔκκριτοι ἀστέρες οἴοι / ἐνθέμενοι βίβλοις ὄλβον ἀπειρέσιον· / Ἀρχύτας ἦρξε, Πλάτων πλάτυνε· τέλος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, / ὡς ἔτυχε κληθεῖς, θῆκεν Ἀριστοτέλης (*Anth. Graec.* App. 203).

Plato's number metaphysics set forth in his *agrapha dogmata* (to be sure, Aristotle never mentions Archytas in this connection).⁶⁰ Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, where this view is stated, became available only in the first century BC, and at this very time the main principles of Plato's unwritten doctrine, Monad and Indefinite Dyad, started to be assigned to Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans⁶¹ – as opposed to what Aristotle himself asserted.⁶²

Thus, when number metaphysics turned out to be a common denominator of Pythagoreanism and Platonism and Plato's intellectual indebtedness to Pythagoras was willingly recognized by the Platonists (earlier this was claimed by their critics), the role of Archytas as an immediate transmitter of the Pythagorean dogmata became crucial, for Pythagoras, as was mostly agreed, left no writings.⁶³ From Plato's student or a person dependent on him,⁶⁴ Archytas suddenly became Plato's teacher. Cicero, following a new biographical vulgate, several times reports the same narrative: Plato came to Italy and Sicily in order to meet the Pythagoreans and to appropriate their dogmata, of which Socrates had not even wanted to hear; Plato became acquainted with Archytas, Echechrates, and Timaeus of Locri, got access to Philolaus' book, learned all the Pythagorean teachings, first of all their *mathēmata*, and made it more argumentative; out of love for Socrates, however, he ascribed this Pythagorean *sapientia* to his teacher.⁶⁵ In such a way biographical and philosophical traditions support each other.⁶⁶ It is on the intersection of these traditions that we find two pseudepigraphical letters (D. L. 8.80–83), in the first of which Archytas informs Plato that he has found, apparently at Plato's request, and sent to the latter four works of Ocellus Lucanus, while in the second Plato enthusiastically thanks him for these writings which he greatly admires. Both letters were intended to authenticate the

60 See Zhmud (2012) 421–432; 433–451. Cf. Burkert (1972) 62–65, 81–83.

61 See e.g. Bonazzi (2013).

62 To be sure, in Theophrastus' *Metaphysics* (11a27–b10) this principle is related to Plato and the Pythagoreans. See recently: Horkey (2013).

63 This view was shared by some well-known Neopythagoreans, e.g. Nicomachus (Porph. *VP* 57). See Burkert (1972) 461 n. 70; Städele (1980) 208–212.

64 As e.g. in Eratosthenes' *Platonicus* (47 A 15 DK). Philodemus relying on the Hellenistic sources still calls Archytas a student of Plato (Dorandi 1991, 134–135 = A5c3 Huffman). Cf. also Ps.-Demosthenes' *Erotic Oration* 44 (= A5c1 Huffman), where Archytas the statesman gains success due to his contacts with Plato.

65 Cic. *Rep.* 1.15–16; *Tusc.* 1.39; *Fin.* 5.86–87; Dörrie/Baltes (1990) 250–256, 526–536.

66 Cf. Anonymus Photii: "Plato is said to have learned his theoretical and physical doctrines from the Italic Pythagoreans, and his ethics mostly from Socrates" (238.17–18). On Socrates and the Pythagoreans as Plato's teachers, see Arist. *Metaph.* 986a29–b14, 1078b16–23, cf. *MM* 1182a12–14.

‘newly found’ Ocellus’ treatise *On the Nature of the Universe* and thus can be dated in the first century BC.⁶⁷

