

AMMONIUS ON THE DELPHIC E

THE purpose of this paper is to investigate the source of Plutarch's inspiration for the impressive discourse which he presents from the lips of Ammonius in the *De E apud Delphos*, and in particular for the following much-quoted passage:¹

Ἄλλ' ἔστιν ὁ θεός, εἰ χρὴ φάναι, καὶ ἔστι κατ' οὐδένα χρόνον, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τὸν ἀκίνητον καὶ ἄχρονον καὶ ἀνέγκλιτον καὶ οὐ πρότερον οὐδὲν ἔστιν οὐδ' ὕστερον οὐδὲ μέλλον οὐδὲ παρωχημένον οὐδὲ πρεσβύτερον οὐδὲ νεώτερον· ἀλλ' εἰς ὧν ἐνὶ τῷ νῦν τὸ αἶε πεπλήρωκε, καὶ μόνον ἔστι τὸ κατὰ τοῦτον ὄντως ὄν, οὐ γεγονὸς οὐδ' ἐσόμενον οὐδ' ἀρξάμενον οὐδὲ παυσόμενον. Οὕτως οὖν αὐτὸν δεῖ σεβόμενους ἀσπάζεσθαι καὶ προσαγορεύειν, "εἰ", ἢ καὶ νῆ Δία, ὡς ἔνιοι τῶν παλαιῶν, "εἰ ἔν". Οὐ γὰρ πολλὰ τὸ θεῖόν ἐστιν, ὡς ἡμῶν ἕκαστος ἐκ μυρίων διαφορῶν ἐν πάθει γενομένων ἄθροισμα παντοδαπὸν καὶ πανηγυρικῶς μεμιγμένον· ἀλλ' ἐν εἶναι δεῖ τὸ ὄν, ὥσπερ ὄν τὸ ἔν. Ἡ δ' ἑτερότης διαφορᾶ τοῦ ὄντος εἰς γένεσιν ἐξίσταται τοῦ μὴ ὄντος. Ὅθεν εὖ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἔχει τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον· Ἀπόλλων μὲν γὰρ οἶον ἀρνούμενος τὰ πολλὰ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἀποφάσκων ἔστιν, Ἰήμιος δ' ὡς εἰς καὶ μόνος· Φοῖβον δὲ δῆπον τὸ καθαρὸν καὶ ἄγνόν οἱ παλαιοὶ πᾶν ἀνόμαζον, ὡς ἔτι Θεσσαλοὶ τοὺς ἱερέας ἐν ταῖς ἀποφράσιν ἡμέραις αὐτοὺς ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ἐξω διατριβοντας, οἶμαι, "φοιβονομείσθαι" λέγουσι. Τὸ δ' ἐν εἰλικρινὲς καὶ καθαρὸν· ἑτέρου γὰρ μίξει πρὸς ἕτερον ὁ μiasμός, ὡς πού καὶ Ὁμηρος "ἐλέφαντα" τινὰ φοινισσόμενον βαφῇ "μαίνεσθαι" φησί· καὶ τὰ μιγνύμενα τῶν χρωμάτων οἱ βαφεῖς "φθείρεσθαι" καὶ "φθορὰν" τὴν μίξιν ὀνομάζουσιν. Οὐκοῦν ἐν τ' εἶναι καὶ ἄκρατον αἶε τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ καὶ καθαρῷ προσήκει.

De E apud Delphos 393 A–393 C.²

Both Norden and Diels believed, rather surprisingly, that in invoking the supreme divinity as ἔν Plutarch had Heraclitus in mind, though Diels suggests that Plutarch was probably thinking of Xenophanes too.³ There are certainly fragments of Heraclitus which might justify the ascription to him of the equation ἔν = θεός.⁴ In practice, however, it does not seem that this conception was related to his name in the doxographic tradition.⁵ In the case of Xenophanes

