

AMEINIAS' CONCEPTION OF ΗΣΥΧΙΑ

With a view to construe a difficult passage from Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, J.A. Fabricius, E. Zeller and L. Joubert¹ contended that, according to Diogenes Laertius, Parmenides had studied under Ameinias, whereas E. Wellmann² objected that, according to Diogenes Laertius, Parmenides had only made the acquaintance of Ameinias. Now H. Diels put forward the opinion that Diogenes Laertius' alleged reference to Ἀμενία καὶ Διοχαίτη τῷ Πυθαγορικῷ is nothing but a reference to Ἀμενία Διοχαίτη τῷ Πυθαγορικῷ³. Keeping in mind that the name Ἀμενίας is not included in Jamblichus' catalogue of the Pythagoreans, we are inclined to think that Jamblichus took into consideration that there was a rumour that Ameinias, who might have been a citizen of Selinus⁴, incurred blame for not showing the qualities of a patriot during the events of 480 B.C.⁵. In our opinion, it seems probable that Ameinias was blameless in this matter because he had emigrated from Selinus to Elea about the year 495 B.C.⁶. Being convinced that Ameinias did not only teach philosophy but also died in Elea, E. Zeller, B. Centrone and A.A. Long⁷ did not question the

1. Cf. J.A. FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, Olms, 1966⁴, p. 860; E. ZELLER, Parmenides, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, vol. 5, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1848, p. 1172; L. JOUBERT, Parménide, *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, vol. 39, Copenhagen, Rosenkilde et Bagger, 1968², p. 228.

2. Cf. E. WELLMANN, Ameinias, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, suppl. vol. 1, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1903, p. 68.

3. Cf. H. DIELS, Parmenidea, *Hermes*, 35, 1900, p. 197. Far from being favourable to the reading Διοχαίτη, U. VON WILAMOWITZ, *Lesefrüchte*, *Hermes*, 65, 1930, pp. 250-251, asserted that the emendation Ἰοχαίτη, which goes back to E. Teza, has the ring of truth. On the other hand, M. GIGANTE, *Diogene Laerzio. Vite dei filosofi*, vol. 2, Bari, Laterza, 2000⁴, p. 558, stressed the point that U. von Wilamowitz's assertion seems to be a questionable one. Keeping in mind that, according to Pindar, the flower ἶον is famous for its παμπόρφυροι ἄκτῖνες (cf. H.G. LIDDELL - R. SCOTT, *Greek-English Lexicon* (translated from English into Modern Greek by X.P. MOSCHOS - M. CONSTANTINIDES), vol. 2, Athens, Sideres, p. 531) and taking into account that for the Greeks the most important kind of ἶον is the so-called *Iris Germanica* (cf. *ibid.*, p. 537), which has χρώμα τι πορφυροειδές (cf. *ibid.*, p. 507), we consider that in all probability Ameinias' father was nicknamed Ἰοχαίτης because of his quasi-red hair.

4. Cf. P.M. FRASER - E. MATTHEWS, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. 3, part 1, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1997, p. 32.

5. Cf. E. OLSHAUSEN, Selinus, *Der neue Pauly*, vol. 11, Stuttgart, Metzler, 2001, p. 367.

6. Cf. L. ZHMUD, *Wissenschaft, Philosophie und Religion im frühen Pythagoreismus*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1997, p. 72.

7. Cf. E. ZELLER, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. 1, part 1, Hildesheim, Olms, 1963⁷, p. 680; B. CENTRONE, Ameinias, in R. GOULET, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 1, Paris, Éditions du C.N.R.S., 1989, p. 159; A.A. LONG, *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy*, London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999, p. xxiv.



accuracy of Sotion's statement about the hero shrine that Parmenides dedicated to Ameinias, whereas J. Burnet, W. Burkert and P. Kingsley⁸ implied that the shrine erected by Parmenides would still be there in later days. Taking into account that Sotion's statement goes back to Timaeus of Tauromenium⁹, who has proved himself to be quite unreliable¹⁰, we may throw doubt upon the precision of the details in Timaeus' reference to Ameinias. In other words, being of the opinion that Timaeus laid special emphasis on the so-called Parmenidean piety¹¹ and its moral implications¹², we consider that Timaeus' statement about the hero shrine that Parmenides dedicated to Ameinias does read like an invention.

