

1113

MARTENS, J.W.

2003

APPENDIX 1

THE DATE OF THE PYTHAGOREAN
KINGSHIP TRACTATES

Armand Delatte was the first modern scholar to discuss the date of the Pythagorean texts in depth in his book *Essai sur la Politique Pythagoricienne*.¹ He claimed that all these textual fragments relating to kingship were genuine products of Pythagoras' students. The consensus today has turned to A. Delatte's conclusion regarding Archytas, but away from his conclusions regarding the other three authors. Willy Theiler was the first to take issue with Delatte in *Gnomon* 2 (1926), 147–156. He argued for a Hellenistic date, specifically in the third century B.C.E.

E. R. Goodenough was the next to take up the challenge in his ground-breaking and still significant article "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship" in *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928), 55–102. He argued for a Hellenistic date for all of the fragments, including Archytas, and rejected their attribution to actual students of Pythagoras. The next major work was that of Lucien Delatte, the son of Armand, who in a display of independence proposed a radical solution in his 1942 work *Les Traités de la Royauté d'Épiphane, Diogène et Sthenidas*.² He combined a critical text of the fragments, a French translation of the texts, a close study of the language, an overview of kingship in Greek thought, and a commentary on the Pythagorean texts to produce what remains the most important work on the topic. His radical solution? He argued for a second or third century C.E. date, and Philonic influence on the texts, especially those attributed to Epiphanius.

The next major contribution was that of Holger Thesleff, whose *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period* accepted the dating of Goodenough for the kingship fragments, with the exception of Archytas, which he accepted as earlier, though not genuine (fourth century B.C.E.).³ Thesleff considered not only the kingship fragments,

¹ Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 1922.

² Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 97, 1942.

³ Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1961.

but all of the related Pythagorean texts, which gives his work an authority which the other writings lack. He took L. Delatte to task for what he believed was an untenable position in dating the kingship texts. In this regard, he challenged the conclusions of L. Delatte's study of the language, while generally praising the study itself. Thesleff himself published a critical edition of all the Pythagorean texts which he judged to be Hellenistic in *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*.¹

Walter Burkert, without reference to Thesleff, published two articles in *Philologus* 105 (1961), 16-43; 226-246 titled "Hellenistische Pythagorica". In these two articles, without much specific reference to the kingship fragments, he too argued for a Hellenistic date for the whole of the Pythagorean pseudepigrapha, giving third century B.C.E. as a *terminus a quo*.

In the meantime, Francis Dvornik, in a large work entitled *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background* 2 Vols., agreed with Goodenough and Theiler in opting for Hellenistic dates for all of the kingship tractates, including Archytas.² He relies for the most part on Goodenough's work and does not seem to be aware of the work of Thesleff.

The next major work was a re-examination by Holger Thesleff and Walter Burkert of their previous work in *Fondation Hardt: Pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité Classique* (1972),³ a volume dedicated to pseudepigrapha in the ancient world in general. Burkert, in "Zur geistesgeschichtlichen Einordnung einiger Pseudopythagorica," gives a revised position. For the *terminus a quo* he suggests 150 B.C.E. and for the *terminus ad quem* third century C.E. In response, Thesleff, in "On the Problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica: An Alternative Theory of Date and Purpose," maintains a Hellenistic date for the fragments, but modifies it by giving a lower border of second century B.C.E.

The last major discussion is that of Glenn Chesnut, "The Ruler and the Logos in NeoPythagorean, Middle Platonic, and Late Stoic Political Philosophy" in *ANRW* II.16.2, 1310-1332. He too opts for a Hellenistic date, pre-Ciceronian, though he does not present many new arguments for the date. He does, however, take account of a number of articles published in the late 1920s which argued that

the living law ideal was present in a number of other authors, such as Cicero and Seneca, and so gives more of a sense of the continuity of the idea.⁴

It is clear that there are two trends in the dating of these texts which are still current. These are the various Hellenistic dates (Thesleff, Goodenough) and the second/third century C.E. dates (Burkert, L. Delatte). The two major works are those of Thesleff and L. Delatte, and to them must go pride of place.