¹ In antiquity the passage in question attracted in particular the attention of the Christian Fathers. Eusebius (*Praep. Evang.* 11. 11, PG 21, cols. 876–80) quotes a lengthy extract from the *De E ap. Delph.* beginning at οὕτε οὖν ἀριθμὸν . . . (391 F) and stretching down to . . . τοῦ μὴ ὄντος (393 B). Cyril of Alexandria quotes from Ἄλλ' ἔστιν ὁ θεός, . . . (393 A) down to . . . ὥσπερ ὄν τὸ ἔν (393 B) at *Adv. Jul.* 8 (PG 76, col. 908). Theodoretus (*Graec. aff. cur.* 2. 108, PG 83, col. 860) quotes from 392 E: τί οὖν ἔστι τὸ αἰδίων, καὶ ἀγέννητον, καὶ ἀφθαρτον; ᾧ χρόνος οὐδεὶς μεταβολὴν ἐπάγει. Since his version differs considerably from the accepted text we must assume that Theodoretus, or his authority, was quoting from memory. This in itself is an indication of the popularity of the *De E ap. Delph.*

² There are certain textual difficulties,

which do not, however, affect the present discussion. I quote from *Plutarque: Sur l'E de Delphes*, texte et traduction avec une introduction et des notes par R. Flacelière (*Annales de l'Université de Lyon*, 3^e série, Lettres, fasc. 11, Paris, 1941).

³ See E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (rp. Darmstadt, 1956), pp. 231–3, where Norden quotes a private communication from Diels.

⁴ Cf. in particular DK 22 B 32 ἐν τὸ σοφὸν μόνον λέγεσθαι οὐκ ἐθέλει καὶ ἐθέλει Ζηνὸς ὄνομα.

⁵ There is, to my knowledge, no pre-Neoplatonic counterpart to Plot. *Enn.* 5. 1. 9 καὶ Ἡράκλειτος δὲ τὸ ἐν οἶδεν αἰδίων καὶ νοητόν· τὰ γὰρ σώματα γίνεταί δει καὶ ρέοντα. It should be noted that the doctrine which Plotinus here ascribes to Heraclitus resembles only superficially that of the *De E*. Plutarch contrasts God and man in respect

this ascription was actually made,¹ and indeed Xenophanes himself had paved the way for it.²

I do not believe that Plutarch can have had Heraclitus in mind. The god who is invoked as *ἔν* is identified with a conception of being as immutable that owes much to Plato, in particular to the discussion of *χρόνος* and *αἰών* at *Timaeus* 37 c–38 c. There can be no justification for relating this conception to Heraclitus. If Plutarch has made reference to Heraclitus in the preceding pages³ his purpose was only to draw a contrast between immutable being and Heraclitean flux. Finally, if Plutarch had Heraclitus in mind, then one must suppose that the plural form *ἔνιοι τῶν παλαιῶν* refers to a single philosopher and is intended as a stylistic elegance. There are, however, basic objections to this view. (1) It seems unlikely that Plutarch would have used the phrase *ἔνιοι τῶν παλαιῶν* thus without at the same time making it obvious which philosopher he had in mind; a sophisticated allusion of this kind is after all worthless if the object of its reference is not apparent to the educated reader.⁴ But in fact Plutarch has not given any obvious indication that he was thinking of Heraclitus.⁵ (2) A consideration of the context indicates that the locution *ἔνιοι τῶν παλαιῶν* is not intended as a literary elegance but as an appeal to the authority of an ancient tradition. As such it is characteristic of the philosophical attitude of the period,⁶ and of the *De E.* in particular, the whole object of which is to recover the viewpoint of *τοὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ περὶ τὸν θεὸν φιλοσοφήσαντας* (385 A).

If, as Diels supposed, Plutarch were thinking of both Heraclitus and Xenophanes (a somewhat unusual combination),⁷ then the plural form would

of being; in Plotinus, since *σώματα* refers to the material universe in general, the contrast is impersonal.

¹ Cf. Arist. *Metaph.* A, 986^b24 f. (*εἰς τὸν ὅλον οὐρανὸν ἀποβλέψας τὸ ἐν εἶναι φησι* (sc. Xenophanes) *τὸν θεόν*), and especially the ps.-Aristotelian MXG (= DK 21 A 28).

² Cf. DK 21 B 23 *εἰς θεός, ἐν τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος, οὗτι δέμας θνητοῖσιν ὁμοίος οὐδὲ νόημα*.

³ Cf. Norden, loc. cit.