Keeping in mind that in all probability it was in Elea that Parmenides received instruction from Ameinias, A. Reymond, O. Gigon and E. Moutsopoulos¹³ did not disregard the fact that, according to Jamblichus, Parmenides had the reputation of being favourable to Pythagoreanism¹⁴. In this connexion we may note that Jamblichus' testimony is supported by Proclus' reference to Parmenides as a thinker who was influenced by some doctrines held by the followers of Pythagoras¹⁵. Indeed, F. Enriques¹⁶ demonstrated that Proclus was fully aware of the Pythagorean background of Parmenides' conception of the *mathematical point*, whereas L. Tarán, E. Maraghianou and L. Zhmud¹⁷ maintained that the method of Parmenides was almost certainly influenced by mathematical deduction because Parmenides had been connected with the Pythagoreans through association with Ameinias. On the other hand, F. Wehrli¹⁸ pointed out that Ameinias did not confine himself to the exact sciences. As a matter of fact, F. Aronadio and F. Decleva Caizzi¹⁹ remarked that, according to Sotion, it was not Xenophanes but Ameinias who became a major source of inspiration and ideas for Parmenides, whereas F. Ueberweg and J. Stenzel²⁰ contended that, according to Sotion,

8. Cf. J. BURNET, *Early Greek Philosophy*, London, Black, 1930⁴, p. 170; W. BURKERT, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard Univ. Press, 1972, p. 280; P. KINGSLEY, *In the Dark Places of Wisdom*, California, The Golden Sufi Center, 1999, p. 162.

9. Cf. H. DIELS, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

10. Cf. I. LÉVY, *Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore*, Paris, Leroux, 1926, p. 59.

11. Cf. J. ZAFIROPULO, *L'École Eléate*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1950, p. 81.

12. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 51.

13. Cf. A. REYMOND, *History of the Sciences in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, London, Methuen, 1927, p. 37; O. GIGON, *Die Ursprung der griechischen Philosophie*, Basel, Schwabe, 1945, p. 245; E. MOUTSOPOULOS, *Presocratic Thought* (in Greek), Athens, Gregores, 1978², p. 48.

14. Cf. A. MELE, *Megale Hellas e pitagorismo*, in M. TORTORELLI CHIDINI - A. STORCHI MARINO - A. VISCONTI, *Tra Orfeo e Pitagora*, Napoli, Bibliopolis, 2000, p. 312.

15. Cf. J.E. RAVEN, *Pythagoreans and Eleatics*, London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1948, pp. 22-23; J.P. DUMONT - D. DELATTRE - J.L. POIRIER, *Les Présocratiques*, Paris, Gallimard, 1988, p. 1262.

16. Cf. F. ENRIQUES, *Parmenide e la geometria*, *Enciclopedia Italiana*, vol. 26, Milano, Rizzoli, 1935, p. 392.

17. Cf. L. TARÁN, *Parmenides*, Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press, 1965, p. 3; E. MARAGHIANOU, *Eleatic School* (in Greek), Athens, Cardamitsas, 1996, p. 92; L. ZHMUD, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

18. Cf. F. WEHRLI, *Sotion*, Basel, Schwabe, 1978, p. 60.

19. Cf. F. ARONADIO, *Due fonte laerziane: Sozione e Demetrio di Magnesia*, *Elenchos*, 11, 1990, p. 225; F. DECLEVA CAIZZI, *Il libro IX di Diogene Laerzio*, in W. HAASE, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 36, part 6, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1992, p. 4231.

20. Cf. F. UEBERWEG, *Die Philosophie des Altertums*, Berlin, Mittler, 1926¹², p. 21; J. STENZEL, *Sotion aus Alexandria*, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ser. 2, vol. 3, part 1, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1927, p. 1237.

