

On the problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica : an alternative theory of date and purpose

Autor(en): **Thesleff, Holger**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **18 (1972)**

PDF erstellt am: **12.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-661084>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

III

HOLGER THESLEFF

On the Problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica
An alternative Theory of Date and Purpose

ON THE PROBLEM OF THE DORIC PSEUDO-PYTHAGORICA

AN ALTERNATIVE THEORY OF DATE AND PURPOSE

When ten years ago I constructed what I thought might be "a reasonably solid hypothesis regarding the date and place of the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha"¹, I deliberately left to more competent experts the analysis of the doctrinal contents of the texts, and the conclusions possibly to be drawn from this. That much seemed clear, however: the contents could, on the whole, be fitted into a Hellenistic context. Considering our lack of fixed points in Hellenistic philosophy, and the mass of vexed problems such as the relevance of Poseidonios or Andronikos or the beginning and nature of eclecticism, I had the feeling that what we needed in the case of the Pythagorean texts was first of all an accumulation of the literary, linguistic, historical and otherwise 'external' evidence, at which the picture to be drawn from the doctrinal evidence could be tested.

So I based my hypothesis mainly upon 'formal and external' criteria. My conclusion was, in short, the following: Whereas the wildly heterogeneous texts attributed to, or concerning, Pythagoras and members of his family had been compiled at different times and in different places, mainly in the East (Athens, Alexandria, cities of Asia Minor, etc.), the Doric tracts reflect a rather more homogeneous tradition, ultimately following the model of Archytas of Tarentum, and chiefly deriving from South Italy in the 3rd century B.C., with later offshoots.

¹ *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*, Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora 24, 3, Åbo (Finland) 1961; Preface. Quoted *Introduction*.

Now Prof. Burkert has given us a set of arguments from the contents of the texts. They would seem to contradict my hypothesis very seriously. Is a compromise possible? Or would it be wise to give up the 3rd/2nd-century theory in its entirety? After all it was just a model, designed to provoke a critical discussion.

Prof. Burkert has made, as usual, many important points from which I have learned very much and on which I cannot but agree. In general, I should like to state that his considerations have convinced me, as I believe they have convinced the rest of the audience, that we should seriously try to fit the Doric tracts into the framework of late Hellenistic philosophical syncretism, and that there are very strong indications that some or many of them were written after, say, Kritolaos and Karneades—to put it cautiously. Prof. Burkert's paper seems to include much more of positive evidence for the later dating than what the adherents of the traditional view have been able to produce until now. I am not ready to abandon the 3rd-century model completely (just in case there should suddenly turn up more evidence in favour of it), but I find it simply uninteresting for the time being. So I shall not bother my audience with reviewing the details of it, as I had planned to do before I had seen Prof. Burkert's manuscript.

Instead, I shall begin with some remarks on the language and style of the Doric texts. Then I intend to criticize some aspects of Prof. Burkert's theory from the point of view of my theory, and to offer an alternative model that could be described as a compromise. And finally I shall make some suggestions as to the intention and purpose of these tracts.

COMMENTS ON LANGUAGE AND STYLE

For a general survey of the dialect used in the Doric Pythagorean writings, see my *Introduction*, pp. 85-91. I have

later checked this survey with regard to the text adopted in my edition ¹; some minor points demand correction ².

Well over 40 genuine Doric characteristics occur in 3 or more of the texts; but no Doric forms are employed consistently in all texts (though some are more consistently used than others), and no two texts seem to have identical preferences. To some (indeterminable) extent this is due to textual corruption, but corruption is clearly not the only relevant explanation. The dialect form of the writings is an artificial device; it represents a literary convention.

As I argued in my *Introduction* (pp. 82; 91 ff.), this 'Pythagorean Doric' is based upon the dialect of Tarentum. It may be described as an Italiote Koiné, not very different from the dialect of the Heracleian Tables, though it is considerably more literary. The compromises with Attic Koiné are largely of the same kind as those found in Hellenistic Doric inscriptions (thus, for instance, the Pythagorean texts, like inscriptions, are more consistent in the use of Doric $\bar{\alpha}$, $-\nu\tau\iota$, and $\kappa\alpha$, than in the use of $\alpha\iota$ and $\tau\omicron\iota$).

It is reasonable to think that the ultimate model was the literary dialect practice adopted by Archytas in his authentic works. This assumption also agrees with the fact that, among the Doric pseudepigrapha, Archytas is the name that has attracted the greatest amount of texts ³.

For the present purpose I have also tentatively examined the style (i.e., the general manner of exposition, the phrase-

¹ *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*, collected and edited by H. THESLEFF, Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A, Vol. 30, 1, Åbo 1965. Quoted *Texts*.

² All of the characteristics listed in *Introduction*, 85 f. do not actually occur in the majority of the texts, but a more or less regular use can be inferred for them; add $\alpha\iota$ (cf. p. 87), $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$; from p. 88 $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$, $-\eta\omicron-$; and from p. 89 the pseudo-Doric $-\omicron\iota\sigma\alpha$. Cf. below, p. 67, n. 3.

³ 13 writings, not counting the probably authentic works and unclear cases. Next comes Philolaos with two or three texts in addition to the *Περὶ φύσεως*. The rest have one or two each.

ology, and the vocabulary) of the Pythagorean writings and some other post-classical philosophical texts. I have had two questions in view: (1) could the Pythagorean texts be easily classified according to stylistic criteria? and (2) what stylistic parallels to these texts do there occur outside Pythagorean literature?

The first question can be answered positively: "yes", though I have not been able to make a detailed classification for this paper. The second question, however, seems to lead to a frustrating *non liquet*: the remains of philosophical prose from the Hellenistic and early Imperial periods do not provide sufficient material for comparison. Okkelos' *De univ. nat.* and Timaios' *De univ. nat.* are all-round εἰσαγωγαί of a type apparently (but not necessarily) introduced by Chrysippos¹. The only extant non-Pythagorean representative of this type is Ps.-Arist. *De mundo* which, however, uses a more advanced literary style. Isolated instances among the Doric texts represent other genres that give no better chronological clues, e.g. Lysis, Hipparchos and Dios (see below). The majority of the Doric tracts are rather specialized semi-literary ὑπομνήματα of a kind that was evidently current since the late 4th century B.C.² Most of the tracts have no diatribic traits³. The only non-Pythagorean hypomnemata of this kind, of which we have sufficient remains for making comparisons, are those of Philodemos and Areios Didymos. By conventional standards, Philodemos would seem to be considerably later owing to his advanced terminology and style; but Pythagorean naiveté

¹ Cf. A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Révé. d'Herm. Trism.* II, 344 ff. The ultimate model is of course the Pre-Socratic Περὶ φύσεως type.

² On semi-exoteric hypomnemata in the Hellenistic period, see F. WEHRLI, *Schule d. Arist.* X, 99 f.

³ However, apart from Dios (below, p. 68), note the question-answer style in Archyt. *De vir. bon.*, 9 f. Th. This is apparently the type of exposition from which the catechismal form was developed in the late Hellenistic period; cf. *Texts*, 242, 10 n.

is rather likely to be a conscious device. Areios Didymos looks more advanced, too, but in parts his doxographical accounts (especially the Peripatetic section, Stob. II pp. 116-152 Wa.) really have much in common with the average Doric tracts. Yet I am not prepared to draw chronological conclusions from this, because the genre is likely to be traditional.—The Hermetic Corpus clearly belongs to a different world, if not to a different age.

For the vocabulary, see below (3).

Regarding the conclusions to be drawn from the dialect and the style of the Doric texts, I should like to make seven points which seem to me relevant to the problem of date and place :

(1) On the whole the internal differences in dialect and style are not so great. They suggest a series of authors writing approximately at the same date and in the same environment, rather than writing independently or at widely different dates. Except for some texts listed below under (7), the Pythagorean Doric prose tradition forms a fairly homogeneous whole¹. 'Normal Pythagorean Doric' seems to be represented at least by the following 38 texts :

- Archytas, *De vir. bon.* (*Texts*, p. 8 Th.)
- » *De oppos.* (15)
- » *De princ.* (19)
- » *Categ.* (21)
- » *De leg.* (33)
- » *De intell.* (36)
- » *De nat.* (40)
- » *De educ.* (40)
- » *De sapient.* (43)²
- Aresas (48)
- Aristaios (52)
- (Aristombrotos, 53)³

¹ Detailed statistics cannot be made here ; cf. below (6).

² For *Periktione*, *De sapient.*, cf. below (6).

³ This is a fairly brief fragment not explicitly said to be by a Pythagorean and dealing with a special topic which is rather outside the Pythagorean tradition. Linguistically, however, it belongs to this group.

Brotinos, *De intell.* (55)
 Bryson (56)
 Damippos (68)
 Diotogenes, *De regn.* (71)
 » *De piet.* (75)
 Ekkelos (77)
 Ekphantos (79)
 Euryphamos (85)
 Eurytos (88)
 Hippodamos, *De felic.* (94)
 » *De rep.* (97)
 Kallikratidas (103)
 Kleinias, *De piet.* (108)
 Kriton (109)
 Lysis (111)
 Melissa (115)
 Metopos (116)
 Myia (123)
 Okkelos, *De leg.* (124)
 » *De univ. nat.* (125)
 Onatas (138)
 Philolaos, *De an.* (150)
 Phintys (151)
 Sthenidas (187)
 Theages (190)
 Timaios, *De univ. nat.* (203)

The following were demonstrably or probably also in Doric, though few or no traces remain :

Akron (1)
 Archytas, *De tib.* (20)
 » *De decad.* (21) ¹
 » *Fr. inc.* (47) (one or more)
 Athamas (54)
 Epicharmos, *Ad Anten.* (84)
 Kleinias, *Fr. math.* (108)
 Megillos (115)
 Metrodoros? (121)

¹ This title may refer to an authentic text. The non-Pythagorean titles *Opsart.* (p. 8) and *De r. rust.* (p. 20) suggest that the tracts may have been written in Attic Koiné. *De machin.* (p. 32), from which Diog. Laert. VIII 82 quotes the opening (overlooked in my edition), was evidently in Attic.