Both of them rely on arguments from the nature of the Greek for dating the texts, because the texts are embedded in the anthology of Stobaeus. External criteria for dating are extremely hard to come by. On the basis of the language and syntax, Delatte and Thesleff come to radically different conclusions.⁵

L. Delatte argues that the language of the texts is artificial, namely, it is a mixture of Doric, with elements of Attic, Ionic, and Lyric poetry (85-87). As a result, Delatte concludes that when the texts were written Doric was no longer spoken. Thesleff maintains, however, that the Doric features are essentially consistent and that the archaisms which lend the language its artificiality "are insufficient to prove that the texts belong to an age when Doric was not used in conversation" (*Intro.*, 66). Delatte's study of vocabulary (88-109) and syntax (110-117) convinced him that the texts cannot have been written before first century C.E. Thesleff maintains that Delatte's study "confirms my impression that the texts are Hellenistic", but states "we do not know Hellenistic prose practices sufficiently well to be able to make chronological inferences from matters of style" (*Intro.*, 67).

Thesleff's comments strike me as convincing, but Delatte uses the same syntactical and linguistic arguments to argue for quite another period. As a result, it is difficult on the basis of textual research alone to date the texts.

The other method of dating is a comparison of ideas with those found in other texts. Delatte has, to some degree, depended upon such comparisons, but his conclusions seem weak and he has not

¹ William Klassen, "The King as 'Living Law' with reference to Misonius Rufus," in *SR* 14/1 (1985) 67 also dates the texts in the Hellenistic period. He is entirely reliant upon E. R. Goodenough's article, Aalders, "νόμος ἑμπροσθεν", 315-329, also accepts the Hellenistic dating of these tractates, but does not engage the discussion at all.

² Thesleff, *An Introduction*, for instance, finds most of Delatte's work on the language of the fragments convincing; he rejects the interpretation on which Delatte bases his findings.

³ *Acta Academiae Aboensis. Ser. A: Humaniora*, v. 30, no. 1; Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1965.

⁴ Washington, D.C., 1966.

⁵ *Fondation Hardt: Pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité Classique Entretiens: Tome XVIII Pseudépigrapha* I. Geneva: Fondation Hardt 1972.

considered all the evidence. His claim that these authors are influenced by the Middle Stoics (cf. 284f.) are not convincing, and Thesleff is correct to point out (*Intro.*, 68–69), as did Goodenough, that none of the Stoic ideas found in these texts is foreign to the early Stoa. I am convinced, however, that a close study of the ideas in the Pythagorean texts makes the Hellenistic period the only possible period in which these texts could have been produced.

The Ptolemaic-Seleucid period was the period from which the worship of Alexander the Great stemmed, the beginning of the Hellenistic cult of the emperors.⁹ Though the initial impulses came from Alexander the Great, the actual development of the cult was left to his followers. Not only did a cult of emperors grow, but so too did literature concerning them.¹⁰ This literature had a wide-ranging effect, influencing even a number of Jewish tractates.¹¹ Most of this literature is lost to us, but such terms as benefactor (εὐεργέτης) and saviour (σώτηρ) began to appear applied to kings in the early Hellenistic period.¹² The Pythagorean kingship fragments, while only a portion of Hellenistic kingship thought, contain many of these terms. In general, then, the Hellenistic period, due to actual monarchical developments and the presence of a flourishing literature of kingship in general, makes the climate ripe for a literature which supports the claims to divinity and perfection and absolutism of the emperors, and gives no external reasons to doubt such a development.

When we consider the ideas in the texts, and compare them to other such texts, the case becomes even stronger. L. Delatte believed that Philo influenced Ecphantus,¹³ and so, it would appear, was the originator of the νόμος ἑμψυχος ideal. Others have suggested that

⁹ W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization* (Cleveland and New York Meridian Books 1961) 18–57; W. S. Ferguson in *The Cambridge Ancient History VIII: The Hellenistic Monarchy and the Rise of Rome* (eds. F. E. Adcock; S. A. Cook; M. P. Charlesworth; Cambridge University Press 1954) 17–18; Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* 17–31; Cuthbert Lattey, "The Diadochi and the Rise of King Worship" in *The English Historical Review* 32 (1917) 321f.; Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, 380f., esp. 335; Dvornik, *Early Christian* 210–233.

¹⁰ See Goodenough, "Hellenistic Kingship" 58.

¹¹ Dvornik, *Early Christian*, Vol. I 261; Günther Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies I: 'The Seven Banquets'" in *JSS* 4 (1959) 21–36; Oswyn Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship" in *JTS* n.s. 13 (1967) 337–371; James M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press 1970) 71.

¹² See Schubart, "Das Hellenistische Königsideal" for the appearance of these and other terms in non-literary settings.

¹³ Delatte, *Les Traités* 177–180, 235–283, but cf. 183, 200, 216, 224, 235.