Parmenides was influenced not only by some doctrines held by Xenophanes but also by some doctrines held by Ameinias. Now Diogenes Laertius, who found himself in opposition to Sotion on this question, did not only state positively that Parmenides was regarded as a disciple of Xenophanes²¹ but also stressed the point that Parmenides was counted among the so-called sporadic thinkers and not among the Pythagoreans²². This being so, we concur with G. Rodier²³ in observing that Parmenides disapproved of the Pythagorean background of natural philosophy, in spite of the fact that his cosmology had something to do with Pythagoreanism²⁴. With a view to shed light on the background of the Parmenidean cosmology, K.R. Popper suggested that under the influence of Ameinias Parmenides might have written «a first version of a cosmology that combined, and transcended ideas of Anaximander, Pythagoras, Pherecydes, and perhaps Hesiod»²⁵. In view of P. Tannery's assertion that Parmenides embodied some Pythagorean ideas in the second part of his poem²⁶, we consider that E. Zeller rightly noted that Parmenides was chiefly influenced by Xenophanes, who had given his adhesion to some astronomical discoveries attributed to the Pythagoreans²⁷. Taking into account that Parmenides certainly broke away from Pythagoreanism after his meeting with Xenophanes²⁸, we have reason to believe that Parmenides, who was the first Greek ontologist²⁹, wrote in opposition to the quasi-naturalistic mode of explanation adopted by the Pythagoreans³⁰.

In view of the quasi-naturalistic implications of the Pythagorean philosophy of science, we disagree with G. Reale's³¹ statement that the so-called Pythagorean mysticism was influential

21. Cf. F. WEHRLI, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

22. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 60; F. DECLEVA CAIZZI, *op. cit.*, p. 4231.

23. Cf. G. RODIER, Parménide, *La Grande Encyclopédie*, vol. 25, Paris, Larousse, p. 1177.

24. Cf. T. GOMPERZ, *Griechische Denker*, vol. 1, Leipzig, Veit, 1903, p. 136.

25. Cf. K.R. POPPER, *The World of Parmenides*, London, Routledge, 1998, p. 136.

26. Cf. L. ZHMUD, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

27. Cf. E. ZELLER, *op. cit.*, p. 680. In this connexion we may note that, according to A.-P.D. MOURELATOS, Xenophanes' Contribution to the Explanation of the Moon's Light, *Philosophia*, 32, 2002, pp. 52-53, Parmenides rightly implied that «new crescent moon (waxing) always close behind the sun...When full moon is rising the sun is always setting...When the full moon is setting the sun is always rising». From this point of view Parmenides reminds us of Aratus, who laid special emphasis on τὸ χρήσιμον τοῖς ναυτιλλομένοις (cf. EUDOX., F 8 Lasserre). Now Diogenes Laertius admitted that it became a matter of doubt whether Parmenides or Pythagoras had been the first to identify the *morning* - *star* with the *evening* - *star* (cf. D.W. GRAHAM, La lumière de la lune dans la pensée grecque archaïque, in A. LAKS - C. LOUGUET, *Qu'est - ce que la Philosophie Présocratique?*, Septentrion, P. U. S., 2002, p. 372). In view of the evidence produced by A. DELATTE, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce*, Hildesheim, Olms, 1988², pp. 178-179, we do not align ourselves with those who maintain that Diogenes Laertius' phrase ὥς φησι Παρμενίδης is an emendable one (cf. M. GIGANTE, *op. cit.*, p. 543), and we put forward the opinion that Parmenides' statement on Pythagoras' astronomical reasoning was drawn from Ameinias.

28. Cf. W. NESTLE, Parmenides, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 18, part 2, Waldsee, Druckenmüller, 1949, p. 1554; K. FREEMAN, *The Pre - Socratic Philosophers*, London, Blackwell, 1946, p. 152; E. ZELLER - R. MONDOLFO, *La filosofia dei Greci*, part 1, vol. 2, Firenze, La Nuova Italia, 1950², p. 326; W.K.C. GUTHRIE, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. 2, London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1965, p. 3.

29. Cf. E. MOUTSOPOULOS, *The Itinerary of Mind* (in Greek), vol. 2, Athens, Hermes, 1975, p. 162.

30. Cf. K. REICH, Parmenides und die Pythagoreer, *Hermes*, 82, 1954, pp. 291-292.

31. Cf. G. REALE, *Storia della filosofia antica*, vol. 1, Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 1976², p. 119.