Now we can better understand why Archytas and not Philolaus⁶⁸ or Pythagoras himself has played such an important role in the pseudo-Pythagorean writings of the second category, with about a dozen preserved treatises or long fragments. He was essential as the historically trustworthy Pythagorean teacher of Plato, because Platonic number doctrine is not accountable from Socrates. Whereas the early Hellenistic pseudepigrapha gained very little success not in the least because they could not offer a relevant philosophical agenda, the strategy of the new generation of forgers consisted in filling the treatises with the rediscovered Platonic and/or Aristotelian ideas, while adding to them the final historical touch in the form of archaizing Doric dialect. This dialect, I believe, points neither to Southern Italy nor Rome as a birthplace of the Doric pseudepigrapha⁶⁹ – it points in the first instance to Archytas. As for the birthplace, such figures as Eudorus of Alexandria, Arius Didymus and Philo of Alexandria in various ways related to these texts⁷⁰ indicate that their authors lived as before in Alexandria.⁷¹ But this time they belonged mostly to the Platonic milieu, so that their attitude to Pythagoras and Plato was equally reverential only on the surface, but opposite in essence. Whereas, on the one hand, they wanted to restore the ‘real’ Plato, using his dialogues and the evidence of his students, most often of Aristotle, on the other, they were not at all concerned about studying or even consulting the original Pythagorean treatises. It was not the theories of the Pythagoreans that attracted the authors of pseudepigrapha, but their authorities and their names, to which they could ascribe what they considered as relevant, relying on Plato and his students, in the first place Aristotle as well as Speusippus, Xenocrates and others.⁷²

67 Zeller (1919) 81 n. 3. The treatise, first mentioned by Varro (Censorinus *DN*, 4.3) and Philo (*De aet. mundi* 12), heavily relies on Aristotle and the Academy (Moraux 1984, 606; Centrone 2014, 328–329).

68 Note that according to Satyrus (cf. above, section 2), Plato bought from Philolaus “three Pythagorean books” published by the latter, containing the previously unavailable teaching of Pythagoras (D. L. 3.9, cf. 8.6; 9; 15; Aul. Gell. 3.17.1–5; Iamb. *VP* 199). In the first century BC this story was superseded by an account about Plato’s meeting with Archytas.

69 Italy: Thesleff (1961) 30–41; Rome: Burkert (1961) 245.

70 Eudorus presents a Neopythagorean theory (Simpl. *in Phys.* 181.10–30 = fr. 3–5 Mazzarelli); Arius Didymus wrote *περὶ Πυθαγορικής φιλοσοφίας* where he referred to Theano’s poems (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.16.80); Philo is the first to quote an anonymous pseudo-Pythagorean arithmological treatise (Staehle 1931) and Ocellus Lucanus (*De aet. mundi* 12).

71 This was Zeller’s conclusion (Zeller 1919, 113–114), see also Centrone (2014) 336–339. Alexander Polyhistor also had good contacts with Alexandria.

72 See recently: Zhmud (2016).

Where, then, did they find the names? Evidently, in Aristoxenus. More than half of the names attached to the pseudo-Pythagorean writings of the second category⁷³ derive from Aristoxenus' biographical work *Περὶ Πυθαγόρου καὶ τῶν γνωρίμων αὐτοῦ*, to which he appended his famous list of 218 Pythagoreans, preserved in Iamblichus (*VP* 267).⁷⁴ It is only in Aristoxenus that Zaleucus and Charondas appeared as Pythagoreans (fr. 17; 43), and it was Aristoxenus who told stories of the friendship of Cleinias and Prorus (Diod. Sic. 10.4.1 = 54 A 3, from Aristoxenus), of the Lucanian Pythagoreans Ocellus and Occilus (Iamb. *VP* 267, cf. Aristox. fr. 17), and so on. The other part of the names stems either from the previous pseudo-Pythagorean tradition (Theano, Telauges), or includes real people, who never were Pythagoreans (Epicharmus, Hippodamus of Miletus, Perictione, if this is the mother of Plato) or just pretended to be Pythagoreans (Diodorus of Aspendus). The rest of the names was simply made up⁷⁵ or taken from the literary tradition, like Timaeus of Locri, a resuscitated hero of the homonymous dialogue, or Megillus of Sparta, a personage of Plato's *Laws*.