Philo uses Ecphantus,¹⁴ or that Ecphantus and Philo have a common source.¹⁵

Before considering any of these possibilities, we need to establish Philo's connections to this Pythagorean literature. That Philo knows Pythagorean thought in general is not in dispute, as his use of Pythagorean numerology bears witness (e.g. *Opif.* 90–127). Philo also knows, however, specific Pythagorean writings, as his references to writings which he has read by Philolaus (*Opif.* 100) and Okkelos (*Act.* 12) show. Both of the writings attributed to these authors are dated to the Hellenistic period by Thesleff.¹⁶ Finally, Philo knows of the term νόμος ἑμψυχος (*Max.* 1.162; 2.4; *Abr.* 5) and shares the ideas and the language of the concept (*Max.* 1.148–162). But could he be responsible for these ideas? The ideal appears in Philo's work, clearly and in full, but is it possible that Philo could have been the source for this ideal?

L. Delatte's suggestion is fraught with problems, even impossibilities. First, one must overlook the clear evidence of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* and the evidence of Cicero that the ideal existed prior to Philo. If we suspend disbelief on this score, we are met by further problems.

L. Delatte believes, for instance, that Ecphantus' view of the king as a special creation in the image of God is actually an adoption of Philo's view that humanity in general was created in God's image, which was then altered by Ecphantus.¹⁷ L. Delatte believes that evidence of this is found in the Eurysos fragment in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 5.5.29), a passage which is in most respects identical to the passage in Ecphantus. In the Eurysos passage, however, the king is not different from the rest of humanity, humanity is different from the rest of creation, that is, from the animals.

L. Delatte's suggestion that Ecphantus is dependent upon Philo meets improbability after improbability. L. Delatte would have us believe that Ecphantus borrowed an idea of the creation of humanity from Philo and altered it to refer to the unique creation of the king. Following this, Ecphantus borrowed the νόμος ἑμψυχος descriptions from Philo, which he used to describe Moses and the Patriarchs, and built a model of ideal kingship based upon these borrowings.

¹⁴ Bréhier, *Les Idées* 18–19.

¹⁵ Thesleff, *An Introduction* 50.

¹⁶ Thesleff, *An Introduction* 16–17, 114–115; *Texts* 124–138, 147–151.

¹⁷ Both Delatte, *Les Traités* 177–180 and Thesleff, *An Introduction* 69, n. 1 seem to overlook that this idea of humanity created in the image of God is not Philo's own idea. Cf. Gen. 1:26.

Ecphantus' modified model of the king was worked into a subsequence political tractate which influenced other Pythagorean pseudepigrapha (the work of Sthenidas and Diogenes). This was then disseminated to a wider audience and adopted by authors such as Philarch and Musonius Rufus.

In addition, another Pythagorean author, Eurysos, borrowed a section from Ecphantus and altered it to agree with the accounts of creation in Gen. 1:26. This is the fragment which Clement used.

It does not seem probable that the Jewish writer Philo could have influenced entirely the development of the concept in the Greek world. Philo is, first of all, a borrower and transformer of Greek philosophical concepts, not a creator. More significantly, however, it seems unlikely that Gentile writers would have fastened upon a concept used to describe the Jewish patriarchs in an ideal context, and then developed the concept to support a view of absolute monarchy in the Greco-Roman world. But it is impossible that Philo could have influenced writers who wrote before him.

Let me propose a more probable scenario. Philo had access to these Pythagorean writings, as he did with Philolaus and Okkelos, and used them to present Moses and the patriarchs as types of Greco-Roman wise men, *vógon éppuroz*. The passage of Eurysos which Clement used was altered by Clement to agree with Gen. 1:26 and to protect the figure of Jesus, elsewhere described as the *vógos éppuroz* (*Mem.* 2.1.35–40). The claim that humanity is not like the animals was not the point of the Eurysos passage. We may be certain his point was the one made by Ecphantus: the king is the unique creation of God.¹⁹ Clement's point is related to his polemic against idolatry, specifically worship of animals.²⁰ The choice is clear: Philo and Clement adapt a pagan concept which was quite widespread by "Judaizing" and "Christianizing" it; or pagan authors borrow a Jewish

¹⁹ Thiesself, *An Introduction* 69 n. 4.