⁴ It is interesting to compare Plutarch's formulation with Philo, *De vit. Mos.* 2. 2 *φασὶ γὰρ τινες οὐκ ἀπὸ σκοποῦ, μόνως ἂν οὕτω τὰς πόλεις ἐπιδοῦναι πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον, ἐὰν (ἦ) οἱ βασιλεῖς φιλοσοφῶσιν ἢ οἱ φιλόσοφοι βασιλεύσωσιν*. Since *Rep.* 473 c 11 ff. (cf. also *Ep.* 7. 326 b) was a favourite Platonic commonplace which, in condensed form, is specifically referred to Plato by Cicero (*ad Q. Fr.* I. I. 29) and Jul. Capitolinus, who remarks that this *sententia* was constantly on the lips of Marc. Aurelius (*Vita* 27), it can hardly be doubted that Philo was aware that he was presenting a paraphrase of Plato. Thus, one must assume that the phrase *φασὶ γὰρ τινες* is intended as sophisticated flattery of the educated reader who might reasonably be expected to recognize the allusion to Plato and to feel in consequence entitled to pat himself on the back. Interestingly, Justin (*Ap.* I. 3, PG 6, col. 332) quotes the

same sentiment with a similar indirect reference to Plato: *ἔφη γάρ πον καὶ τις τῶν παλαιῶν. Ἄν μὴ οἱ ἄρχοντες φιλοσοφῶσαι καὶ οἱ ἀρχόμενοι, οὐκ ἂν εἴη τὰς πόλεις εὐδαιμονῆσαι*. It may be noted that Capitolinus' condensation of Plato's text (*florere civitates si aut philosophi imperarent aut imperantes philosopharentur*) resembles that of Philo to such a degree that one is tempted to believe that their common source was a Hellenistic florilegium rather than the actual text of Plato. Cicero's version, though somewhat more elaborate (. . . *Plato tum denique fore beatas res publicas putavit, si aut docti ac sapientes homines eas regere coepissent aut ii qui regerent omne suum studium in doctrina et sapientia collocassent*), follows the same basic pattern. Cf. also Alb. *Didasc.* 34, Apul. *de Plat.* 2. 24.

⁵ Plutarch often quotes Heraclitus (see W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O'Neil, *Plutarch's Quotations* (Baltimore, 1959), p. 34), but that in so doing his general practice seems to be to refer to him specifically by name.

⁶ Cf. H. Dörrie, 'Die Schultradition im Mittelplatonismus und Porphyrios' (*Porphyre, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* xii [Vandœuvres-Genève, 1966], pp. 3 ff.), and C. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos* (Berlin, 1955), pp. 108 ff.

⁷ This in spite of Diog. Laert. 9. 5 (= DK 22 A 1) *Σωτρίων δέ φησιν εἰρηκεῖναι τινὰς Ξενοφάνους αὐτὸν* (sc. Heraclitus) *ἀκηκοέναι*.

be natural—though Plutarch could hardly have expected his readers to divine that it was these two he had in mind. However, I do not believe that Plutarch can have been thinking specifically of Xenophanes and Heraclitus, for the simple reason that his inspiration can, I hold, be shown to be primarily Neopythagorean.¹

That this is so is indicated, firstly, by Plutarch's identification of the One with Apollo on the ground that the name Apollo means 'not many', i.e. 'one' (α-privative and πολλά). We meet this same etymology elsewhere in Plutarch,² in Clement of Alexandria,³ in Plotinus,⁴ in Porphyry,⁵ in a pseudo-Plutarchean fragment preserved by Stobaeus⁶ and in Jo. Lydus,⁷ whilst Macrobius refers to it in connection with both Chrysippus⁸ and Numenius.⁹ That it is a Pythagorean etymology is stated by Plutarch himself on the two occasions on which he refers to it in the *De Iside*,¹⁰ and this is confirmed by Plotinus,¹¹ Porphyry,¹² Stobaeus,¹³ and Lydus.¹⁴ Moreover P. Boyancé has shown¹⁵ that the same etymology is implied in a fragment of Philolaus¹⁶ quoted by both Philo¹⁷ and Lydus.¹⁸ Macrobius' ascription of it to Chrysippus reveals that it was used by Stoics too,¹⁹ but for our purpose it is sufficient to note that Plutarch regarded this etymology as specifically Pythagorean.