in formulating the introductory part of Parmenides' poem. On the other hand, we concur with I. Gobry³² in observing that the introductory part of Parmenides' poem is in harmony with the verse ἡνίοχον γνώμην στήσας καθύπερθεν ἀρίστην, that is to say with a verse which may go back to the advocates of genuine Pythagoreanism. In point of fact, there is much reliance to be placed on Aristotle's reference to the authenticity of the Pythagorean precept κράτιστον γνώμη³³. Now, keeping in mind that in the second part of his poem Parmenides expounds a dualist cosmology partially based on Pythagorean premises³⁴ and taking into consideration that the Parmenidean dual principles have something in common with Alcmaeon's dualism³⁵, we are inclined to think that Ameinias, who might have approved of the Alcmaeonean distinction between φανερά and ἀφανῆ³⁶, clearly understood that for the Pythagoreans φανερά was a term used to represent a life of faithlessness, whereas ἀφανῆ was a term used to represent a life of faith in Pythagoras' revealed Word. Far from being of the opinion that Parmenides built on the Pythagorean distinction between φανερά and ἀφανῆ, U. von Wilamowitz³⁷ maintained that Parmenides was not favourable to the Pythagorean doctrine of *metempsychosis*, whereas G.S. Kirk - J.E. Raven - M. Schofield³⁸ contended that Parmenides' teaching about the faith of the soul was anticipated by the Pythagoreans. In view of H.S. Schibli's assertion that «by singling out the immortal soul as the essential element of life Pythagoras foreshadowed the Parmenidean/ Platonic distinction between eternal being and changeable becoming»³⁹, we concur with E. Zeller - R. Mondolfo⁴⁰ in observing that Parmenides laid special emphasis on the Pythagorean conception of purification because he had some association with Ameinias. In this connexion we may note that F.M. Cleve stated

32. Cf. I. GOBRY, *Pythagore*, Paris, Éditions Universitaires, 1992, pp. 120- 121.

33. Cf. A. DELATTE, *Études sur la littérature pythagoricienne*, Paris, Champion, 1915, p. 73. Keeping in mind that the Pythagorean precept κράτιστον γνώμη contrasts sharply with Thales' precept ἰσχυρότατον ἀνάγκη (cf. *ibid.*, p. 285), we think that the Pythagoreans were probably the first to concern themselves with the problem of the nature of free agency and its relation to the origins and conditions of responsible behaviour. Granting this to be true, we have reason to believe that Ameinias was counted among those who had praised Pythagoras for his free will (cf. ARISTOX., F 16 Wehrli). Now F.M. CLEVE, *op. cit.*, p. 525, contended that in all probability Ameinias was «just one of those common members, or auditors, of the (Pythagorean) fraternity who belonged largely to the lower classes». Taking into account that Ameinias was reputed to be a Πυθαγορικός (cf. DIOG. LAERT., *Vit. Phil.*, 9. 21), we concur with A. ALEGRE GORRI, *Los filósofos presocráticos*, in C. GARCÍA GUAL, *Historia de la Filosofía antigua*, Madrid, Editorial Trotta, 1997, p. 59, in observing that Ameinias' approach to Pythagoreanism had nothing to do with the Acousmatics. In point of fact, the abstract character of the Parmenidean philosophy naturally results in coincidences with the Pythagorean philosophy of number (cf. W. BURKERT, *op. cit.*, p. 280), which was familiar to Ameinias.

34. Cf. J.P. DUMONT - D. DELATTE - J.L. POIRIER, *op. cit.*, p. 1262.

35. Cf. A.L. PIERRIS, *Origin and Nature of Pythagorean Cosmogony*, in K.I. BOUDOURIS, *Pythagorean Philosophy*, Athens, International Center for Greek Philosophy and Culture, 1992, p. 156.

36. Cf. ALCMAEON, B1 Diels.

37. Cf. U. VON WILAMOWITZ, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, vol. 2, Berlin, Weidmann, 1932, p. 211.

38. Cf. G.S. KIRK - J.E. RAVEN - M. SCHOFIELD, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983², p. 240.

39. Cf. H.S. SCHIBLI, *Pythagoras*, in E. CRAIG, *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 7, London, Routledge, 1998, p. 856.

40. Cf. E. ZELLER - R. MONDOLFO, *op. cit.*, pp. 683- 684.

that Parmenides benefited much from his association with Ameinias, which «must have had a great and durable impact on the formation of his personal life»⁴¹, whereas H. Fränkel objected that evidence in confirmation of F.M. Cleve's statement is lacking⁴².

