

## SUMMARIES

The Metempsychosis of Pythagoras in Heraclides Ponticus, fr. 89 Wehrli

Yoshinao Sato

For what purpose and in what situation did Pythagoras set forth metempsychosis? It is generally accepted that he taught the doctrine of metempsychosis. But in Heraclides, fr. 89 Wehrli the main motif is the memory of his previous lives rather than metempsychosis itself.

It was Pythagoras himself who chose Euphorbus as his earlier incarnation. It is not obvious why he chose this obscure figure. The answer is suggested by the fact that Euphorbus is unique in leaving behind two traces, a shield dedicated to Apollo's temple and a passage of Ilias (Il. XVII 51-60). Pythagoras chose Euphorbus because he could prove his earlier incarnation with these clues. The memory of earlier incarnations was, as Emp. B 129 testifies, a source of his knowledge. Pythagoras gave evidence in proving himself to have been Euphorbus that his stored knowledge was true.

Many miracles are reported about Pythagoras. They are defined as performances in front of the general public, not selected disciples, to attest his supernatural power. The attestation of his memory should be placed on a level with these miracles. Pythagoras did not teach the doctrine of metempsychosis, but performed a miracle of attesting his memory of previous lives on the premise of the metempsychosis which had been introduced into the Greek world by Pherecydes.

A motif of katabasis is also interwoven into Heraclides, fr. 89 that, as a whole, tells of the transmigration of Pythagoras' soul. The katabasis of Pythagoras is transmitted by some testimonies with differences. The historical fact was that, having shut himself up in an underground room, and reappeared, Pythagoras made such impressive speeches that he persuaded the Crotoniates of his katabasis. As Burkert rightly interprets, Pythagoras performed katabasis to get a message from Meter, Demeter. Pythagoras played the role of a hierophant in the cult of Demeter. He worked the miracle of demonstrating his memory in

the speeches following his katabasis.

Many scholars have paid the more attention to Porphyr. vit. Pyth. 19, where the doctrine of metempsychosis is systematically described, because the testimonies about Pythagoras' teachings are scanty. They regard section 19 as a quotation from Dicaearchus, joining this section to the previous section 18, Dicaearchus fr. 33 Wehrli. According to section 19, contrary to our conclusion, Pythagoras taught the "dogmata" of metempsychosis. But I regard this section neither as traceable to Dicaearchus, nor as having credibility, because of the wrong usage of the Pythagorean term, "siope", and Dicaearchus' materialistic view that disbelieved in the immortality of the soul.

#### The Conference of Agesilaos and Pharnabazos in Xenophon's *Hellenica*

Hideyo NEMOTO

In *Hel.* 4.1.29~39 Xenophon depicts the conference between the Spartan king Agesi-laos and the Persian satrap Pharnabazos. An attempt is here made to demonstrate the purpose of this lengthy narrative, and to show how elaborately Xenophon arranged historical facts in order to attain his purpose.

The conference is fixed, according to 4.1.29, at the suggestion of Apollophanes of Cyzicus. But *Plu.Ages.*12.1 tells us that the Cyzician suggestion resulted from the request of Pharnabazos, about which Xenophon is silent. Plutarch must be credible if one calls to mind that Apollophanes was an old *xenos* of the Persian, while his friendship with Agesilaos had just begun. The reason for Xenophon's silence may be to cover over the failure of Agesilaos, who, though in an advantageous position, could not win Pharnabazos to the Spartan side.

Just before the conference Pharnabazos recognizes the Spartan simplicity, the virtue which --he perhaps remembers-- in olden times a Persian traditon,too, but one which the present Persians make light of (*Xen.Cyr.*8.8.3~27); also he immediately, in spite of the carpet prepared for him, sits directly on the ground as the Spartans do: this shows not only his noble character as a

Persian satrap but also his respect for the old tradition of simplicity and fortitude as a commander. Therefore Xenophon's ἡσχύνθη is much convincing than Plutarch's αἰδεσθεῖς because of the straightforward expression of Pharnabazos' shame-feeling.

Pharnabazos 1a) recounts his contributions to the Spartans so far, sometimes in defiance of his own life, 2a) blames their ingratitude, which gives to his logic a strong condemnatory tone as might be expected of its simple structure, and reduces them to a dead silence, Agesilaos 1b) refutes with a famous phrase "to do good to friends, harm to enemies" so as to justify their deeds, adding that πάντα ἡναγκάσαμεθα τὰ ἐκείνου πολέμια νομίζειν. The imperfect tense of this shows that in future the situation could change (Plu. Ages. 12. 6, present!); which is a preparation for 2b), his exhortation of Pharnabazos toward defection from the Persian King. In 2b) he tries to attract the Persian by appealing to territorial ambition as well as material desire. The description in *HG* is more probable and more realistic than that in *Plu.Ages.* (12.7), where Agesilaos seems to be coercive and menacing when he forces Pharnabazos to the choice of staying as a slave of the King, or allying himself with the Spartans to be guarded by them.

Pharnabazos refuses Agesilaos' proposal in *HG* as well as in *Plu.Ages.* In *HG* he says he will fight his best for the King so long as the King entrusts him with full power --to respond to the expectation of his master under any circumstances, this he himself calls *philotimia*. This Persian norm of behaviour is in a marked contrast to the Greek ideal of "freedom" which realisation makes up the kernel of Agesilaos' discourse in 2b). Here is clearly seen an encounter between Greek and Persian values, which seems to be the main purpose of Xenophon's description of the scene. Pharnabazos declares himself to be acting naturally on the Persian principle, on which Agesilaos bestows high praise, accepting Pharnabazos' challenge politely and mildly: this acceptance, omitted in *Plu.Ages.*, brings the description of the conference between the two commanders in the field to a close completion. These examinations of the reality and the vividness of the account affirm the estimation of *HG* by Porphyrios (Jakoby, *FGH*, 115F21) and hint at Xenophon's own presence at the conference, or at least, at the direct derivation of the information from Agesilaos himself.