²⁰ The glosses Gen. 1:26 in the context of a polemic against idolatry elsewhere and makes much of the fact that only humans are made in the image and likeness of God (*Exhortation*, 10.79–84; cf. 12.93). Clement also shows anger at Alexander's supposed dedication (*Exhortation*, 10.77) and claims that *vanu sui generis* was made by the Supreme Artist (*ó 'apótopotézovs pectip*) as a living statue (*ζωοποιος έμπαυρον*) (11.78). For a fuller treatment of all of these questions, refer to John W. Matens, "Nomos Pseudepigraphos in Philo and Clement of Alexandria" in *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. Wendy E. Hellenand-Latham, Mervin University Press of America, 1994), 323–338.

concept, alter and recreate it in political tracts, and disseminate it to a wide audience.

As to Thiesself's contention that Ecphantus and Philo share a source, this seems to multiply probabilities. One could argue that both Philo and Ecphantus were influenced by other, earlier writings which are now lost to us. Ecphantus could then be dated late without it impinging directly upon his relationship with Philo; both would have other, earlier sources. Why is it likelier though that Philo used a source earlier than Ecphantus? The ideas which Philo presents are present in the work of Ecphantus, Diogenes, and Sthenidas, so why should we propose an earlier source?

I am not certain who Philo is dependent upon as his source, but his use of Okkelos and Philolaus, both of whose writings are considered Hellenistic, leads me to suspect both that Ecphantus, Diogenes, and Sthenidas are Hellenistic writings and that Philo could have had access to them.

The Pythagorean texts themselves speak for a Hellenistic date and against a late date in two ways: they are not influenced by the syncretistic, philosophical ideas which one expects if they are from the first century C.E./first century B.C.E.; and they give the impression that they are working with a concept in its infancy and developmental stages, not a fully realized concept which was adopted by them.

The writings of Ecphantus, Diogenes, and Sthenidas do not show any of the syncretism common to the philosophy of the period from the first century B.C.E. and beyond. The ideas and expressions are almost always consistently Pythagorean. The Stoic influence, which L. Delatte sees as an important element in the writings, is not as we have seen, except in rare instances, as Goodenough and Thiesself have both noted. If indeed the texts are influenced by Stoic texts, it seems unlikely that the kings in the fragments would not be toned as wise men. It also seems unlikely that a Stoic influenced text would not mention the law of nature in any context; if the kings were Stoic wise men, the law which they represented could only have been the law of nature. All of this is especially unlikely if Philo had any influence on the texts as Delatte claims. For, in Philo's thought, the *vógos éppuroz* is related closely to the law of nature.

The texts also seem to be situated in the developmental stage of the concept. All the texts are working with the same ideas, but they express them in unique ways. The ideas, therefore, are not systematically

they are being created and developed. As a result there is very little similarity in tone among these texts. The ideas do not seem to be in their infancy in the work of Philo or Musonius Rufus, who present finished topics which they have clearly borrowed. One can see fully developed *topoi* in their writings.

Finally, the Hellenistic Pythagorean fragments seem to be aimed at actual kings.²⁰ This again points to the nascency of the concepts, and also their origin. The texts appear to be written to influence the behaviour of existing kings. There is an urgency and freshness about them, which is not apparent in authors such as Cicero, Philo, or in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, which in fact purports to be written to an actual king. The Hellenistic period supplies us with the most likely period in which such texts could have been written.

The concept was widespread in the first century B.C.E. and first century C.E. It seems unlikely that an idea which Musonius Rufus calls "ancient" could have stemmed from a first century B.C.E. source, let alone a first century C.E. source, and have been disseminated so quickly and with such success. The influences of the concept are found in Plutarch, Musonius Rufus, Cicero and the pseudo-Aristotelian *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. Both Cicero and the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* must be dated to the first century B.C.E., but in the case of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* the date usually given is second or third century B.C.E. The fragments should be placed firmly in the Hellenistic period, either at the end of the third century B.C.E. or the beginning of the second century B.C.E.

And yet, these fragments do not seem to have exercised their influence directly upon Musonius Rufus, Plutarch, or the others, except for Philo. It appears that there is a stage missing in the transmission of these ideas. It is probably no accident that the authors who preserve this idea are the heirs or followers of Middle Platonism, such as Plutarch and Cicero. Richard Horsley has argued that Cicero and Philo have a common source for their view of the law of nature, Antiochus of Ascalon, and it could be that Plutarch, Musonius Rufus, and Cicero, among others, also have a common source for their concept of the living law.²¹ If this is the case, and it is only a supposition, Middle Platonism could be the missing stage in the transmission of the idea.