With a view to shed light on Sotion's statement that it was Ameinias who converted Parmenides to the quiet philosophic life (εἰς ἡσυχίαν)⁴³, D. Gallop and A.S. Bogomolov⁴⁴ suggested that it was Ameinias who persuaded Parmenides to abandon political activity. Now M. Timpanaro Cardini⁴⁵ and M. Untersteiner⁴⁶ stressed the point that Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία was in sharp contrast with the Athenean conception of πολυπραγμοσύνη. This being so, it seems reasonable to infer that Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία had a great deal to do with public interest but was out of line with party politics⁴⁷. In other words, we consider that there was an interrelation between Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία and the Pythagorean conception of καλοκαγαθία and therefore we regard with approval Jamblichus' assertion that «for some time the nobility (ἡ καλοκαγαθία) of the Pythagoreans prevailed and the resolve of the cities themselves, so that they were willing to have their political affairs managed by them»⁴⁸. Granting this to be true, we do not align ourselves with those who maintain that under the influence of Ameinias Parmenides decided to give laws to his native city of Elea⁴⁹. On the other hand, being of the opinion that Ameinias laid special emphasis on the scientific

41. Cf. F.M. CLEVE, *The Giants of pre - Sophistic Greek Philosophy*, vol. 2, The Hague, Nijhoff, 1973³, p. 525.

42. Cf. H. FRÄNKEL, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, München, Beck, 1962², p. 399. In spite of the fact that Ameinias left no writings (cf. K. FREEMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 41), we may reach the conclusion that Ameinias' way of life was differentiated from the Parmenidean one. In other words, keeping in mind that Ameinias had the reputation of being a Pythagorean (cf. *supra* and n. 33), and taking into account that for the Pythagoreans «persons must engage in no sexual activity other than procreationist, and hence heterosexual, intercourse» (cf. K.L. GACA, *The Reproductive Technology of the Pythagoreans*, *Classical Philology*, 95, 2000, p. 113), we consider that Parmenides, who was engaged in homosexual intercourse with Zeno of Elea (cf. PL., *Prm.*, 127 b; DIOG. LAERT., *Vit. Phil.*, 9. 25), did not adhere faithfully to Ameinias' moral standards. From this point of view we do not find ourselves in opposition to C.M. BOWRA, *The Poem of Parmenides*, *Classical Philology*, 32, 1937, p. 108, who noted that Ameinias and his colleagues «might perhaps think that Parmenides was not on the right way».

43. Cf. C.D. GEORGOULES, *Greek Philosophy (in Greek)*, *The Helios Encyclopedia*, vol. 7, Athens, Helios, p. 567; C.I. VOURVERES, *Parmenides (in Greek)*, *The Helios Encyclopedia*, vol. 15, Athens, Helios, p. 559; C.J. DE VOGEL, *Greek Philosophy*, vol. 1, Leiden, Brill, 1957, p. 35; M. GIGANTE, *Biografia e dossografia in Diogene Laerzio*, *Elenchos*, 7, 1986, p. 88.

44. Cf. D. GALLOP, *Parmenides of Elea*, Toronto, The Univ. of Toronto Press, 1984, pp. 3-4; A.S. BOGOMOLOV, *History of Ancient Philosophy*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1985, p. 83.

45. Cf. M. TIMPANARO CARDINI, *Pitagorici*, vol. 1, Firenze, La Nuova Italia, 1958, p. 161.

46. Cf. M. UNTERSTEINER, *Parmenide*, Firenze, La Nuova Italia, 1958, p. 6.

47. Cf. E. KOLLER, *Muße und musische Paideia*, *Museum Helveticum*, 13, 1956, p. 24.

48. Cf. IAMBL., *Vit. Pyth.*, 249. The translation is by J. DILLON - J. HERSHBELL, *Jamblichus. On the Pythagorean Way of Life*, Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1991, p. 243.