Before trying to figure out what else that is Pythagorean was in pseudepigrapha of the second category, we should ask ourselves: did their authors really need to read the books of ancient Pythagoreans and imitate, or use, or cite their views? The situation with citing is quite revealing, for the whole corpus of *Pseudopythagorica* contains not a single authentic quotation of Alcmaeon, Menestor, Hippon, Philolaus, Archytas, Ecphantus, or any other ancient Pythagorean. Respectively, it is almost completely useless for any historical reconstruction of the teachings of the ancient Pythagoreans. Archytas is the most conspicuous example. Obviously, he became the author of the most pseudepigrapha not because he was the greatest Pythagorean philosopher (to Philolaus only two or three treatises were ascribed), but because he was instrumental in creating a firm spiritual bond between Plato and Pythagoras. A passage from Porphyry cited by Ibn Abi Usai-bi'a, though it is not unproblematic,⁷⁶ shows that in the late Neopythagorean

73 Archippus, Archytas, Athamas, Bro(n)tinus, Boutherus, Charondas, Cleinias, Eccelus, Ecphantus, Euryphamus, Eurytus, Hippasus, Criton, Lysis, Metopus, Ocellus, Onatas, Opsimos, Philolaus, Prorus, Sthenidas, Theages (cf. Apoll. *FGrHist* 1064 F 2 = Iamb. *VP* 257, 261), Thymaridas, Zaleucus.

74 For a detailed analysis of the catalogue, see Zhmud (2012) 111–118.

75 Androcydes (cf. below, n. 91), Aresas (Iamb. *VP* 266, from Apollonius), Aristaios (Iamb. *VP* 104; 265), Aristombrotus, Bryson (Iamb. *VP* 104, Phot. 115b7), Damippus, Dios, Diotogenes, Hipparchus, Callicratides, Panacaeus, Pempelus, Phyntis.

76 Apart from the fact that it does not create a solid impression of Porphyry's authorship, it is unclear how the statement about 80 "authentic books" of Pythagoras squares with Porphyry's *VP* 57 (from Nicomachus), which says that no book of Pythagoras is preserved. Cf. van der Waerden (1985) 862–863; Macris (2002) 114 n. 159; Ehrman (2012) 108.

circles it was thought of Archytas that he compiled and collected writings by Pythagoras and Pythagoreans. Historical Archytas, however, wrote only three treatises we know of and they all seem to be predominantly scientific rather than philosophical: *Harmonics*, *On Mathematical Sciences*, and *Diatribai*, the only preserved fragment of which deals with arithmetic and geometry (47 B 4). Available testimonia contain isolated physical arguments (A 22–24) but no secure evidence of a cosmological or ethical treatise.⁷⁷ Such an Archytas was of no use for the forgers, so it is not surprising that we do not find his authentic ideas in the writings they assigned to him.⁷⁸

In a situation which allowed for the publication of slightly modified *Categories* of Aristotle under Archytas' name and for all the experts, except for Themistius, to be persuaded that the artificial Doric dialect of this work guarantees its authenticity and sufficiently explains the disturbing fact that Aristotle copied it off from Archytas, there was no need to look for Archytas' original views to embellish his pseudepigrapha with them. Though they contain some scattered concepts, which remind us of his activities: harmony, geometry, arithmetic, mechanics, and so on, these concepts never, to the best of my knowledge, take the shape of Archytas' recognizable thoughts.⁷⁹ The closest parallels that I could find are 1) the connection between numbers and concords⁸⁰ and 2) three kinds of proportions (arithmetic, geometric, and harmonic), yet the first is rather a generally Pythagorean than a specifically Architean view, while the second does not necessarily come directly from Archytas, who did not apply it to politics as the author of *On Law and Justice* did; this seems to be Platonic and Aristotelian.⁸¹ Though Archytas' pseudepigrapha may occasionally be sprinkled with original Pythagorean expressions and thoughts, their authors did not intend to make them look authentic by their content.

In the case of Ocellus Lucanus' treatise it is both unnecessary and impossible to look for his original doctrines, for outside of Aristoxenus' catalogue Ocellus did

⁷⁷ Though Aristotle wrote *On Archytas' Philosophy* in three books (D. L. 5.25 = A 13), the only fragment of this work refers to Pythagoras' philosophical theory, which is suspiciously similar to Plato's (fr. 207). Cf. Huffman (2005) 579–594.

⁷⁸ Late tradition attributes to Archytas treatises on mechanics (B 7 Huffman, from Vitruvius), musical instruments (B 6, from Athenaeus) and agriculture (B 8, from Varro), which due to their technical character are rather pseudo-Archytean (if they do not belong to other Archytases) than pseudo-Pythagorean.