- Panakaïos? (141)
 Philolaos, *De rhythm.*? (149)¹
 Proros (154)
 Pythagoras, *Hier. log. Dor.* (164)
 » *Fr. inc.* (186)
 Thearidas (201)
 Thymaridas? (201)
 Timaios, *Math.* (203)

(2) The difference in dialect and style between those fragments of Philolaos and Archytas which are commonly considered authentic, and this 'Normal Pythagorean Doric', lies chiefly in the fact that the pseudepigrapha use a varying amount of post-classical words and archaisms that seem to be lacking in the former. There are no conspicuous differences in the use of dialect characteristics.

(3) The post-classical elements (forms, words, phrases, etc.) occurring in the Doric writings are either found in other Hellenistic texts or, if they are attested only in the Roman period or later (or if they are seemingly hapax legomena), an earlier employment can normally be inferred with some degree of certainty. Arguments *ex silentio* from our scanty Hellenistic material are notoriously easy to misuse as 'chronological criteria'². A few examples at random: For *ιδιωφελής*, Archyt. *De leg.* 33, 31, LSJ give Alex. Aphr. and a Schol. to Arrian as the next occurrences; but Diod. Sic. has *κοινωφελία*, and Philon *κοινωφελής*, and so their opposites may well have been current in Hellenistic literature. The adjective *ειδημονικός* in Archyt. *De educ.* 42, 16 seems to be hapax before Suid., and *ειδήμων* is found only from Ath. onwards; but it may be an archaism, modelled upon classical words such as *ἐπιστημονικός* and upon derivatives in *-ήμων*

¹ Or should we, after all, accept the variant reading *Περὶ ἀριθμῶν*? Cf. Philol. B 11-12 (below, 7).

² Cf. *Introduction*, 57 ff., esp. 66 f.

which are largely poetic. And *τριχθάδιος* in Aresas 49, 3 is, according to LSJ, attested in late poetry ; but Hellenistic poetry has *διχθάδιος*, which makes a contemporary archaistic analogical formation quite possible. On the whole morphology, vocabulary and syntax do not contradict a Hellenistic date, as far as I have been able to extend my examination ; but there are exceptions (see below, 7).

(4) The use of archaisms (including poeticisms and a certain naiveté which may be to some extent a conscious attitude)¹ varies from very occasional traits in some texts (notably Archyt. *De vir. bon.*, *De oppos.*, *Categ.*, *De leg.*, *De intell.*, and Okkelos *De univ. nat.* ; Archyt. *Cathol.* in fact is totally free from archaisms in the vocabulary, though it has other peculiarities) to a very high frequency in some other texts (notably Archyt. *De educ.*, *De sapient.*, *Ep.* 3, Aresas, Dios, Ekkelos, Ekphantos, Lysis, Melissa, Onatas, Pempelos, Pyth. *Hier. log. Dor.*). Sometimes, but not always, a high frequency of archaisms correlates with other oddities, for which see under (7).

(5) The linguistic practice of the texts does not prove that the authors had a practical knowledge of Doric, but it does not prove the opposite, either. As Pythagorean Doric is a literary convention, it necessarily compromises with literary Attic Koiné ; and as some degree of corruption of the text must be assumed, this may account for e.g. the apparent inconsistency in the use of original $\bar{\alpha}$ which is, after all, the greatest obstacle to the assumption of native Dorian authorship. Even literary pseudo-dorisms such as *ὄκως* or *-οισα* may well have been used by Doric-speaking writers (cf. e.g. Theokritos). Only abstruse dialect features, such as *ἐν* with the accusative in Dios (71, 4), look somewhat suspicious in this context. The comparative

¹ Poeticisms are commonly found in Hellenistic prose ; cf. *Introduction*, 66 and n. 4. I do not know of any study of naivism in Greek literature.

homogeneity of 'normal Pythagorean Doric' at least indicates that most of the authors had studied the rules of their dialect convention with some care, whether they were native Dorians or not ¹.

(6) Without the aid of very detailed statistics and electronic computers it is rather hopeless to map out the linguistic inter-relations of the texts, and especially the distribution of identical or mutually exclusive patterns. On the basis of the analyses I have made I can only state that very few of the texts give the impression of having been written by the same person. Common authorship can, in my view, be assumed for :

Archytas, *De oppos.* and *Categ.*
 Diotogenes, *De regn.* and *De piet.*
 Hippodamos, *De felic.* and *De rep.* ²

Regarding the question of Periktione, *De sapient.*, I have changed my view since the publication of the *Texts*: following Hense (see *Texts*, p. 146), I am now inclined to identify it with Archytas, *De sapient.*

(7) The following texts show notable oddities and anomalies ³; it is reasonable to assume that most of these writings were composed in environments different from that which produced 'Normal Pythagorean Doric':

¹ Cf. *Introduction*, 94.

² *De felic.* has only γα and *De rep.* only γε, but this may be due to corruption.

³ Minor peculiarities cannot of course be recorded here. Some of these are clearly distinctive features (cf. above, 6), though their relevance to chronology is doubtful. I mention the following: the use of the abstruse ἐστώ in Archyt. *De princ.* (cf. Pyth. *Hier. log. Dor.*, p. 166, 3); σδ for ζ in Archyt. *De educ.* (recorded as a properly Doric δδ in *Introduction*, 88); the pomposity of Ekphantos (above, 4); the predilection of Timaios Lokros for the τούτέων type (*Introduction*, 89).

ARCHYTAS, *Cathol.* Very superficial Doric with some peculiar mannerisms¹. The author is unacquainted with Archyt. *Categ.* and normal Pythagorean Doric. A few terms look decidedly late: ἀθύπαρκτος 3, 13; ἑτερούσιος 4, 1; ἐγκόσμιος / ὑπερκόσμιος 7, 30.

ARCHYTAS, *Ep.* 1 and 2. A comparatively ambitious use of the dialect with some inconsistencies (not identical in the two letters)².

ARCHYTAS, *Ep.* 3. A rather florid style; badly corrupted.

CHARONDAS, *Proem.* Only the first paragraph is in Doric. This is probably a secondary device: the whole text is written in a fluent literary style unlikely to have been originally composed in Doric.—The *Laws* seem to have been current only in an Attic version, like the *Laws* of Zaleukos.

DIOS. A rhetorical diatribe using a very artificial Doric colouring and a notably exuberant style.

HIPPARCHOS. Superficial Doric touch (perhaps a secondary device). The style seems to be that of literary protreptic, a genre not practised by other Pythagoreans.

LYSIS. A fairly elaborate Doric mask of the Pythagorean type, and an expansive and florid style. The author seems to aim at a higher literary level than what Pythagorean Doric normally represents.

MELISSA and MYIA. The dialect of these letters is rather 'normal Pythagorean Doric', but their form and subject matter bring them into a class of their own³. Myia is considerably more matter-of-fact than Melissa.

PEMPELOS. A stylistically over-loaded elaboration of some passages in Plato, in a somewhat artificial Doric.

PHILOLAOS, B 11-12 DK⁴. A notably inconsistent use of Doric (yet τούτας p. 411, 12), and a somewhat expansive style of a type not elsewhere used in the Doric prose texts⁵.

ZALEUKOS, *Proem.* A fluent style in Attic Koiné with very occasional dorisms (which are probably secondary). Cf. Charondas.

¹ Cf. *Introduction*, 89.

² *Ep.* 1 has 1st pl. -μεν, inf. -μεν; *Ep.* 2 1st pl. -μες, inf. -μειν.

³ Cf. the paraenetic letters of Theano (*Texts*, 195 ff.; W. BURKERT, *Gnomon* 39 (1967), 550) which probably existed in Attic versions only. On the other hand the approach of Phintys (*Texts*, 151 ff.) corresponds to that of the Doric tracts, not to the letters.

⁴ Proved to be post-Platonic by W. BURKERT, *Weisheit und Wissenschaft*, 252 ff. The apocryphal fragment B 14 (*ibid.*, 230 f.) presents problems of its own.

⁵ It resembles the so-called 'hymnic style'; for this term, see G. RUDBERG, *Arctos*, N.S. I (1954), 138 f.

COMMENTS ON BURKERT'S VIEW

In the case of Archytas' *Cathol.* I have nothing to add to Prof. Burkert's exposition. This is clearly an anomalous text, and the reasons for regarding it as a Renaissance forgery seem conclusive.

Archytas' *Categ.*, *De intell.*, and a series of ethical tracts, notably Archytas' *De educ.* and *De vir. bon.*, are dated by Prof. Burkert in the age of Augustus, and Ekphantos is put by him, tentatively, as late as the 3rd century A.D. Here I have to start protesting.

The first and foremost difficulty, for me, is having to accept a spreading out of these texts over a wide range of periods—from some indeterminate pre-Posidonian date (Prof. Burkert suggests 150 B.C.) over late Hellenism and the Augustan age to the late Imperial period. The Doric texts really do seem to form a relatively homogenous group¹—with a few striking exceptions that only confirm this general impression. This is not only a matter of language and style (see above). It is also a matter of attitudes, of choosing pseudonyms, of neglecting Pythagoras and neglecting some well-known aspects of Pythagoreanism, and so forth. I would find it very odd indeed, if it could be proved that this kind of literature was produced at very different dates. At least the main body of it is likely to belong approximately to the same age.

And I still see another serious difficulty in the fact that, in the first centuries B.C. and A.D., the general picture of a 'Pythagorean' was distinctly different from that displayed by Pseudo-Archytas, Pseudo-Okkelos, and similar texts². I find it quite significant that Cicero calls the occultist

¹ I assert this contrary to W. BURKERT, *Gnomon* 34 (1962), 39; 39 (1967), 556.

² Cf. *Introduction*, 46 ff.; 54 f.; W. BURKERT, *Weisheit und Wissenschaft*, p. 85 n. 56. For Nigidius, see the next note.

Nigidius Figulus a Pythagorean¹, and that he provides his own 'Archytas' with a strong ascetic pathos² which is absent from the Ps.-Archytea known to us. Also the pythagorizing platonism of the *Dream of Scipio* is clearly religious. In my *Introduction* I argued that King Juba II, the notorious collector of Pythagorica, was in fact searching for works by 'Pythagoras'³. Now Prof. Burkert suggests that a shift of emphasis may have occurred owing to the expulsion of Anaxilas from Rome in 28 B.C. This I find rather improbable. Apart from the fact that decrees of authorities seldom manage to change religious attitudes—can we really expect occultists to become Academics and Peripatetics just out of opportunism? And not long after this we have the Sextii and Sotion focusing their interest, not on Archytas, but on Pythagoras and the Pythagorean way on life (they taught abstinence from flesh, it should be remembered, though they emphasized the ethical implications of this precept), and Ovid writing his much-debated myth of Pythagoras. Producing, in those days, 'Pythagorean philosophy' of the Pseudo-Archytas kind would have been rather anomalous. However, the texts must have been quite a success, to judge by the amount produced. Should we not have heard more about their authors, if they had been active in the days of the last Alexandrians and Varro and Cicero, or in early Imperial Rome?