49. Cf. P. VRACHAS, *Parmenides (in Greek)*, *Hydria*, vol. 43, Athens, Etaireia Elinikon Ekdoseon, 1987, pp. 108- 109. In view of Jamblichus' assertion that «none of them (the Pythagoreans), while possessed by anger, punished a slave or admonished a freedman, but each waited for the restoration of his ability to think rationally..., for they accomplished this delay by using silence and quiet» (cf. IAMBL., *Vit. Pyth.*, 197; the translation is by J. DILLON - J. HERSHBELL, *op. cit.*, p. 203), we may reach the conclusion that Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία had a great deal

aspects of the Pythagorean conception of ἡσυχία, we underline the fact that Ameinias' alleged dependence on the so-called Pythagorean precept ὦ νέοι, ἀλλὰ σέβεσθε μεθ' ἡσυχίας τάδε πάντα⁵⁰ is a misleading one⁵¹. Moreover, keeping in mind that in the case of Ameinias the Latin word *otium* is the exact equivalent of the Greek word ἡσυχία⁵², we consider that Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία is indissolubly linked to the Pythagorean conception of the mode of existence of the objects of mathematics⁵³, which finds some confirmation in view of Archytas' utterance οὐ γὰρ δύναται τὸ νέον ἡσυχάζειν⁵⁴. Now it is worth recalling that, according to Sotion, Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία had a profound impact on many of his contemporaries because Ameinias was reputed to be a noble and good man (καλὸς καγαθός)⁵⁵. In spite of the fact that the terms καλὸς καγαθός were originally used for denoting a perfect gentleman⁵⁶ having much money or many possessions⁵⁷, we may rest assured that in the case of Ameinias, who was counted among the poor⁵⁸, the terms καλὸς καγαθός had a moral sense related to «the creation of a spiritual aristocracy and of a religion based on ethical principles»⁵⁹. Taking into account that «for five whole years» the Pythagoreans «had to keep

to do with the core of the Pythagorean way of life. Now H. DIELS - W. KRANZ, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, Berlin, Weidmann, 1974¹⁷, p. 217, maintained that Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία was influential in formulating Prodicus' tale of Heracles' choice between the good and evil paths of life. Furthermore, D.L. BLANK, Faith and Persuasion in Parmenides, *Classical Antiquity*, 1, 1982, p. 175, who had remarked the similarity between Parmenides' association of ἀλήθεια with a path and Prodicus' tale of Heracles' choice, suggested that «this archaic metaphor of the choice between the good and evil paths of life...seems to have been used by the Pythagoreans for the choice between a life of faithlessness and one of faith in Pythagoras' revealed Word». To our way of thinking, it seems probable that Ameinias, who might have approved of the Alcmaeonean distinction between φανερά and ἀφανῆ, clearly understood that for the Pythagoreans φανερά was a term used to represent a life of faithlessness, whereas ἀφανῆ was a term used to represent a life of faith in Pythagoras' revealed Word (cf. *supra* and n. 36). Assuming this to be true, we contend that for Ameinias the sign Y did not represent any choice between the good and evil paths of life and therefore we concur with A. BRINKMANN, Ein Denkmal des Neupythagoreismus, *Rheinisches Museum*, 66, 1911, p. 621, in observing that the sign Y had nothing to do with genuine Pythagoreanism.

50. Cf. W. NESTLE, *op. cit.*, p. 1554.

51. Cf. C. RIEDWEG, «Pythagoras hinterliess keine einzige Schrift»- ein Irrtum?, *Museum Helveticum*, 54, 1997, pp. 91- 92.

52. Cf. H. DIELS, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

53. Cf. R. SCHOTTLAENDER, *Früheste Grundsätze der Wissenschaft bei den Griechen*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1964, p. 59.

54. Cf. E. FRANK, *Plato und die sogenannten Pythagoreer*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962², p. 339.

55. Cf. F.M. CLEVE, *op. cit.*, p. 525; J.F. MATTÉI, *Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans* (translated from French into Modern Greek by C. CAPSAMBELE), Athens, Cardamitsas, 1995, p. 59.

56. Cf. P. CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, vol. 1, Paris, Klincksieck, 1990², p. 486.

57. Cf. F. BOURRIOT, *Kalos kagathos- kalokagathia*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, Olms, 1995, p. 83.