⁷⁹ See Huffman's overview of Ps.-Archytas' treatises (Huffman 2005, 595–618).

⁸⁰ E.g. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐν διπλόῳ λόγῳ ἀρμονία τυγχάνει (Ps.-Archytas, *De intell.*, p. 37.3).

⁸¹ Pl. *Resp.* 544–550, 558; *Leg.* 756e–758a; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1131b12f., 1132a1f., *Pol.* 1301b27–1302b8. On Ps.-Archytas' dependence on Aristotle, see Harvey (1965) 124, 131–135.

not exist, while his presence in the catalogue does not imply that Aristoxenus regarded him as a philosopher: most people on his list were important members of Pythagorean *hetaireiai*. Ocellus' *On the Nature of the Universe* contains textual borrowings not only from Aristoxenus' *Pythagorean Precepts*,⁸² this favorite source of the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha, but also from Aristotle's *On Generation and Corruption* (336a–338b) that became available as a part of his recently published corpus.⁸³ Ocellus' materialization as a philosopher was anything but exemption. The Neopythagorean forgers took all the Pythagoreans of the catalogue for philosophers, otherwise they would not have ascribed philosophical writings to such persons as Metopus, Onatas, Opsimos, Prorus, Sthenidas, Theages and other Pythagoreans, who either figure in a political context (Onatas, *DK I*, 103.12), or are the heroes of Aristoxenus' stories on Pythagorean friendship (Prorus), or do not exist outside of the catalogue. The famous would-be Pythagorean Timaeus Locrus, with whom, according to Cicero, Plato communicated in Italy, does not even figure in the catalogue and owes his existence to Plato's dialogue. His treatise *On the Nature of the World and the Soul* (first century BC),⁸⁴ pretending to be the original of the *Timaeus*,⁸⁵ includes nothing directly relating to pre-Platonic Pythagoreanism. An Arabic version of Bryson's *Oikonomikos*, preserved in Greek only in two short fragments (56.14–57.10) has been recently published and thoroughly studied by S. Swain. The Greek original, which Swain dates to the first century AD, contains, except for its topic, “virtually no other sign of Pythagorean philosophy ... which is true also of the other Neopythagorean ethical texts”.⁸⁶

A special case is Philolaus. In a sense he could have been an exemplary figure for the Neopythagorean forgers: his cosmological treatise containing new ideas on *mathēmata* and numbers was used by Plato and Aristotle; Plato referred to him as an older contemporary; their meeting was made up in the early Hellenistic biography (see above, section 2). In the end Philolaus was eclipsed by Archytas

⁸² § 52–57, p. 137.6–138.12 = Aristox. fr. 39 W. See Harder (1926) 134–137.

⁸³ Syrianus saw it differently: “From Ocellus *On the Nature of the Universe* the treatise *On Generation and Corruption* is more or less entirely taken and the bulk of the *Timaeus*” (*In Met.*, p. 175.7–11).

⁸⁴ Baltes (1972) 20–26.

⁸⁵ According to Timon of Phlius, Plato's *Timaeus* was copied from a little book which the philosopher had bought for a high price (fr. 54), Hermippus, however, asserted that the author of the book was Philolaus (*FGrHist* 1026 F 69). It does not seem that in the third century BC Timaeus Locrus was known as a Pythagorean author.

⁸⁶ Swain (2013) 34. This is very close to the conclusions of Centrone (1990).

and only a few writings were attributed to him,⁸⁷ yet a pseudo-Philolaic book (or books) seemed to exist, the content of which intersects to some extent with the material of his genuine treatise, for example, in such areas as musical theory and cosmology.⁸⁸ What the title of this work was is not known. One expression of Philolaus, ἐστὼ τῶν πραγμάτων (B 6), occurs in Ps.-Archytas *On Principles* (19.26), though in the Platonist/Aristotelian context. The cosmic ἄρμονία repeatedly appearing in the Doric pseudepigrapha is sooner Stoic than Philolaic,⁸⁹ because in Philolaus it unites his principles, ἄπειρα and περαίνοντα (B 6–7), which are not attested as such in this literature. Ps.-Philolaus' *On the Soul* follows Plato and Aristotle, not the historical Pythagorean.⁹⁰ Thus, Philolaus seems to be only a partial exemption from the general rule.