I am glad to see that Prof. Burkert not only accepts my assumption of an Italian origin of most of the Doric tracts, but also reinforces it with additional arguments (though some of these, such as the reference to Juba, I would consider rather irrelevant).

¹ *Tim.* 1. Cf. *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 46 f.

² *Cato Ma.* 39-41: *nullam capitaliorem pestem quam uoluptatem*, etc.

³ *Introduction*, 54 f. Cf. especially Pyth. *On plants* and Juba's botanical interests (*FGrH* 275).

On the other hand, the lack of evidence from Alexandria, even at a date when there certainly existed pseudonymous Doric tracts, seems to form a rather strong negative argument against the assumption that the texts were compiled anywhere in the metropolies of the East. Even Ps.-Ekphantos' *De regn.*, in spite of its Jewish and Hermetic traits, was not necessarily written in Alexandria. The Alexandrian sources of Diogenes Laertios did not possess lists of Archytas' writings; yet there evidently existed authentic or semi-authentic works by him, and the *Περὶ γεωργίας* and *Περὶ μηχανῆς* known to Demetrios Magnes suggest the existence of other Pseudo-Archytea at that date. Moreover, Eudoros' account of Pythagorean doctrines appears to refer to metaphysical ideas already current in Pythagorean circles in the 4th century, and at any rate his account is pointedly historical¹; indeed it is not wholly unthinkable that he employed texts such as Ps.-Archytas' *De princ.* as historical documents. And if the *Anonymus Photii* belongs to the environment of Eudoros, as has been recently argued², it is worth notice that Archytas and his school receive only a brief mention in passing (237, 6 Th.): the interest is really focused on Pythagoras. And Philon, who was naturally interested in Pythagoreanism, had only few 'original texts' at his disposal: he refers to Okkelos as an ancient authority whom he happened to come across, and he quotes Onatas from an intermediate source—mistaking him for Philolaos because of the unclear reference of the source, as can be seen from the corresponding passage in Johannes Lydus³. This is

¹ Simpl. *In Phys.*, CAG IX, 181, 10 ff. Cf. P. WILPERT, *Hermes* 76 (1941), 225 ff.; A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Révé. d'Herm. Trism.* IV, 6 ff.; P. BOYANCÉ, *REA* 64 (1962), 446. Note the fact that Eudoros uses past tense.

² W. THEILER, *Parusia, Festgabe für Hirschberger*, Frankfurt 1965, p. 209 ff. (also in *Unters. z. ant. Lit.*, 494 ff.).

³ See *Texts*, 140, 151, 8 n. P. BOYANCÉ, *REG* 76 (1963), 91-95 tentatively suggests that the source was Eudoros.

quite an important piece of evidence against the theory of Alexandrian origin.

The Doric tracts *On Kingship*, and in particular the most extravagant of them, Ekphantos, have been placed in very different contexts by different scholars. Now Prof. Burkert suggests the environment of Iulia Domna. Somehow I feel sure that this Imperial Lady had preferred to read a tract by a more prominent Pythagorean, or by Pythagoras himself, but this is of course no argument. Personally I should like to have Ekphantos fitted into a Seleuco-Ptolemaic framework, as also has been done¹. But I do not want to deny the reflexes of Jewish and perhaps Egyptian thought to which Prof. Burkert has now drawn our attention. Perhaps we may leave the date of Ekphantos open.

As to the question which post-classical epochs are most likely to have produced pseudo-Doric prose, I proposed in my *Introduction*² the Dorian vogue in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. as a reasonable background. If the 3rd century is too early—and as the Hadrianic age is definitely too late for the majority of the Pythagorean tracts—a Hellenistic date and a (formerly) Doric environment seem preferable to an early Imperial date and a completely non-Doric environment. As a matter of fact, following the rules of Pythagorean Doric (cf. above) certainly did require more skill and more interest in the dialect, than writing Ionic prose: Ionic could be produced, and was indeed produced, almost anywhere in antiquity. The case of the unfortunate Xenon only indicates that the court of Tiberius (and hence Thrasyllus?) were not habitually impressed by Doric *σεμνότης*.

On the other hand I should like to call attention to the tradition (Greg. Corinth. *De dial. ling. gr.*, p. 3 ff. Schaef.; from

¹ Cf. *Introduction*, 38 f.; T. ADAM, *Clementia Principis*, Kieler historische Studien 11 (1970), esp. p. 13, n. 17 (where further references), 14 f.

² Cf. *Introduction*, 78-83, 95.

Johannes Philoponos?) according to which Tryphon, the Greek grammarian who lived in Rome under Augustus, considered Archytas a classic of Doric prose. If this is so (and in fact we know that Tryphon was interested in dialectology), it probably implies the existence of a collection of Archytea at that date—and a collection that did not bear quite a recent stamp.

As Prof. Burkert mentioned, a collection of Doric tracts of the Pseudo-Archytas type is also implied by a passage in a work by a more famous contemporary of Tryphon, Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Περὶ μιμήσεως* p. 210, 11 ff. Us.-Rad. The passage reads in full as follows: τῶν φιλοσόφων δ' ἀναγνωστέον τούς τε Πυθαγορικούς τῆς σεμνότητος καὶ τῶν ἠθῶν καὶ τῶν δογμάτων ἕνεκεν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀπαγγελίας· μεγαλοπρεπεῖς γὰρ τῇ λέξει καὶ ποιητικοί. καὶ οὐδὲ παραλυποῦσι τὴν σαφήνειαν κεκραμένη τῇ διαλέκτῳ χρώμενοι· μιμητέον δὲ [lacune] μάλιστα Ξενοφῶντα καὶ Πλάτωνα κτλ. Unfortunately, however, this is probably an interpolation¹.

To sum up: Together with the references in Philon and Varro (and some other considerations to which I shall come presently), these indications point to the existence of a 'Pythagorean Corpus' of some kind in the first part of the 1st century B.C. It included works attributed to Archytas and other Pythagoreans. The Varro passage (*Censorin.* IV 3, *Texts* p. 125, 10) in particular makes such an inference probable. Here the author records, as authorities for the view that mankind has always existed, *Pythagoran Samium et Ocellum Lucanum et Archytan Tarentinum omnesque adeo Pythagoricos*. This is really a somewhat silly generalization from Pseudo-Okkelos, but it suggests that Varro (or his source, the author of the *Vetusta Placita*) knew the existence of a

¹ This does not necessarily follow from the seemingly superfluous τε and the lacune after μιμητέον δέ. But it is true that Dionysios is not very likely to have taken such an interest in abstruse and little-known dialect texts.

corpus of Doric Pythagorica—which he had not read, of course. So it is not surprising that Cicero was not acquainted with it¹.

Possibly, however, this corpus was largely identical with the collection used by Stobaios and other late authors.

Also the curious occurrence of Archytas ὁ πρεσβύτερος in *Anon. Phot.* (237, 6 Th., here as the teacher of Plato) and Iamblichos (*VP* 104, here as the personal pupil of Pythagoras) may be taken as a slight indication of the existence of philosophical Ps.-Archytea in the Hellenistic age. It probably implies a differentiation of two philosophers named Archytas (and not a differentiation between the philosopher and one of the homonyms listed in Diog. Laert. VIII 82, because the Pythagorean tradition is not likely to have taken account of the latter); and the differentiation may have come about when there occurred Archytea which, to critical minds, were evidently dependent upon Plato or Aristotle. And we happen to know a Hellenistic tradition² according to which it was Archytas who was influenced by Plato, instead of vice versa.

Two Pseudo-Archytea, the *Περὶ γεωργίας* and the *Περὶ μηχανῆς*, which were apparently not in Doric and which did not represent Pythagorean traditions, were known in Rome at least since the mid-1st century B.C. (Demetrios Magnes, Varro, Vitruvius). It is tempting to think that the publication of at least some Pythagorean Pseudo-Archytea must have preceded these.

¹ The picture that Cicero draws of Archytas in *Cato Ma.* 39-41 is a strong indication of this; Cato belongs to Cicero's last works. Cf. also above, p. 69 f.

² [Dem.] *Erot.* 46 and (Ps. -?) Eratosth. ap. Eutoc. *In Archim.* III 88 Heiberg. Sometimes Iamblichos seems to imply that Archytas was dependent upon Plato in matters concerning the doctrine of the soul (cf. A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Révélation d'Herm. Trism.* III, 207 n. 1); note especially Stob. I 369, 9 f. Wa.: οἱ δὲ περὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Ἀρχύτας καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Πυθαγόρειοι τὴν ψυχὴν τριμερῆ ἀποφαίνονται.

I do not deny that I feel greatly tempted to go still further back in time and suggest a partial identification of this hypothetical collection of Doric Pythagorica with the collection of Pythagorean texts that Poseidonios apparently knew of. Prof. Burkert also seems to admit this possibility. Especially the passage on the tripartite soul appears to be relevant here. Poseidonios (ap. Galen *Plac. H ϕ . et Plat.* 4, 7 V p. 425 K.) states that, before Plato, Pythagoras had divided the activities of the soul into νοῦς, θυμός, and ἐπιθυμία (cf. Aët. IV 4, 1; Cic. *Tusc.* IV 10); and in a similar context (ibid. 5, 6 V p. 478 K.) he states that what Pythagoras said about the soul can be inferred from what his pupils wrote. Could these 'pupils' have been, for instance, Aresas (49, 3 ff.), Kallikratidas (103, 3 ff.), or Metopos (118, 1 ff.)? Prof. Burkert evidently would not go as far as that, as he places Kallikratidas and Metopos in the environment of Areios Didymos. Yet it is remarkable that the Pythagorean hypomnemata used by Alexander Polyhistor offer a variant of the tripartite soul (*Texts*, p. 236, 1-2) which is not the Platonic one ascribed to Pythagoras by Poseidonios. Poseidonios obviously did not use the hypomnemata known to Alexander, but he did use some texts rather corresponding to our Doric tracts.