58. Cf. DIOG. LAERT., *Vit. Phil.*, 9. 21.

59. Cf. C.J. DE VOGEL, *Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism*, Assen, van Gorcum, 1966, p. 126. Taking into account that for the Pythagoreans the term καλοκαγαθία was indicative of «the true dignity of perfect character» (cf. IAMBL., *Vit. Pyth.*, 181; the translation is by J. DILLON - J.

silence (ἡσυχάζον)⁶⁰ in order to attain the true dignity of perfect character (καλοκαγαθία), we affirm that there was a mutual relation between the Pythagorean conception of καλοκαγαθία and Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία.

Christopher N. POLYCARPOU
(Athens)

HERSHBELL, *op. cit.*, p. 191), we are inclined to think that the Pythagoreans were counted among those who used to imply that «a man is noble and good when he is morally perfect; for only his virtue entitles him to such appellation. Thus it is the just man, the brave man, the temperate man who is called *noble and good*; in a word, it is virtue that wins a man the name» (cf. ARIST., *M.M.*, B9, 1207 b 23- 27; the translation is by G.CYRIL ARMSTRONG, *Aristotle. Magna Moralia*, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard Univ. Press, 1935, pp. 641- 643). From this point of view we doubt the truth of Xenophon's assertion that Simmias and Cebes, who had studied under the Pythagorean philosopher Philolaus, became disciples of Socrates in order to attain the true dignity of perfect character (cf. F. BOURRIOT, *op. cit.*, p. 309). In other words, we concur with Diogenes Laertius in observing that Xenophon's Socrates presented himself as a moralist who used to teach whatever a noble and good man needed to know for civic purposes (cf. DIOG. LAERT., *Vit. Phil.*, 2.48), in spite of the fact that one hundred years before Socrates the Pythagoreans, including Ameinias, had attained the true dignity of perfect character (cf. DIOG. LAERT., *Vit. Phil.*, 9. 21). In this connexion we may note that the Pythagoreans laid special emphasis on τηρεῖν τὴν καλοκαγαθίαν with a view to avoid the implications of the term ἀρετή (cf. C.J. DE VOGEL, *op. cit.*, p. 131). Keeping in mind that Eudoxus had no hesitation in making use of the term ἀγαθὰ instead of the term ἀρεταί (cf. EUDOX., D 3 Lasserre), we may rest assured that the avoidance of the implications of the term ἀρετή is characteristic of genuine Pythagoreanism.

60. Cf. DIOG. LAERT., *Vit. Phil.*, 8. 10. (The translation is by R.D. HICKS, *Diogenes Laertius*, vol. 2, New York, Putnam's Sons, 1925, p. 329). In view of the link between τὸ πρόρρητον τῆς φιλοσοφίας and the Pythagorean πεντάγραμμον (cf. C.N. POLYCARPOU, The Eudoxean Biography of Pythagoras, *Diotima*, 32, 2004, p. 64), we consider that for Ameinias πεντάγραμμον was a symbol used to represent the period of time during which the disciples of the Pythagoreans had to keep silence. In other words, we put forward the opinion that for Ameinias πεντάγραμμον was indicative of a life of faith in Pythagoras' revealed Word, which might have been regarded as the outcome of ἡσυχία (cf. *supra* and n. 49). Moreover, it is worth recalling not only that πεντάγραμμον is a figure with five sides which give a starlike effect by intersecting one another (cf. J.F. MATTÉI, *op. cit.*, p. 121) but also that the construction of πεντάγραμμον presupposes the construction of dodecahedron, which was familiar to Pythagoras and his followers (cf. E. ZELLER - R. MONDOLFO, *op. cit.*, p. 681). Now, in view of the interrelation between the construction of πεντάγραμμον and the Pythagorean conception of the so-called golden section (cf. J.F. MATTÉI, *op. cit.*, p. 121), which was of great importance to Eudoxus (cf. P.H. MICHEL, *De Pythagore à Euclide*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1950, p. 557), we may reach the conclusion that πεντάγραμμον had a great deal to do with a moral interpretation of the mathematical implications of Ameinias' conception of ἡσυχία (cf. *supra* and n. 53). Keeping in mind that Ameinias was counted among Pythagoras' immediate followers (cf. P. EBNER, Alcmeone Crotoniate, *Klearchos*, 11, 1969, p. 33), we are inclined to think that Ameinias developed the Pythagorean conception of ἡσυχία as a response to Xenophanes' frank criticism of the worldview of Pythagoras (cf. M. UNTERSTEINER, *op. cit.*, p. 6).