For Heraclitus' own estimate of Xenophanes see Diog. Laert. 9. 1 (= DK 22 B 40) πολυμαθὴ νόον ἔχειν οὐ διδάσκει. 'Ἡσίοδον γὰρ ἂν ἐδίδεξε καὶ Πυθαγόρην αὐτίς τε Ξενοφάνεά τε καὶ Ἑκαταῖον.

¹ Already Plato (*Phlb.* 16 c 7 f.) could refer to the Pythagoreans as οἱ μὲν παλαιοί, κρείττονες ἡμῶν καὶ ἐγγυτέρω θεῶν οἰκοῦντες.

² *De E.* 388 F; *De Iside* 354 F and 381 F.

³ *Strom.* I. 24, PG 8, col. 912.

⁴ *Enn.* 5. 5. 6.

⁵ *De abst.* 2. 36, p. 165. 3 ff. N.

⁶ *Anth.* I, p. 21. 26 ff. W. (cf. Diels, *Doxogr.*, pp. 96 ff.).

⁷ *De mens.* 2. 12, p. 33. 8 ff. W.

⁸ *Sat.* 1. 17. 7 = SVF ii. 1095.

⁹ *Sat.* 1. 17. 65 = Numenius fr. 38 Leemans Ἀπόλλωνα Δέλφιον vocant . . . , ut Numenio placet, quasi unum et solum. ait enim prisca Graecorum lingua δέλφον unum vocari unde et frater, inquit, ἀδελφός dicitur quasi iam non unus. Macrobius refers to an interpretation of Δέλφιος rather than of Apollo. But clearly there would be no point in Numenius interpreting Δέλφιος as meaning 'one' if he were not already familiar with the Pythagorean etymology of Apollo. For the formula *unus et solus* (= εἷς καὶ μόνος) see below. Cf. Apuleius, *De Platone* 1. 11 deorum trinas nuncupat species, quarum est prima unus et solus summus ille, ultra-mundanus, incorporeus.

¹⁰ 354 F Δοκῶ δ' ἔγωγε καὶ τὸ τὴν μονάδα τοὺς ἄνδρας (sc. the Pythagoreans) ὀνομάζειν Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ τὴν δυνάδα Ἄρτεμιν, Ἀθηναίαν δὲ τὴν ἐβδομάδα, Ποσειδῶνα δὲ τὸν πρῶτον κύβον, εἰκέναι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἰδρυμένοις καὶ γλυφομένοις νῆ Δία καὶ γραφομένοις.

381 F οἱ δὲ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ ἀριθμοὺς καὶ σχήματα θεῶν ἐκόσμησαν προσηγορίαις. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἰσόπλευρον τρίγωνον ἐκάλουν Ἀθηναίαν κορυφαγενή καὶ τριτογένειαν, ὅτι τρισι καθετοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν γωνιῶν ἀγομέναις διαιρεῖται· τὸ δ' ἐν Ἀπόλλωνα πλήθους ἀποφάσει καὶ δι' ἀπλότητα τῆς μονάδος.

¹¹ Loc. cit. τάχα δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐν ὄνομα τοῦτο ἄρσιν ἔχει πρὸς τὰ πολλά. ὅθεν καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα οἱ Πυθαγόρικοι συμβολικῶς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐσημαίνον ἀποφάσει τῶν πολλῶν.

¹² Loc. cit. οἱ γοῦν Πυθαγόρειοι περὶ τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς καὶ τὰς γραμμὰς σπονδάζοντες ἀπὸ τούτων τὸ πλεόν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπῆρχοντο, τὸν μὲν τινα ἀριθμὸν Ἀθηναίαν καλοῦντες, τὸν δὲ τινα Ἄρτεμιν, ὥσπερ αὐτὸν ἄλλον Ἀπόλλωνα, καὶ πάλιν ἄλλον μὲν δικαιοσύνην, ἄλλον δὲ σωφροσύνην. Cf. Plutarch's account in n. 10 above.

¹³ *Anth.* I, p. 22. 1 f. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεικάζων ἐπωνόμαζεν (sc. Pythagoras) ὡς Ἀπόλλωνα μὲν τὴν μονάδα οὖσαν.