The question of the hypomnemata of Alexander, however, leads over to a further set of difficulties as regards the late date theory. I mean the following considerations:

Whatever be the precise order of composition of the Doric tracts¹, it seems reasonable to suppose that at least some Pseudo-Archytea are earlier than most of the texts attributed to other Pythagoreans. The primary position of Archytas within this literature is rather obvious (cf. *Intro-*

¹ In my *Introduction* I tentatively suggested a model for this; I do not wish to insist upon it, as it includes too many unknown factors. On the question of internal borrowing, see *Introduction*, 75; 109 f.

duction, pp. 92 ff., and above), and it is also emphasized by Prof. Burkert. I have been playing with the thought that all or most of the Pseudo-Archytea opened the series of apocryphas, and that all or most of the rest were compiled later, but attributed to Pythagoreans who were supposed to have lived earlier than Archytas. Though the process was perhaps not as simple as that, there occurred rather inevitably a 'regressive inflation' of authorities, an ever 'higher bidding', as the writings are clearly not by the same person¹, and no deliberate distribution of rôles and tasks can be assumed.

This hypothetical process, as I am inclined to see it, probably had some remote connection with the legends that told about secret hypomnemata containing the true teaching of Pythagoras. The elaboration of these legends can be traced in some apocryphal letters and some other passages, notably in Porphyry. It will be necessary here to review them briefly.

In the classical age there were current various stories about Ἱεροὶ λόγοι or other speeches by Pythagoras, with the implication that these were not written down by Pythagoras himself². Somebody (possibly Aristoxenos) intimated that Plato had copied his *Timaeus* from such a secret Pythagorean document, which he had acquired at a very high price. In the first known reference to this story, deriving from Timon of Phleious, the author or writer of the document is anonymous; but Hermippos (beginning of

¹ Cf. above, comments on language (6). I also think the theoretical possibility can be excluded that the names of the Pythagorean authors have been later added by a collector or a librarian, as a literary ornament. As can be seen both from the form and the contents, the texts were written as 'Pythagorean' tracts; and the personal elements indicate a composition *in persona* (cf. below, p. 80).

² See the references in *Texts*, 158 ff.; 177 ff.; add C. J. DE VOGEL, *Pythagoras and early Pythagoreanism*, passim (cf. *Mnemosyne* 21 (1968), 298 ff.).

3rd c.B.C.) says it was Philolaos and states the price: 40 Alexandrian (!) minae. Towards the end of the 3rd century (before Satyros) somebody fabricated a letter by Plato to Dion, where Dion is asked to buy from Philolaos, at the price of 100 minae, three books of Pythagorean hypomnemata¹. The latter version obviously has something to do with the so-called *Tripartitum* (Παιδευτικόν, Πολιτικόν, Φυσικόν) attributed to Pythagoras². The growing of these stories apparently reflects Eastern Greek traditions, as the central person is Plato, and as the *Tripartitum* was written in Ionic³. But the legends later received Western Greek counterparts. We possess part of a spurious correspondence between Archytas and Plato concerning the hypomnemata of Okkelos which Archytas has discovered in Lucania and which he now sends to Plato; Plato in his turn sends to Archytas the hypomnemata which he possesses—evidently those of Philolaos are meant. Archytas' letter is in Doric, and there are references in Plato's letter to the Trojan ancestry of the Lucanians, which must be intended for a Roman public, possibly in the 2nd century B.C., at any rate hardly after Sulla⁴. Somewhat similar in content is the badly corrupted Doric letter which I have

¹ References in *Texts*, 147 f.; cf. W. BURKERT, *Weisheit und Wissenschaft*, 208 ff.; K. VON FRITZ, *RE* 23 (1963), 229 f.

² Cf. W. BURKERT, *Philologus* 105 (1961), 19 n. 3; 24 and n. 4. But the habit of attaching 'documentary' letters to forgeries seems to be rather late; in the case of *Rhet. ad Alex.* the letter is rather a prologue. The Pythagorean cases, including the Okkelos letters (cf. my suggestions in *Eranos* 60 (1962), 18 ff. and below, p. 80), are all very doubtful. References to existing or imaginary tracts occur in e.g. [Plat.] *Ep.* XIII, 360 b, but we need not suppose that the letter was actually published together with such texts.

³ Cf. also *Texts*, 46, 16 ff.

⁴ Cf. *Eranos* 60 (1962), 8 ff. With the massacres of Sulla the Lucani seem to have ceased to exist as a nation. And in the 1st century B.C. the Roman literary public was probably too sophisticated for such bluffing.

hypothetically classed as 'Archytas, *Letter 3*'¹. Also the Roman Numa forgery of the year 181 B.C.² may reflect such stories of hypomnemata, and so does perhaps the Latin 'Ἰερὸς λόγος'³.

The problem of the letter of Lysis and Alexander's 'Hypomnemata' is rather more complicated. The letter is written in Doric, yet it refers to hypomnemata preserved in Pythagoras' family and to other matters (initiation, secrecy, etc.) not considered in the Doric tracts of the Pseudo-Archytas type. Prof. Burkert has elsewhere⁴ given us his reasons for dating the letter in the 3rd century and combining it with the hypomnemata of Alexander. Though I would gladly accept the early date, I doubt that this identification of the hypomnemata is correct⁵. However, this is not so important here as the chronology.

An interesting account by Porphyry of the collecting of ancient Pythagorean hypomnemata has recently been dis-

¹ Is 'Adrastos' = Aresas the Lucanian (*Texts*, 48, and cf. the Okkelos story)? Why is the letter put among the Socratic epistles? Is Lysis supposed to be the author?

² Cf. W. BURKERT, *Philologus* 105 (1961), 240 ff.

³ *Texts*, 167. The implication of Iamblichos (*VP* 152 ἐν τοῖς Λατίνοις) is not altogether clear.

⁴ *Philologus* 105 (1961), 17 ff.

⁵ The Hypomnemata of Alexander are rather heterogeneous and suggest a compilation from several sources (cf. *Texts*, 235, 9, 28-29; 236, 20), and they include a number of non-Attic features (235, 10; 236, 10, 11, 14, 15, 22) that suggest poetry or Ionic rather than Doric prose which should be expected in a tract combined with Lysis' letter. The fact that Iamblichos (*VP* 146) makes the impossible combination of the letter with the *Hier. log. Dor.* indicates that Lysis was not traditionally combined with any other text. Moreover, the letter is rather too elaborate and self-sufficient for being an introduction to something more important, and the curse at the end of the letter does not really suit an introduction. I am inclined to think that the letter refers to some 'Ἰερὸς λόγος, existing or fictitious, though it was not published together with it. For the purpose of the letter, cf. below, p. 86.

covered in an Arabic source¹. The extant version is rather confused; I would interpret it as follows: Porphyry recorded that Archytas and his contemporaries (i.e., Plato and others) collected 80 books by Pythagoras and 200 books by Pythagoreans, some of which were forgeries; later, the spurious texts have been separated from the rest². The central position of Archytas is again worth notice. And elsewhere (In Ptol. *Harm.* p. 56 Düring) Porphyry states that most of Archytas' works are authentic. Thus Porphyry appears to have inferred from his sources (chiefly the letters?) that the large collections of Pythagorica that existed in his days contained both authentic and spurious writings by Pythagoras and his personal pupils (cf. Porph. *VP* 6) and, in addition, a largely authentic corpus of Archytea. Apparently he regarded Kallikratidas, Metopos and the rest as belonging to an older generation than Archytas. It was, in fact, a common notion in the Imperial age that most of the Doric tracts are hypomnemata of the teaching of Pythagoras: (Ps. ?-) Galen quotes Metopos as 'Pythagoras'³; Clement and others quote a compilation from Doric texts likewise as 'Pythagoras'⁴; Iamblichos (*VP* 104) implies that most of the Pythagoreans known by name had been personal disciples of Pythagoras—even Archytas ὁ πρεσβύτερος! The notion that pupils of Pythagoras wrote the Pythagorean texts can probably be traced back at least to Poseidonios, as we have seen⁵.

¹ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a; cf. B. L. VAN DER WAERDEN, *RE* Suppl. 10, 1965, 862 f. Cf. also the passages of Porph. and Iambl. recorded in *Introduction*, 77 n. 5.

² B. L. VAN DER WAERDEN l.c. gives a different interpretation.

³ *Texts* 120, 15 n. If this is a Humanist interpolation, as H. DIELS argued (*Doxogr.*, 240), it at any rate reflects an ancient tendency.

⁴ *Texts*, 186. It is true that these Doric texts have not been identified.

⁵ Cf. also Alex. Polyh. quoting 'Pythagorean hypomnemata', above, p. 78, n. 5.

At any rate, the legends of the collecting of hypomnemata concerning Pythagoras' teaching had apparently reached the West in the 2nd century or, if the Numa forgery is irrelevant, about 80 B.C. at the latest (Poseidonios, the Okkelos letters, Alexander Polyhistor).

Let us now return to the question of the relation of the tracts to these legends. To judge by the complete texts we have, Pseudo-Okkelos and Pseudo-Timaios (beside Archytas' *Categories*), and to judge by various other indications (e.g. personal traits such as φαμί, ἐμοῖ δοκεῖ), the Doric writings were not originally composed as hypomnemata of Pythagoras' teaching, but as personal tracts—whatever later users of the *Corpus Pythagoricum* took them for. This would indicate that they were written independently of the now extant elaborations of the legends—perhaps only faintly reflecting the idea that there had been earlier Pythagoreans who knew 'more' than Archytas.

In the Okkelos case, at least, I am now rather convinced that the tracts were composed before the letters were written: the letters allude to the tracts *qua* hypomnemata of the true and authentic doctrine from which Plato and Archytas have profited—a somewhat stupid misconception or rather, perhaps, a shrewdly tendentious construction which the author of the letter is clearly capable of¹. The author of Plato's letter to Dion probably referred to the *Tripartitum*², and this is rather irrelevant to the question of the Doric tracts. Whether the author of Lysis' letter had Doric tracts in his mind or not (the δαμοσίᾳ φιλοσοφέν 114, 4 and παραβάται 114, 11 could imply this), he seems at least to be acquainted

¹ I have somewhat changed my view since I wrote my article in *Eranos* 60 (1962). The author of the letter makes another mistake (which is hardly a deliberate change) in referring to Okkelos' Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντός φύσεως as Περὶ τῶν πάντων γενέσιος (cf. 126, 16).