One might expect that the authors of the Doric pseudepigrapha used Pythagorean metempsychosis and the prohibitions that followed from it, to assign more authenticity to their forgeries, but this is not so. These writings consist for the most part of purely philosophical treatises characterized by rationalistic dogmatism; they are far from such religious issues. Metempsychosis is mentioned in Androcydes' *On Pythagorean Symbols*,⁹¹ in two biographies of Pythagoras, Anonymus Diodori (231.14–17) and Anonymus Photii (238.11–15, cf. 237.12), where it is linked with abstinence from meat and beans; at the very end of the *Pythagorika Hypomnemata* we hear about abstinence from meat, beans and different kinds of fish (236.29–237.3). All these texts, however, are not Doric, besides, they are related to Pythagoras, not to his followers. Metempsychosis in Timaeus Locrus (§ 86, 224.20–225.5) depends on Plato's *Timaeus*.⁹²

The famous letter of Lysis to Hipparchus (cf. above, section 2) refers to Pythagorean secrecy and concealment, a pet subject of the Neopythagorean

87 Regrettably, Thesleff (1965) 149 did not include in his collection an arithmological treatise, attributed to Philolaus (see B 8–8a; 11; 20a–c; 23; A 11; 12 Huffman), as well as other spurious fragments, except for B 21–22.

88 Music: B 6b; A 25, 26–26a Huffman; cosmology: A 16b, 17b Huffman (= Aët. 2.2.7; 2.4.15).

89 τὸν δὲ κόσμον ἄρμονία, ταύτας δ' αἴτιος ὁ θεός (Ocellus, 124.19); ... καὶ τὸν θεῖον νόμον τὰς τῷ κόσμῳ ἄρμονίας ... (Archytas, 42.22); Hippodamus 97.4, 97.8, etc. Cf. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μουσικὴν ἐκάλεσε Πλάτων καὶ ἔτι πρότερον οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν, καὶ καθ' ἄρμονίαν τὸν κόσμον συνεστάναι φασί (Strabo 10.3.10 = Posidon. fr. 370.20–22 Theiler). Cf. Wilhelm (1915) 185–190.

90 Huffman (1993) 341–344, 410–414. There is not enough evidence to believe that Philolaus shared the Pythagorean theory of the soul as *harmonia*.

91 The 'Pythagorean Androcydes' (cf. above, n. 24, n. 46) is unique in that he focuses on allegorical interpretation of Pythagorean symbols, first collected by Anaximander the Younger (ca. 400 BC); see Zhmud (2012) 171–175, 192–196. Thesleff (1961) 108, considering Androcydes a genuine work, did not include it in his edition.

92 Baltes (1972) 244–249.

biography (cf. above, section 3). Letters of Pythagorean women, Theano, Myia and Melissa (the last two in Doric), edited and studied by Städele and recently thoroughly analysed by Annette Huizenga,⁹³ belong to the third category.⁹⁴ They contain virtually nothing that specifically resembles ancient Pythagoreanism, except, perhaps, for the topic of moderation in clothes, decoration and behaviour (cf. above, section 3), prominent in Melissa's letter (115.26–116.12). This motive, which appears also in the Doric treatises by two other Pythagorean women, Phyntis (153.17–23) and Perictione (143.9–27),⁹⁵ might derive from the fourth-century tradition (Aristoxenus, Timaeus of Tauromenium), though it is abundantly present in moral philosophy of the time, Stoic or Christian.⁹⁶ There is conceivably more relevant ancient Pythagorean material in the pseudepigrapha of the second and third categories, but to uncover it a more substantial search is needed. It is abundantly clear, however, that in relation to Platonic, Aristotelian and Stoic theories and notions this material is vanishingly small.