There is no way to tie the texts to the early stages of Middle Platonism or to a particular author, such as Antiochus of Ascalon or Eudorus of Alexandria, but we can, I think, see evidence of transmission from the Hellenistic authors to another stage of Pythagorean writers. Two fragments of Eurytos exist (in Clement, *Strom.* 5.5.29 and in *Stob.* 1.6.19), but there is no biographical information concerning him. As a result, a couple of possibilities present themselves.

Thesleff believes that Eurytos is simply a citation mistake for Eurytos.²² We know a fair amount about Eurytos (Diogenes Laertius 8.45; Iamblichus, *vit. Pyth.*, 146, 148, 267–269), so the suggestion is appealing. There is, however, a problem. If Clement really meant to cite Ecphantus, as Thesleff supposes, then Clement not only made a citation mistake, he also misspelled Eurytos' name. To compound the problem, the same misspelling was made by Stobaeus. Is Eurytos really the creation of two chance misspellings and one citation mistake?

I tend to believe, therefore, that Eurytos was a student of the Hellenistic Pythagorean writings and responsible to some degree for the transmission of the texts. (To suppose that Eurytos is a citation mistake for Eudorus, a Pythagoreanizing Academic, and someone who might have been responsible for the transmission of the texts, runs into the same problems, more acutely, as with Eurytos.) He is dependent upon Ecphantus in the fragment located in Clement,²³ but what has not been noted is his dependence on Diotogenes (*Stob.* 4.1.133—*Περὶ ὁσιότητος*) in the fragment preserved by Stobaeus. The Stobaeus fragment of Eurytos has numerous Doric elements, but both in language and ideas he is dependent on the passage attributed to Diotogenes. Both texts are concerned with fate and the things generated by fate, and both claim that fate produces nothing orderly or good. The Eurytos fragment also refers to the nature of the king.

In Eurytos, therefore, we do have a follower of the tractates—his dependence on Ecphantus and Diotogenes points to this²⁴—and an indication that these Hellenistic tractates were transmitted, but we are still missing, it seems to me, another stage in the transmission.

²² Thesleff, *An Introduction* 69 n. 4; *Texts* 37–38.

²³ In *Strom.* 5.5.29 (2–3) (also found in Mullach, *ETG* Vol. II, Eurytos, frag. 1, p. 112) Clement quotes a passage which is found in Ecphantus word for word. The only differences that I can see are two case endings.

²⁴ Cf. Burkert, "Zur geistesgeschichtlichen" 52. If Diotogenes and Ecphantus were dependent upon Eurytos one would expect them to have language in common, but this is not the case.

²⁰ Thesleff, "On the Problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica" 85.

²¹ Horsley, "The Law of Nature in Philo and Cicero" 35–59.

The first stage would be Archytas' development of the Greek concept of ideal kingly rule. The development of this idea, under the influence of actual claims of absolute kingship, would have been undertaken by Pythagorean authors of the Hellenistic period. The development of this ideal might have been a response to absolute rulership not in order to support such absolutism blindly, but to see that the rulers in question became just rulers. The missing step would be the development of the concept among philosophers of the first century B.C.E., the Middle Platonists.²⁵ Here the concept would have come into contact with Stoicism and the actual *topoi* would have been systematized. This stage is difficult to reconstruct because there is simply no evidence, beyond the possible evidence of Eurysos, but the concept as found in Musonius Rufus and Plutarch does not seem to be dependent upon the actual Hellenistic fragments. The fourth stage would have been the passing down of the concept to the followers of Middle Platonism, men such as Cicero, and Plutarch. From here the idea would have reached out to other authors, such as Philo, Clement of Alexandria and Themistius.

The missing step between the Hellenistic Pythagoreans and men such as Musonius Rufus and Plutarch is difficult to retrace with certainty—it remains possible that the Hellenistic Pythagoreans were themselves read. Whether the transmission of the idea took place in this manner, therefore, is debatable, though there is some evidence, in Eurysos, that the Hellenistic Pythagoreans were being transmitted themselves. More probable, if not certain, is that the texts of the Pythagorean fragments are Hellenistic.

FROM: ONE GOD, ONE LAW.

²⁵ On the need for care when speaking of the Middle Platonists, see D. T. Runia's article, "Redrawing the Map of Early Middle Platonism" in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (ed. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel, and J. Riaud; Louvain-Paris Editions Peeters 1986) 85–104. Cf. also Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*; and H. Tarrant, *Scepticism or Platonism*.