² Timaios' *De univ. nat.* of course implies only the earliest version of the legend of Plato's use of Pythagorean documents.

with 'Pythagorean Doric', though he inclines to exaggerate it stylistically. As far as I can see, the only Pseudo-Pythagorean tracts that probably has some connection with Ps.-Lysis, is Hipparchos' *Περὶ εὐθυμίας* (apart from the pseudonym, note 89, 20 f./113, 12 f.; 91, 8/113, 17 ff.)¹. Now, Ps.-Hipparchos is a conventional protreptic with Democritean or Epicurean traits, and it has not so much in common with the Ps.-Archytas type (see also the dialect, above). I am not prepared to decide whether Lysis alludes to Hipparchos or Hipparchos to Lysis: both interpretations seem possible. But at any rate the Lysis-Hipparchos line appears to represent a side-branch in the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorean tradition.

However, the Okkelos letters are very likely to imply the existence, before 80 B.C., of the Okkelos tracts (which are clearly not written by the same person, see above, dialect), and furthermore the existence of at least Archytas' *De leg.* (implied by 46, 4-6 Th.) and some Philolaic hypomnemata (implied by 46, 13)—a *Corpusculum Pythagoricum* at any rate. And the closely related 'Archytas, *Letter 3*' apparently implies the existence of other works, and so does apparently also the reference in Poseidonios (which does not concern Okkelos nor, to judge by the extant pieces, Archytas *De leg.*).

Now, Alexander Polyhistor evidently either did not know these tracts, or did not regard them as reliable or interesting ancient documents, as he quotes a compilation of a rather different kind as Pythagorean 'hypomnemata'—in fact something similar to, but not identical with, the *Tripartitum*. The question why Alexander did not use the Doric tracts leaves room for speculation in different directions. However, assuming for a moment that our tracts

¹ There is a remote possibility of 'Archytas, *Ep. 3*' being modelled upon Lysis' letter; cf. above, p. 78, n. 1.

actually did not exist before Alexander, and that Poseidonios refers to some other texts, and that the Sullan era is not, after all, the last possible date for the Okkelos letters, we instantly meet a new serious obstacle : how can it be explained that the series of writings to which Varro refers—Okkelos and ‘all the rest’—was compiled in Rome soon after Alexander, *not* as hypomnemata of Pythagoras’ teaching (which could have been easily done), but as *personal* tracts, fathered on various minor Pythagoreans? Also from a general point of view it is much more likely that the tracts here in question did exist before Alexander Polyhistor, and that he knew of their existence, but that he did not find them sufficiently interesting for being worth quoting. To him the current legends of hypomnemata meant a challenge to search for something more archaic. He was oriented towards the teaching of the Master himself, towards original Pythagoreanism ; and so his attitude represents the same tendency as represent, for instance, the *Anonymus Photii*, Diodorus Siculus, most trends in Roman Pythagoreanism and, in fact, the ‘Ἰερὸς λόγος in Doric prose, attributed to Pythagoras himself (which, on the Doric pseudepigraphical side, represents in my view the last stage of the regressive ‘over-bidding’ of authorities) ¹.

AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL

I have here accounted for a number of reasons why I prefer to remain sceptical towards the tendency to date the

¹ Cf. *Introduction*, 105. At any rate the idea of Pythagoras the Samian writing in Doric must have been a fairly late one, and it is likely to have been a consequence of the notion that his pupils ‘wrote’ in Doric. It is a pity that the *t.a.g.* probably offered by Metrodoros (*Texts*, 121, 17 ; 122, 13) is undatable. If the Historian Timaios said that Pythagoras had referred to the Doric word μαῖα (Iambl. *VP* 56, cf. *FGrH* 566 F 17), this does not mean that he imagined him speaking or writing Doric (as W. BURKERT

Doric Pseudo-Pythagorean tracts in the Augustan age or later. I am not going to argue against the parallels in Cicero, Areios Didymos, etc. to which Prof. Burkert has referred; here my only argument is that on the whole such parallels do not seem to exclude the assumption of common sources to be derived ultimately from the environment of Kritolaos and Karneades. Antiochos and Andronikos are no definite *termini post quem* for our texts.

We seem to be facing here a typical, rather frustrating, problem of humanistic method. How far can indicative arguments be trusted in our spirals of cumulative so-called 'proof'? Indeed, if there were a single absolute criterion (an explicit contemporary reference to one of the texts, for instance) things would be rather more safe. But we have found none. We are left with a heap of disparate 'indications', some of them ambiguous so as to point in either direction according to one's wishes.

A compromise between the views of Prof. Burkert and myself might be possible if we could both agree upon the following theory as a frame for further elaborations: The majority of the tracts were composed in Italy, by Greeks from Magna Graecia, after Kritolaos and Karneades but before Poseidonios, i.e., in the latter part of the 2nd century B.C. and, more precisely, somewhere at the periphery of the Scipionic Circle. They reflect a 'modernized' Tarentinian Pythagoreanism. The desperate problem why contemporary and later sources tell us nothing about the efforts and intentions of these quasi-Pythagoreans, at least is not greater with this assumption than if a later date is taken for granted. In fact, the main reasons why the collection of the Doric tracts was so little used and so little known before the Neo-

suggested, *Gnomon* 34 (1962), 766 and n. 3). — O. BRINKMANN, *RbM* 66 (1911), 616 ff. discusses an inscription, probably from the 1st c. A.D., which appears to imply the tradition of Pythagoras 'the Dorian'; cf. also *Introduction*, 83.

platonists rediscovered it, may have been the following: (1) though the texts were not really esoteric, they were too abstruse for the general reader (cf. Porph. *VP* 53, and the 'apology' of Ps.(?)-Dion. Hal., above) and too uninteresting to the specialist in philosophy in the 1st centuries B.C. and A.D.; (2) people interested in Pythagoreanism began to ask for occultism and ritualism rather than for conventional ethics and metaphysics; and (3) the Greek civilization of Magna Graecia died out.

But this alternative, too, is a theoretical model based upon the assumption that the arguments for a late date are not—apart from exceptional cases—absolutely conclusive. The question of the homogeneity of this literature is really crucial. For my part, I find it difficult to regard, for instance, Archytas' *Categ.* as an 'exceptional case' as far as dialect and style are concerned¹. But Archytas' *De educ.*, Timaios and Ekphantos are indeed 'exceptional' in certain stylistic respects². This only complicates matters.

When all is said, I should decidedly prefer an ἐποχή in this chronological controversy, until more arguments have been accumulated.

THE QUESTION OF THE INTENTION AND PURPOSE OF THE DORIC TRACTS

This may have some bearing upon the question of date and place, and it is perhaps of a more immediate interest to this conference than the question of chronology. Besides, as far as I can see, it has never really been discussed. Here I can only offer a few suggestions.

¹ However, it corresponds to Timaios' and Okkelos' *De univ. nat.* (and to Archytas' *Cathol.*) but *differs* from the rest in being mainly a systematic up-to-date epitome of a classic.

² Cf. above, p. 67, n. 3.

Among the various motives which Dr. Speyer¹ has listed as characteristic of pseudepigraphy, I think "Gewinnsucht" can on the whole be excluded in this case. The Doric tracts seem to lack an apparatus for 'assuring' the authenticity or awakening the reader's personal interest, such as could be expected if their primary purpose were to dupe bibliomaniacs or appeal to rich patrons². On the contrary, the authors are seriously engaged in their topics. In the case of Charondas and Zaleukos, Dr. Speyer suggests "Ergänzung der Überlieferung" as motive; this may well be true, though the slight Pythagorean touches indicate an additional purpose: *ad maiorem Pythagoreorum gloriam*. The latter also applies to Hipparchos' *De tranqu.* which represents a Pseudo-Pythagorean incorporation of a new area of philosophy: the protreptic. And in a way this applies to many or most of the tracts—Dr. Speyer would perhaps call it "Wirkungswille". The tracts *On Kingship* are of course addressed to a king (potential or actual) or an emperor³ (and so they may imply a touch of "Gewinnsucht"); they attempt to illuminate the 'Pythagorean' basis of kingship. The large tracts of Okkelos and Timaios, again, are all-round εἰσαγωγαί with ultimately perhaps an identical purpose: to emphasize the Pythagorean character of the Peripatetic and the Platonic conception of the world, respectively. This must be the general intention of the majority of the rest, too, though they deal with more specific topics.

So I would characterize the Doric tracts, on the whole, as a somewhat reactionary Academic and Peripatetic philosophical propaganda in a Pythagorean disguise. It is propa-

¹ *Lit. Fälschung*, p. 131 ff.

² Cf. above, p. 77, n. 2. The Okkelos letters and the Okkelos tracts are obviously not written by the same person.

³ L. DELATTE thought of the Roman Emperor; cf. *Introduction*, 67 ff. I suggested Hieron II (*Introduction*, 101). Cf. ADAM, *l.c.* (above, p. 72, n. 1).

ganda for a select public who is expected to listen—hence there are few protreptic or diatribic traits, and little polemic. The reason for choosing the archaizing Pythagorean mask can perhaps be explained historically and geographically. But I would venture to assert that the authors themselves sincerely believed that original Platonism and Aristotelism are essentially Pythagoreanism. And so they cannot really be accused of fraud or forgery in a base sense ¹.

The writings are clearly not esoteric, but rather ‘semi-exoteric’. Hence they are not symptomatic of a revival of the Pythagorean School, only of an activating of the interest in Pythagorean philosophy. This is probably true of Lysis’ letter, too, though it makes a point of ‘Pythagorean secrecy’: the letter is clearly literary. Its intention is, possibly, to shift the emphasis from the Archytas line of approach to the Pythagoras line.