¹⁴ Loc. cit. οἷ γε μὴν Πυθαγόρειοι τῷ ἡγεμόνι τοῦ παντὸς τὴν ἐβδόμην ἀνατίθενται, τούτεστι τῷ ἐνί, καὶ μάρτυς Ὁρφεὺς λέγων οὕτως ἐβδόμη, ἣν ἐφίλησεν ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων. Ἀπόλλωνα δὲ μυστικῶς τὸν ἕνα λέγεσθαι προειρήκαμεν (cf. *De mens.* 2. 4, p. 21 W.) διὰ τὸ ἅπαθεν εἶναι τῶν πολλῶν, τούτεστι μόνον. Cf. Clem. Alex. loc. cit. Ἀπόλλων μὲν τοι, μυστικῶς κατὰ "στέρησιν τῶν πολλῶν" νοοῦμενος, ὁ εἷς ἐστὶ θεός.

¹⁵ *REG* lxxvi (1963), 91 ff.

¹⁶ DK 44 B 20 ἔστι γὰρ ἡγεμὼν καὶ ἄρχων πάντων, θεός, εἷς, αἰὲ ὢν, μόνιμος, ἀκίνητος, αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ ὁμοῖος, ἕτερος τῶν ἄλλων.

¹⁷ *De orific.* 100.

¹⁸ *De mens.* 2. 12, p. 34. 1 ff. W.

¹⁹ This is indicated too by the Latin

A further Neopythagorean feature in our text is the interpretation of *Ἰήμιος* (as though derived from the epic adjective *ἰός, ἰα, ἰόν*)¹ as meaning *εἰς καὶ μόνος*. This latter phrase is, as Festugière has pointed out,² a Neopythagorean formula, frequently applied to the supreme deity (sometimes in the neuter version *ἐν καὶ μόνον*) in the *Hermetica*³ and in the writings of Philo.⁴ It is worth recalling at this point that Plutarch's spokesman, his teacher Ammonius, not only had Pythagorean interests⁵ but also was from Egypt.⁶ The presence in Philo, in the *Hermetica* and in the mouth of Ammonius of the formula *εἰς καὶ μόνος* suggests that it was not merely Neopythagorean but, more specifically, Alexandrian Neopythagorean.⁷ Now Norden argued⁸ that Ammonius' interpretation of *εἰ* as an invocation is in itself suggestive of non-Greek influence. Such influence might well derive from the Alexandrian environment.

Furthermore, as R. Flacelière indicates,⁹ the fanciful interpretations of Delphic titles of Apollo put forward by Ammonius (*De E* 385 B-C) in his attempt to prove that the Delphic deity was no less a philosopher than a

version of this etymology given by Cicero, *N.D.* 2. 68: *Iam Apollinis nomen est Graecum, quem solem esse volunt, . . . cum sol dictus sit vel quia solus ex omnibus sideribus est tantus vel quia cum est exortus obscuratis omnibus solus apparet*. For parallels see A. S. Pease ad loc.

¹ Cf. Lydus, *De mens.* 4. 1, p. 64. 11 f. W. (regarding the etymology of *Ἰανουάριος*) . . . *ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς ἰας ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς μᾶς κατὰ τοὺς Πυθαγορείους*.

² *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* iv, *Le Dieu inconnu et la Gnose* (Paris, 1954), pp. 18 ff. See further Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5. 14, PG 9, col. 193, where Clement quotes as follows from a work entitled *Περὶ φύσεως* ascribed to the early Pythagorean Thearidas: *ἀ ἀρχὰ τῶν ὄντων, ἀρχὰ μὲν ὄντως ἀληθινά, μὴ: κείνα γὰρ ἐν ἀρχῇ τέ ἐστιν ἐν καὶ μόνον*.

³ C.H. 4. 1 (i. 49. 4), 5 (i. 51. 6), 8 (i. 52. 11); C.H. 5. 1 (i. 60. 17 f.); C.H. 10. 14 (i. 119. 16 ff.); C.H. 11. 5 (i. 149. 9); C.H. 14. 3 (ii. 222. 19); *Exc. Stob.* 2A. 15. The same phrase was apparently used of this world in the *Λόγος Τέλειος*; cf. Nock-Festugière ii. 304 f.