5 Redefining Neopythagoreanism

It seems then that we need to correct Zeller's conclusion, shared by many scholars, that Neopythagoreanism consists in a combination of Platonic and Pythagorean philosophemes.⁹⁷ In terms of literary production Neopythagoreanism of the first century BC is represented *only* by numerous pseudo-Pythagorean writings, whose Pythagoreanism confines itself to two dozen Pythagorean names, a pseudo-Doric dialect and a handful of original Pythagorean concepts. The philosophy that fills up these writings is anything but Pythagorean by its origin. It seems quite incredible that Neopythagorean forgers, using very economical means, succeeded in persuading almost everybody in the ancient world and so many in the modern that they represent ancient, authentic Pythagoreanism, and not its late filiation, contemporaneous with and dependent on Middle Platonism. Iamblichus was particularly fond of Doric as the most ancient and musical among Greek dialects (VP 241–243) and his extensive collection of Doric *Pseudopythagor-*

⁹³ Huizenga (2013). Both Städele and Huizenga (2013) 41–43 date these letters to the first-second centuries AD.

⁹⁴ Strictly speaking, Melissa is not known as Pythagoras' daughter, but this status was probably implied by the author of the letter, which is closely related to the letters of Theano and Myia.

⁹⁵ Reuthner (2009) 427–428; Huizenga (2013) 171 n. 8.

⁹⁶ Wilhelm (1915) 190–192, 193 n. 2, 216. For parallels between Neopythagorean and New Testament ethical teaching, see Balch (1992) 392–401; Huizenga (2013) 344–350.

⁹⁷ Zeller (1919) 113.

ica was formed not least in view of their dialect.⁹⁸ The last successful attempt of this kind was made around 1500 by an unknown humanist, who has doricized a Byzantine eleventh-century extract from Porphyry's *Isagoge* and passed it off as Archytas' *Καθολικὸι λόγοι δέκα* (3.9–8.19).⁹⁹ One can reasonably assume that most of the authors of pseudepigrapha of the second category were Platonists, which in no way conflicts with the fact that some of them attributed Aristotelian and/or Stoic theories to the ancient Pythagoreans. In the light of these considerations, the term Neopythagoreanism has to be redefined. Burkert asserted that in the first century BC instead of *Pseudopythagorica* come forward the Pythagoreans,¹⁰⁰ but the picture is more complicated. Until the mid-first century AD, when the first Neopythagoreans writings under their own names appeared, the scene was completely dominated by the anonymous and prolific authors of the pseudo-Pythagorean writings, whereas a couple of Roman Neopythagoreans known by names did not seem to have any relation to *Pseudopythagorica* (cf. above, section 4). If emerging Neopythagorean philosophy was not Pythagorean in substance but wanted to be considered as such, so that its unknown originators wrote under pseudonyms of the historical or invented Pythagoreans, thus constructing a new vision of the philosophical past, this and related facts have to become an indispensable part of what we understand by Neopythagoreanism.

Bibliography

- D. Balch, "Neopythagorean Moralists and the New Testament Household Code", *ANRW* II.26.1, 1992, 380–411.
- M. Baltès, *Timaïos Lokros, Über die Natur des Kosmos und der Seele*, Leiden 1972.
- M. Bonazzi, "Pythagoreanizing Aristotle: Eudorus and the Systematization of Platonism", in: M. Schofield (ed.), *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC*, Cambridge 2013, 160–186.
- M. Bonazzi, "Eudorus of Alexandria and the 'Pythagorean' Pseudoepigrapha", in: G. Cornelli/C. Macris/R. McKirahan (eds.), *On Pythagoreanism*, Berlin 2013, 385–404.
- W. Burkert, "Hellenistische Pseudopythagorica", *Philologus* 105, 1961, 16–43, 226–246.
- W. Burkert, "Review of Vogel, C. de. *Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism*. Assen, 1966", *Gymnasium* 74, 1967, 458–460.
- W. Burkert, "Zur geistesgeschichtlichen Einordnung einiger Pseudopythagorica", in: K. von Fritz (ed.), *Pseudepigrapha I*, Genève 1971, 57–102.
- W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge, MA 1972.

⁹⁸ Macris (2002) 97, 125–126.

⁹⁹ Szlezák (1972) 184–186.

¹⁰⁰ Burkert (1961) 235.