¹ Dr. Speyer’s position seems to be somewhat different here, cf. *Lit. Fälschung*, 140 ff., 307. Also Prof. Burkert apparently is of a different opinion. In 1961 (*Philologus* 105, 234 ff.) he regarded Pseudo-Pythagoreanism as, largely, a literary fiction, and in 1962 (*Gnomon* 34, 768) he suggested, following R. HARDER and others, that most Doric texts were forged as would-be ‘models’ for various well-known works by classical philosophers, in order to make the Academics and Peripatetics seem plagiarists. But had it not been more natural, then, simply to reproduce part of the classics and elaborate the fiction of plagiarism, instead of changing, shortening and modernizing the classical text (cf. e.g. Archyt. *De intell.*, *Categ.*, Tim. *De univ. nat.*) and letting the bewildered reader find out for himself that So and So may be accused of plagiarism? It is notable that *Anon. Phot.* 238, 18 Th. still insists that Plato’s ethics were not Pythagorean in origin, contrary to his physics and mathematics. But it is true that Okkelos’ *De univ. nat.* was later taken for the model of Arist. *De gen. et corr.* (see *Texts*, 125, 14 n.); cf. Timaios Lokros. — We know the names of some (supposed or real) forgers of Pythagorica, beginning with Ninon, Hippasos and Lysis. Aston (Diog. Laert. VIII 7) and Kleemporos (Plin. *NH* XXIV 159), like Ninon, Hippasos and Lysis, are said to have fabricated texts attributed to Pythagoras. The list of forgers in Porphyry quoted by Uşaybi’a (cf. p. 79, n. 1) is badly corrupt; possibly it is meant to include the names Archippos, Nearchos, Kleinias, Megillos, Proros. Perhaps Porphyry stated that writings attributed to these persons are spurious. And could ‘Kleemporos’ (indeed a peculiar name!) be a contamination of ‘Kleinias’ and ‘Proros’?

None of the Doric texts, except perhaps the very curious Dios, *Περὶ καλλονῆς*, can be characterized as literary play or school exercise.

With the Doric *Ἱερὸς λόγος*, finally, we reach the problems of Pseudo-Pythagoras which do not concern us here.

DISCUSSION

Nach einer kurzen Zusammenfassung der Hauptpunkte und Hauptargumente der beiden am Tage zuvor von Herrn Burkert und Herrn Thesleff gehaltenen Vorträge eröffnete Herr von Fritz die Diskussion mit den folgenden Bemerkungen :

M. von Fritz : Vielleicht darf ich mir erlauben, die Diskussion mit dem Versuch zu beginnen, auf einen Aspekt des Problem, der in beiden Vorträgen eine Rolle gespielt hat, ein etwas helleres Licht zu werfen, als dies bisher geschehen ist. Die beiden von Herrn Burkert und Herrn Thesleff für die hellenistische und römische Zeit erwähnten Richtungen des Pythagoreismus, eine « mystisch-magische » und eine « rational-nüchterne » hat es spätestens seit der Mitte des 5. Jh. v. Chr. Geburt nebeneinander gegeben. Im allgemeinen behauptet die erste, die Lehren des Meisters unverändert zu bewahren, während die zweite sie selbstständig weiterzubilden sucht.

Der erste hervorragende Vertreter der zweiten Gruppe ist um 450 v. Chr. Hipposos von Metapont, der die Inkommensurabilität entdeckt haben soll, was die Zerstörung der ursprünglichen pythagoreischen Vorstellung bedeutete, dass sich alles in ganzzahligen Verhältnissen ausdrücken lasse. Ausdruck des Chocs, den diese Entdeckung für altgläubige Pythagoreer bedeutete, war die Legende, er sei von den Göttern dafür bestraft in einem Schiffbruch umgekommen. Er soll auch demokratische Tendenzen gehabt haben. Er betrachtete, was er gefunden hatte, natürlich als seine Entdeckung und machte nicht den Versuch, es als Lehre des Meisters auszugeben.

Das zweite grosse Beispiel ist Archytas : er veröffentlichte seine Konstruktion der Würfelverdoppelung als seine Ent-

deckung : ebenso seine Musiktheorie und seine nicht ganz richtige Theorie der Entstehung der Tonhöhen, die auch weit über die altpythagoreische Musiktheorie, von der sie ausgegangen war, hinausging.

Etwas anders steht es mit dem dritten Vertreter eines rationalistischen Pythagoreismus : Aristoxenos von Tarent. Er gab eine rationalistisch-allegorische Erklärung der alten ἀκούσματα, die auf Pythagoras zurückgeführt wurden, nicht, so viel man sehen kann, mit Berufung auf eine alte Tradition, sondern mit der rationalistischen Begründung, dass diese ἀκούσματα wörtlich genommen töricht seien, nach seiner Auslegung dagegen einen ausgezeichneten Sinn ergäben. Er wurde dieserhalb natürlich von den Wortgläubigen heftig angegriffen.

Daneben gab es von Anfang an die « mystische » Richtung, die weitgehend, wenn auch nicht vollständig identisch ist mit einer Richtung, welche behauptete, die Lehren des Meisters, seinen ἐπὶ λόγος, unverändert weiterzugeben.

Innerhalb der Geschichte dieser Richtung nimmt Philolaos eine interessante Zwischenstellung ein. Herr Thesleff hat in seinem Vortrag die Geschichte vom Ankauf eines Werkes des Philolaos durch Platon zu einem sehr hohen Preis erwähnt. Dass dabei sehr bald, wenn nicht von Anfang an, Fälschungen eine Rolle gespielt haben, wird dadurch bewiesen, dass bald von *einem* Buch, in dem alle die erhaltenen, wie Herr Burkert gesagt hat, wahrscheinlich echten Fragmente enthalten gewesen sein müssten, die Rede ist, bald von einem Werk in 3 Büchern, deren Inhalt, wie die 3 Titel zeigen, ein ganz anderer gewesen sein müsste. Das ungeheure Interesse an diesem wirklichen oder gefälschten Werk des Philolaos beruht auf der Annahme, dass Philolaos darin die originale Lehre des Meisters niedergeschrieben habe.

Damit hängt ein weiteres Problem zusammen : Aristoteles erwähnt ein phantastisches astronomisches System, das er den « in Italien lebenden sogenannten Pythagoreern » zuschreibt, das aber von späteren Autoren dem Philolaos zugeschrieben wird.

Jedenfalls handelte es sich auch bei diesem astronomischen System, von wem es auch stammt, faktisch um eine Fortbildung der Astronomie des Pythagoras : aber hier mit dem Anspruch, die wahre Lehre des Meisters wiederzugeben.

Es bestehen also von Anfang an zwei Entwicklungsstränge nebeneinander :

- a) eine selbständige Fortbildung von Lehren des Pythagoras unter eigenem Namen der Autoren o h n e Anspruch darauf, originale Lehren des Meisters wiederzugeben.
- b) eine angebliche Bewahrung, wenn nicht der *ipsissima verba* doch der *ipsissimae doctrinae* des Meisters, obwohl faktisch dabei ebenfalls eine Veränderung und Fortbildung stattfindet.

Da diese beiden Stränge dauernd nebeneinander bestehen, besteht kein Anlass zu der Annahme, dass, wenn einmal die e i n e Richtung wieder stärker hervortritt, dies auf eine politisch schwierig gewordene Lage der anderen zurückzuführen sein müsse.

Zum Schluss ist es zur Eröffnung der weiteren Diskussion vielleicht nützlich, die beiden Hauptprobleme der Vorträge noch einmal herauszustellen.

I. DAS ARCHYTAS-PROBLEM

Abgesehen von einem mit Sicherheit in byzantinische Zeit zu setzenden Traktat *Καθολικοὶ λόγοι*, gibt es, nach Meinung von Herrn Burkert, eine Reihe von Traktaten unter dem Namen des Archytas, aber von verschiedenen Verfassern, die alle unecht sind und alle wahrscheinlich in die Zeit nach Andronikos (ca. 30 v.Chr.) gehören. Herr Thesleff argumentiert aus der Homogenität des dorischen Dialekts der Schriften, es sei wahrscheinlicher, dass sie früher verfasst seien, als das Dorische in Unteritalien noch lebendig war.

Es erhebt sich die Frage, wie weit das Dorische am Ende des 1. Jh. v. Chr. in Süditalien noch lebendig war (cf. infra S. 98 ff., vor allem 101-2).

Ferner argumentiert Herr Thesleff, ein Teil der Schriften müsse zu einem Corpus von Pythagorica gehört haben, das nachweisbar vor 30 v. Chr. bestanden habe.

Die Frage ist, ob nicht zum mindesten eines oder einige der Werke nicht vor 30 v. Chr. entstanden sein können, und welche Folgerungen dann daraus zu ziehen sind.

2. PROBLEM DES DEM EKPHANTOS ZUGESCHRIEBENEN WERKES

Die Frage ist: kann es noch in frühptolemäischer Zeit geschrieben sein? Aber wie kommt dann ein jüdisch-beeinflusstes *dorisch geschriebenes* Werk nach Alexandrien? Kann es zu einer Zeit geschrieben sein als die Frage der Monarchie in keiner Weise aktuell war? Wie passt es in die Kaiserzeit, speziell in die von Herrn Burkert postulierte Zeit der Julia Domna?

Die weitere Diskussion wird eröffnet von Sir Ronald Syme, der erneut die Frage stellt nach der besten Reihenfolge der zu stellenden Fragen nach « purpose », « contents » and « their relation to the philosophy of non Pythagorean authors », « origin » (local and possibly personal), « date ».

M. Thesleff: As I said in my paper, the question of the purpose of these tracts cannot really be separated from the question of their date and place. A couple of examples may perhaps illustrate the possible relevance of a consideration of the purpose for the dating of the tracts. I think it is obvious from the contents that the primary motive in this case is usually not « Gewinnsucht »; and this is an argument for the assumption that the texts do not belong to those that were known to have been forged for King Juba II (cf. Olympiod. CAG 12.1, p. 13 χρημάτων ὀρεγόμενοι).

And again, if one of the purposes of the Okkelos letters was to recommend the Lucani to a Roman public, this has some consequences for chronology, since 80-70 B.C. seems to be the latest possible date for such a recommendation.

M. Smith: Why should anyone forge papers in the names of hardly known authors?

The only explanation for this literature appears to be that there was a genuine survival of Pythagorean philosophy in southern Italy, what one might call a sectarian tradition.

M. Thesleff: There are really a considerable amount of indications of the Italiotes being particularly interested in eschatological religion in the early Hellenistic age, and even some indications of astral religion somehow connected with Plato. A convenient conspectus of the older material can be found in Wuilleumier, *Tarente* (1939); add e.g. Mingazzini, *Arch. Class.* (1958); Schauenburg, *Antike Kunst* (1962). However, such traces are rather irrelevant for the dating of the Doric tracts, because these are not really concerned with such things. But no doubt the archaeological evidence supports the idea that Pythagorean traditions lived on in South Italy.

M. Burkert: Die Namen der angeblichen Autoren sind nicht durchweg unbekannt; etwa die Hälfte steht auch im Pythagoreerkatalog des Iamblich. Dieser Katalog stammt nicht von Iamblich, ist nicht von den Pseudopythagorica abhängig, steht aber in enger Verbindung mit Aristoxenos, ist als Nachahmung offizieller Dokumente (Inschriften) doch wohl von einem frühen Peripatetiker (Aristoxenos?) zusammengestellt. Hier ist insbesondere die Quelle für « Okkelos den Lukaner ».

M. von Fritz: Aber wie weit waren die in dem Katalog oder in den Katalogen enthaltenen Namen ausserhalb des Zirkels der Pythagoreer bekannt?

M. Speyer: Die Sammlung der Pseudopythagorica von H. Thesleff könnte zu der irrtümlichen Annahme führen, einen gemeinsamen Ursprung für alle aufgenommenen Stücke anzunehmen. Die Frage ist genau zu prüfen, ob nicht ganz verschiedene religiöse und philosophische Kreise die Namen des Pythagoras und seiner Anhänger als Maske benutzt haben, um ihre Ideen besser zu propagieren. Die Numabücher, die im Jahre 181 v. Chr. verbrannt wurden, verfolgen religionspolitische Absichten in Rom, Traktate unter dem Namen des Archytas, die mit akademischen und peripatetischen Begriffen arbeiten (vgl. die Ausführungen von W. Burkert), richten sich gegen stoische Lehren. Gab es vielleicht Akademiker, die unter der Maske des Pythagoras Platon und Aristoteles wieder zu Ehren bringen wollten?

M. von Fritz: Aber wie kamen aristotelische Gedanken unter den Namen des Archytas?

M. Hengel: Das Interesse der Pythagoreer an Aristoteles hängt damit zusammen, dass sie unter Berufung auf Aristoteles aus dem in hellenistischer Zeit beherrschenden Schulgegensatz zwischen den Stoikern und der Akademie ausbrechen wollten. Sowohl die Stoiker wie die spätere Akademie haben die wahre Philosophie verfälscht, ihr letzter Vertreter war eben Aristoteles, er ist damit zugleich ein echter Repräsentant der Philosophie Platons und letztlich auch des Pythagoras selbst. Was nach ihr kommt, ist Abfall.

M. Aalders: Hier drängt sich auch die Frage auf, ob alle Schriften *Περὶ πολιτείας* und *Περὶ βασιλείας* usw. aus derselben Zeit stammen, und, weiter gespannt, ob das ps-pyth. Schrifttum, das uns nur sehr fragmentarisch erhalten ist, hauptsächlich bei Stobaios, zeitlich und räumlich mehr oder weniger zusammengehört, wie Herr Thesleff annehmbar zu machen versuchte, oder ob man jedes Stück auf seine eigenen Qualitäten zu prüfen und einzuordnen hat.

M. Speyer: In einem « Nomos » unter dem Namen des Pythagoras, den Synesios in seinem *Dion* (c. 16) anführt, wird befohlen, die Worte des Meisters nicht zu verändern. Dieser « Nomos », der in der Sammlung von H. Thesleff nachzutragen wäre, erinnert an die aus der jüdisch-christlichen Literatur bekannte Kanonisierungsformel; vgl. W. C. van Unnik, « De la règle μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du canon » in *Vigil. Christ.* 3 (1949), 1-36. Neupythagoreischen Worten des Pythagoras begegnet man bei Synesios noch öfter; vgl. K. Treu in seinem Kommentar von Synesios, *Dion* = Texte und Unters. 71 (1958), 120-3. Diese Pseudepigrapha sind zu prüfen. Im 4. und 5. Jh. n. Chr. lebt das Interesse für Pythagoreisches im Westen erneut auf: Philostrats *Vita Apollonii* wird in Rom von Virius Nicomachus Flavianus übersetzt; noch Sidonius Apollinaris beschäftigt sich mit ihr (*Ep.* 8 3 Loyen). Es gab vielleicht in dieser Zeit eine ähnliche Pythagoras-Verehrung, wie während des 2. Jhrdts. im Kreise der Julia Domna.

M. Thesleff: I am grateful for the reference to Synesios. In fact my edition does not attempt to be exhaustive regarding material that can be reasonably stamped as post-Hellenistic. Your references, however, may well go back upon earlier sources. At any rate the name of Pythagoras attracted forgeries throughout antiquity down to Byzantine times; see e.g. the evidently late *Prognostica* recorded in an appendix to my edition (p. 243 ff.). Texts fathered on Pythagoras are normally not in Doric, and so I have not discussed them at this conference. The only Doric text demonstrably attributed to Pythagoras himself (disregarding the *Fr. inc.*, my ed., p. 186, where the attribution to Pythagoras is probably secondary) is the Doric Ἱερὸς λόγος (p. 164); and this, I have argued, rather comes at the end of the Doric tradition.

On the other hand it is true that some of the Doric tracts seem to have very little to do with Pythagoreanism, as far as the contents are concerned, e.g. Zaleukos, Charondas (these two tracts obviously have received their slight Doric colouring later),

or Hipparchos. The Pseudo-Pythagorean authors apparently tended to incorporate with their tradition non-Pythagorean personalities (Charondas, Hippodamos, etc.) and genres (the *Protreptic* of Hipparchos). However, most of the tracts seem to interweave occasional genuine Pythagorean traits (such as the *συναρμογά* doctrine) with the Academic and/or Peripatetic contents. This is perhaps an indication that they somehow reflect a continuous esoteric Pythagorean tradition. I would like to think that Prof. Morton Smith is right. The "non-entities" among the pseudonyms are likely to derive ultimately from authentic South Italian sources, independently of the list preserved in Iamblichos. It may be mentioned that we happen to have an inscription from a collective tomb in Tarentum (*IG* XIV, 668, dated around 300 B.C. by the editors) which records names of both sexes, some known to be Pythagorean, including Eurytos and Kallikrates (sic); the latter may have been the model of "Kallikratidas" who does not occur in the list of Iamblichos (though in our text tradition there seem to come in associations with the Spartan general, as the Pythagorean is said to be a Spartan).

M. von Fritz: Hier tritt vielleicht noch ein weiteres Problem auf. Wie weit kann man Hippodamos als Pythagoreer betrachten? Er stand zweifellos bis zu einem gewissen Grad unter dem Einfluss pythagoreischer Gedanken. Aber er war sicher nicht ein Mitglied des pythagoreischen « Ordens » und kann in keine der beiden Entwicklungsrichtungen eingeordnet werden. Das muss auch bei der Beurteilung der ihm zugeschriebenen unechten Schriften berücksichtigt werden.

H. Hengel: Diese Rückbeziehung auf die mit dem 4. Jh. endende wahre « kanonische » Philosophie hat eine eigenartige Parallele in der « Kanonisierung » der jüdischen Überlieferung bis Esra in 4. Jh. Mit ihm endet die « Inspiration » und damit die normative Überlieferung.

Der Rückgriff auf das archaische Dorisch hat eine Parallele in der Pflege des klassischen Hebräisch bei den Essenern von Qumran, die damit bewusst an die alte biblische Tradition anknüpfen und in einem sprachlichen Purismus die Einflüsse der aramäischen Umgangssprache möglichst ausschlossen.

Frage: Hinter derartigen Erscheinungen könnte eine nationale Reaktion stehen, in Süditalien etwa eine Selbstbesinnung auf die alte dorische Überlieferung als Reaktion gegen die Überfremdung durch die Römer und den Zerfall des Griechentums im 2. Jh. v. Chr. Ab der zweiten Hälfte des 1. Jhrdts. zeigt sich eine analoge sprachliche Rückbesinnung im Attizismus.

M. Thesleff: It would certainly be of considerable help if it could be established where and when there arose conditions suitable for a combination of Dorian national pride and a need for Greek "Selbstgefühl". In my *Introduction* I argued for Magna Graecia in the 3rd century B.C. I am not sure there were, in Italy, such suitable conditions after, say, the Social Wars.

M. Burkert: Strabon beschreibt den Zustand Tarents in seiner Zeit: die Tarentiner leben als römische Kolonie «besser als zuvor» (p. 281); Metapontiner zeigten Cicero die Stelle, wo Pythagoras starb (*De fin.* V 4); Elea errichtete in Klaudischer Zeit (*MusHelv* 25 (1968), 181-5) eine Statue des Parmenides: die Griechen Unteritaliens pflegten noch damals bewusst ihre eigenen Traditionen.

M. Smith: Must we treat all the tracts as a unit? Why should any one have written about kingship in Italy after Pyrrhus and before Augustus? We must distinguish between:

- a) sectarian tracts attributed to unknown, sectarian authorities;
- b) publications under famous names;
- c) literary exercises; compositions in Doric prose—this would account for the banality of the contents of many and their failure to treat significant Pythagorean themes.

M. Thesleff: Here I should like to emphasize, again, the difficulty of separating distinct groups within the body of Doric texts. Many of the tracts attributed to Archytas are very similar to tracts attributed to various minor Pythagoreans, regarding contents as well as style.—I admit that writing *Περὶ βασιλείας* would seem rather odd in Italy between, say, Pyrrhus and Augustus. In my *Introduction* I suggested that these tracts were addressed to Hiero II. However, there certainly did exist “potential” kings and people who dreamed of becoming king (such as, perhaps, the elder Scipio). After all the idea of monarchy is implied even in Archytas’ *Περὶ νόμου*, which was certainly known in Italy in the early 1st century B.C. (*infra*, p. 100). Of course I do not want to argue that the tracts *Περὶ βασιλείας* reflect “genuine” Italian philosophy. If they were written in Italy, they set forth imported ideas. And Ekphantos is somewhat exceptional, at any rate.