- W. Burkert, "Pythagoreische Retraktionen", in: id. et al. (eds.), *Fragmentsammlungen philosophischer Texte der Antike*, Göttingen 1998.
- B. Centrone, *Pseudopythagorica Ethica: i trattati morali di Archita, Metopo, Teage, Eurifamo*, Napoli 1990.
- B. Centrone, "L'VIII libro delle 'Vite' di Diogene Laerzio", *ANRW* II.36.6, 1992, 4183–4217.
- B. Centrone, "La letteratura pseudopitagorica: origine, diffusione e finalità", in: G. Cerri (ed.), *La letteratura pseudopitagorica nella cultura greca e romana*, Napoli 2000, 429–452.
- B. Centrone, "The pseudo-Pythagorean Writings", in: C. A. Huffman (ed.), *A History of Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge 2014, 315–340.
- P. Corsen, "Die Schrift des Arztes Androkydes Περὶ πυθαγορικῶν συμβόλων", *RhM* 67, 1912, 240–262.
- A. Delatte, *Études sur la littérature pythagoricienne*, Paris 1915.
- A. Delatte, *La vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce*, Bruxelles 1922.
- L. Delatte, *Les traites de la royauté d'Euphante, Diotogene et Sthenidas*, Liège 1942.
- H. Diels, "Ein gefälschtes Pythagorasbuch", *AGPh* 3, 1890, 451–472.
- H. Dörrie/M. Baltes (eds.), *Der Platonismus in der Antike*, vol. 2, Stuttgart 1990.
- T. Dorandi, *Filodemo. Storia dei filosofi. Platone e l'Accademia*, Napoli 1991.
- D. S. Du Toit, *Theios Anthropos*, Tübingen 1997.
- B. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*, Oxford 2012.
- A.-J. Festugière, "Les 'Mémoires Pythagoriques' cités par Alexandre Polyhistor", *REG* 58, 1945, 1–65.
- J.-J. Flinterman, "Pythagoreans in Rome and Asia Minor around the Turn of the Common Era", in: C. A. Huffman (ed.), *A History of Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge 2014, 341–359.
- K. von Fritz, "Theano", *RE* 5A, 1934, 1379–1381.
- R. Harder, *Ocellus Lucanus*, Berlin 1926.
- P. Hardie, "The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15: Empedoclean Epos", *CQ* 45, 1995, 204–214.
- F. D. Harvey, "Two Kinds of Equality", *CM* 26, 1965, 101–146.
- P. S. Horky, "Theophrastus on Platonic and 'Pythagorean' Imitation", *CQ* 63, 2013, 686–712.
- C. A. Huffman, *Philolaus of Croton. Pythagorean and Presocratic*, Cambridge 1993.
- C. A. Huffman, *Archytas of Tarentum. Pythagorean, Philosopher and Mathematician King*, Cambridge 2005.
- C. A. Huffman, "Aristoxenus' *Pythagorean Precepts*: A Rational Pythagorean Ethics", in: M. M. Sassi (ed.), *La costruzione del discorso filosofico nell'età dei Presocratici*, Pisa 2006, 103–121.
- C. A. Huffman (ed.), *A History of Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge 2014.
- A. B. Huizenga, *Moral Education for Women in the Pastoral and Pythagorean Letters: Philosophers of the Household*, Leiden 2013.
- A. Laks, "The Pythagorean *Hypomnemata* reported by Alexander Polyhistor in Diogenes Laertius (8.25–33)", in: G. Cornelli/R. McKirahan/C. Macris (eds.), *On Pythagoreanism*, Berlin 2013, 371–384.
- A. A. Long, "The Eclectic Pythagoreanism of Alexander Polyhistor", in: M. Schofield (ed.), *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC*, Cambridge 2013, 139–159.
- C. Macris, "Jamblique et la littérature pseudo-pythagoricienne", in: S. C. Mimouni (ed.), *Apocryphité: histoire d'un concept transversal aux religions du Livre*, Turnhout 2002, 77–129.
- C. Macris, "Télaugès [de Samos]", *DPhA* 6, 2016, 722–731 (= 2016a).