M. Aalders: Ich möchte hier anschliessend bemerken, dass antike Fürstenspiegel gewöhnlich an bestimmte konkrete Personen gerichtet sind, wie im 4. Jh. v. Chr. die Schriften des Isokrates an Nikokles und, jedenfalls als Fiktion, im *Hieron* des Xenophon, und wie das auch in der Spätantike der Fall ist (vgl. auch Seneca’s *De clementia*). In der hellenistischen Zeit sind viele Fürstenspiegel geschrieben worden, und ihr Zweck und ihre Adressierung ergibt sich u.a. aus der bekannten Anekdote, Demetrios von Phaleron habe dem Ptolemaios gesagt, er solle sich in die Lektüre dieser Schriften vertiefen, weil diese ihm vor Augen hielten, was seine Umgebung ihm nicht zu sagen wagte (Plut. *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 189 D; vgl. auch Pseudo-Aristeas 283, wo gesagt wird, ein guter König lese solche Schriften). Wenn man die ps-pyth. Schriften *Περὶ βασιλείας* im ausgehenden 2. oder im 1. Jh. v. Chr. datiert und annimmt, sie stammen aus Süditalien, dann fragt es sich doch, an wen diese Schriften gerichtet sind und was ihr Zweck ist—oder aber man muss annehmen, die Form des Fürstenspiegels sei hier nur rein litera-

rische Einkleidung. Für Ekphantos würde daher die von W. Burkert vorgeschlagene Datierung in der Severerzeit besser stimmen, wenn mir das auch aus anderen Gründen reichlich spät vorkommt.

M. Thesleff: I have classed Ekphantos as representing "Normal Pythagorean Doric" as far as the dialect is concerned (see my paper, *supra* p. 64), though it could be argued, perhaps, that the dialect is a bit overdone. The style is very overloaded indeed, with a great number of archaisms and curious expressions. This could possibly be a sign of separate origin.

M. von Fritz: Kann einer der Experten in jüdischer Literatur eine Auskunft darüber geben, woher der jüdische Einfluss in der Schrift des Ekphantos kommt, was der Charakter dieses Einflusses ist?

M. Hengel: Ekphantos *Περὶ βασιλείας* setzt die LXX *Gen.* 1+2 voraus. Das war in Alexandrien frühestens seit der Mitte des 3. Jhdts. möglich, für einen Griechen wohl kaum vor dem 2. Jh. Im ersten Jh. v. Chr. wäre es auch in Süditalien denkbar (Cic. *Pro Flacco* 67; Caecilius von Calacte). Die stark metaphysische überhöhte Deutung des Königtums im Traktat des Ekphantos scheint mir jedoch eher in die Kaiserzeit zu gehören. Abgesehen von dem Genesiszitat in *De sublimitate* hat vor allem der Neupythagoreer Numenius im 2. Jh. n. Chr. die jüdische Schöpfungsüberlieferung anerkannt und zusammen mit der chaldäischen als die älteste bezeichnet (*Entretiens* XII, 49 ff.). Auch die monotheistische Tendenz passt in diese Zeit. Sicherlich ist der Ekphantos-Traktat keine jüdische Fälschung. Der *Aristeasbrief* (ca. 140 v. Chr.) kennt ebenfalls die Schriftengattung *Περὶ βασιλείας*, aber bei einer jüdischen Fälschung würde doch das Proprium des jüdischen Glaubens stärker zum Vorschein kommen.

M. Aalders: Auch die hellenistische Theorie des Königtums kennt eine metaphysische Begründung. Man denke an die Theorie, der König sei νόμος ἔμψυχος.

Ich stimme Herrn Thesleff gerne zu, dass der dorische Dialekt der pseudo-pythagoreischen Fragmente das Merkmal eines bestimmten Kreises ist. Man braucht nicht gerade an eine Art Geheimsprache zu denken. Man könnte auch an eine Art Mode denken, in dorischem Dialekt zu schreiben, die sich nicht auf Mitglieder eines geschlossenen Kreises zu beschränken brauchte, aber auch von Sympathisierenden gepflegt würde, etwa wie z.B. der hieratische, feierlich gehobene Stil des Stefan-George-Kreises.

M. Speyer: Um den Traktat Περὶ βασιλείας des Pseudo-Ekphantos genauer datieren zu können, wäre eine Analyse der Schrift erwünscht. Vergleichs-Material bietet der Artikel «Fürstenspiegel» im *RAC*, Bd. 8, Lfg. 60 (1970), 555-632 (P. Hadot).

M. Thesleff: Unfortunately, as far as I can see, the best known "Fürstenspiegel" in postclassical Greek literature are precisely these Pseudo-Pythagorean tracts.

M. von Fritz: Vielleicht kann man den Versuch machen, mit Hilfe einiger präziser Fragen zu einer Art Abschluss hinsichtlich dieses speziellen Problems zu kommen.

1. Können die auf die Kategorienschrift bezogenen pseudarchyteischen Schriften vor 30 v. Chr. verfasst sein?
2. Gibt es eine pseudoarchyteische aristotelisierende oder platonisierende Schrift, die vor 30 v. Chr. oder vor einem noch früheren Datum verfasst sein muss?
3. Wie weit lässt sich «Okkelos» chronologisch fixieren?

M. Burkert: «Archytas»' Kategorienschrift kann allerfrühestens etwa 30 v. Chr. verfasst sein; «Okkelos» ist, wenn er in den *Vetusta Placita* vorkam, 30, wenn nicht 60 Jahre älter;

Varro kannte andere Schriften des « Archytas », Poseidonios kannte Pythagoreerschriften ; die Fabrikation zieht sich jedenfalls über viele Jahrzehnte hin.

M. Thesleff : I should like to make two important additions : (1) If the Varro passage (my ed., p. 125 : “... *Pythagoran Samium et Ocellum Lucanum et Archytan Tarentinum omnesque adeo Pythagoricos*”) is genuine—and it is extremely likely to be so—it clearly implies a collection of Pythagorica, including Pseudo-Okkelos and Pseudo-Archytas, before, say, 60 B.C. And (2) Archytas’ letter to Plato (my ed., p. 46) intimates that Archytas used Ocelliana for his *Περὶ νόμου* (see *Eranos*, 60 (1962), 8 ff.), and this would mean that some time before 70 B.C. is the latest *terminus ante quem* for this tract. It could also be argued that the polemics against scepticism in Archytas’ *Περὶ τοῦ ὄντος* (p. 40) are likely to belong to the time before Antiochos of Askalon.

M. von Fritz : Es scheint sich also zu ergeben, dass trotz der immer wieder hervorgehobenen vor allem sprachlich-stilistischen Homogenität der platonisierenden und aristotelisierenden Pseudo-archytea diese nicht alle aus derselben Zeit stammen können, sondern sich ihrer Entstehung nach auf einen Zeitraum von circa 100 Jahren verteilen.

M. Thesleff : I was rather convinced by Professor Burkert’s dating of Archytas’ *Περὶ τοῦ καθόλου λόγου* in the latter part of the 1st century B.C., and therefore it intrigues me that this tract seems to be written in “Normal Pythagorean Doric”—considering the existence of this “normal” type at least two generations earlier.

M. Burkert : Die ganze Tradition der dorischen Pythagorica geht, wie Herr Thesleff gezeigt hat, offenbar von echten Archytasschriften aus. Die echten Fragmente (besonders Diels-Kranz

47 B 1) sind aber sprachlich nicht wesentlich verschieden von den Pseudopythagorica. Insofern diese alle Imitation sind, ist es nicht erstaunlich, dass die Imitationen, selbst wenn sie aus verschiedener Zeit stammen, einander ähnlich sind. Allerdings treten einzelne Schriften hervor durch abstruses Vokabular, wie ποταύγασις, ποταυγάζεσθαι (Diotogenes p. 74, 18; 75, 15; 75, 19), ὀπτίλος (Metopos p. 116, 27).

M. Thesleff: The main difference in language between the (probably) authentic fragments of Philolaos and Archytas, and the obviously spurious ones, is that the former use no archaisms, whereas a clear tendency to archaizing is noticeable in the latter (cf. *supra*, p. 65).

M. Speyer: Die stilistischen Fähigkeiten der Imitatoren dürfen nicht gering gewertet werden, wie etwa das Selbstzeugnis des Synesios in seinem *Dion* (c. 18) zeigt: er vermag im Stil von Autoren der Alten wie der Neuen Komödie zu schreiben (A. Fitzgerald, *The Essays and Hymns of Synesios of Cyrene I* (London 1930), 240, verweist auf die Zusätze König Alfreds in seiner Übersetzung des Boethius, die im Stil des Originals abgefasst sind).

M. von Fritz: Es ist wohl wahrscheinlich, dass entgegen einer weitverbreiteten Annahme der dorische Dialekt in Unteritalien in mündlichem Gebrauch noch bis zu einem gewissen Grad lebendig war, so dass es nicht so erstaunlich ist, wenn man in einem Zirkel mit dorischer Tradition imstande war, ein mehr oder minder konformes Dorisch zu schreiben, auch wenn mehrere, etwa 100 Jahre auseinander liegende, Autoren daran beteiligt waren. Ein Dialekt, der von einer verhältnissmässig kleinen Gruppe gesprochen wird, pflegt sich länger rein zu erhalten als eine Sprache, die von einer weit ausgedehnten Bevölkerung gesprochen wird — es sei denn, dass im letzteren Fall bewusste Anstrengungen gemacht werden, die literarische Sprache rein zu erhalten.

Übrigens hat G. Rohlfs neuerdings, ebenfalls entgegen einer lange Zeit herrschenden Meinung, nachgewiesen, dass sich Spuren dorischer Dialekte in Unteritalien vom Altertum her noch bis in die Neuzeit hinein erhalten haben.

Wenn niemand mehr etwas hinzuzufügen wünscht, kann man vielleicht als Ergebnis der Diskussion feststellen :

1. dass sich hinsichtlich der Pseudoarchytea eine sehr beträchtliche Annäherung der zu Anfang entgegengesetzten Meinungen der Herren Thesleff und Burkert ergeben hat ;
2. dass hinsichtlich der dem Ekphantos zugeschriebenen Schrift, zwar keine Lösung des Problem es gefunden worden ist, wohl aber ein Hinweis auf verschiedene Mittel, mit denen die Untersuchung weitergeführt und vielleicht in Zukunft einer Lösung näher gebracht werden kann.