- C. Macris, “Théano (de Crotona ou de Métaponte?)”, *DPhA* 6, 2016, 820–839 (= 2016b).
- G. Méautis, *Recherches sur le pythagorisme*, Neuchâtel 1922.
- P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, vol. 2, Berlin 1984.
- C. W. Mueller, “Die neuplatonischen Aristoteleskommentatoren über die Ursachen der Pseudepi-graphie”, *RhM* 112, 1969, 120–126.
- K. Praechter, “Metopos, Theages und Archytas bei Stobaeus *Flor.* I 64, 67”, *Philologus* 50, 1891, 49–57.
- R. Reuthner, “Philosophia und oikonomia als weibliche Disziplinen in Traktaten und Lehrbriefe neupythagoreischer Philosophinnen”, *Historia* 58, 2009, 416–437.
- E. Rohde, *Psyche*, London 1925.
- A. Rostagni, “Un nuovo capitolo nella storia della retorica e della sofistica” (1922), in: *Scritti minori*, vol. 1, Torino 1955, 3–59.
- S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kalatis*, Basel 2006.
- S. Schorn, “Die Pythagoreer im zehnten Buch der Bibliothek Diodors: Quellen, Traditionen und Manipulationen”, in: M. Berti/V. Costa (eds.), *Ritorno ad Alessandria. Storiografia greca e cultura bibliotecaria: tracce di una relazione perduta*, Tivoli 2013, 179–259.
- S. Schorn, “Pythagoras in the Historical Tradition”, in: C. A. Huffman (ed.), *A History of Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge 2014, 296–314.
- A. Städele, *Die Briefe des Pythagoras und der Pythagoreer*, Meisenheim am Glan 1980.
- K. Staehle, *Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandria*, Leipzig 1931.
- S. Swain, *Economy, Family, and Society from Rome to Islam: A Critical Edition, English Translation, and Study of Bryson’s ‘Management of the Estate’*, Cambridge 2013.
- T. A. Szlezák, *Pseudo-Archytas Über die Kategorien: Texte zur griechischen Aristoteles-Exegese*, Berlin 1972.
- W. Theiler, “Review of A. Delatte, *Études sur la littérature pythagoricienne*. Paris 1915 and other works”, *Gnomon* 2, 1926, 147–156.
- H. Thesleff, *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo 1961.
- H. Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo 1965.
- H. Thesleff, “On the Problem of the Doric pseudo-Pythagorica”, in: K. von Fritz (ed.), *Pseudepi-grapha I*, Genève 1971, 57–102.
- J. C. Thom, *The Pythagorean Golden Verses*, Leiden 1995.
- J. C. Thom, “Cleanthes, Chrysippus and the Pythagorean Golden Verses”, *AClass* 44, 2001, 197–219.
- C. de Vogel, *Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism*, Assen 1966.
- B. L. van der Waerden, “Die Schriften und Fragmente des Pythagoras”, *RE Suppl.* 10, 1965, 843–864.
- M. Węcowski, “Pseudo-Democritus, or Bolos of Mendes (263)”, in: I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill’s New Jacoby Online*, 2012.
- M. Wellmann, “Eine pythagoreische Urkunde des 4. Jh. v. Chr.”, *Hermes* 54, 1919, 225–245.
- W. Wiersma, “Das Referat des Alexandros Polyhistor über die Pythagoreische Philosophie”, *Mnemosyne* 10, 1941, 97–112.
- F. Wilhelm, “Die Oeconomica der Neupythagoreer Bryson, Kallikratidas, Periktione, Phintys”, *RhM* 70, 1915, 161–223.
- E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 6th ed., vol. III.2, Leipzig 1919.
- L. Zhmud, “Aristoxenus and the Pythagoreans”, in: C. A. Huffman (ed.), *Aristoxenus of Tarentum*, New Brunswick 2011, 223–249.

- L. Zhmud, *Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreans*, Oxford 2012.
- L. Zhmud, “Greek Arithmology: Pythagoras or Plato?”, in: A.-B. Renger/A. Stavru (eds.), *Pythagorean Knowledge from the Ancient to the Modern World: Askesis, Religion, Science*, Wiesbaden 2016, 311–336.
- M. Zucconi, “La tradizioni dei discorsi di Pitagora in Giamblico”, *Vita Pythagorica*, 37–57, *RFIC* 98, 1970, 491–501.