⁴ *De agric.* 54; *Quis rer. div.* 216; *Leg. alleg.* 2. 1 ff.; *De gig.* 64. The locution, after finding its way into Philo, soon lost its Pythagorean ring and eventually (no doubt via Philo) received a new home in the Christian formulary; cf., e.g., Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 1. 1, PG 21, col. 24, and *passim*. This is particularly obvious in the case of Pseudo-Justin's *Exhortation to the Greeks* (composed in the second half of the third century after Christ?) where the fact that Pythagoras regarded the Monad as first principle of everything and source of all good things is accepted as evidence that (*Cohort.* 19, PG 6, col. 276) *δι' ἀλληγορίας ἕνα τε καὶ μόνον*

διδάσκει Θεὸν εἶναι. The formula reoccurs in a Christian context at *Cohort.* 20, PG 6, col. 276.

⁵ οὐ τὸ φαυλότατον ἐν μαθηματικῇ φιλοσοφίας τιθέμενος (*De E.* 391 E).

⁶ On Ammonius see Zeller, *D. Phil. d. Griech.*, iii. i.⁵ 832 n. 1; iii. ii.⁵ 177 n. 1.

I assume that Plutarch is reproducing substantially the teaching of Ammonius. However, this assumption is not vital to my argument, for Plutarch's own interest in Neopythagoreanism is well known and is indeed sufficiently attested by the discourse put forward in his own name in the *De E.* (387 F-391 E). See further Zeller, *D. Phil. d. Griech.*, iii. ii.⁵ 175 ff.; P. Geigenmüller, 'Plutarch's Stellung zur Religion und Philosophie seiner Zeit', *N. Jahrb. f. klass. Alt.* xlvii (1921), 251 ff. If from no other source, Plutarch would be familiar with Alexandrian Neopythagoreanism (see n. 7 below) from Eudorus' commentary upon the *Timaeus*; cf. below. Plutarch himself had visited Alexandria in his youth, but it is not known what he studied there; cf. *Qu. conv.* 678 c.

⁷ Recent work, above all Thesleff's examination of the Pythagorean *pseudepigrapha* (H. Thesleff, *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period* [Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora xxiv. 3, Aabo, 1961]), has shown that Zeller's view that Neopythagoreanism was in its inception exclusively an Alexandrian movement is improbable. To some extent, however, the evidence of Plutarch (whom we know to have been familiar with Alexandrian sources) may, like that of Philo, be taken as representative of Alexandrian speculation.

⁸ Loc. cit.; cf. op. cit., pp. 182 ff.

⁹ *Sagesse de Plutarque* (Paris, 1964), p. 193 n. 1.

prophet are suggestive of the Pythagorean conception of Apollo.¹ It is significant that most of these titles, similarly interpreted, reappear in Ammonius' discourse (394 A) in a dualistic scheme² which contrasts Apollo with Pluto and is reminiscent of Pythagorean 'Tables of Opposites' still current in Plutarch's day and later.³

Finally, the frequent transition back and forth from masculine to neuter in Ammonius' presentation is not irrelevant to our inquiry. At 393 A deity is introduced as *ὁ θεός* and is described as *εἷς*. At 393 B he is invoked as *εἰ ἔν*. He is next referred to as *τὸ θεῖον* and equated with *τὸ ἔν* and *τὸ ὄν*. Ammonius then reverts to the masculine at 393 C for the interpretations of Apollo, Ieius, and Phoebus, but changes to neuter for the characterization of *τὸ ἔν* which follows. Such transitions are easily made in Greek and need have no particular significance. However, they are tendentious whenever, as here, they involve the identification of a personal deity with an impersonal principle. Philo is a good case in point. On the basis of the LXX version of Exodus 3: 14 he refers to God as *ὁ ὢν*. But because of his desire to identify his God with absolute reality conceived in impersonal Platonic terms he frequently and tendentiously substitutes for the masculine form of the participle the neuter *τὸ ὄν* or *τὸ ὄντως ὄν*.⁴ In precisely the same way Plutarch, in describing Apollo as *τὸ ὄν*, is equating the Delphic deity with Platonic reality.⁵

A similar tendency is at work in the Neopythagoreans. Eudorus, an eclectic Platonist of the first century B.C., described the transcendent One of the Neopythagoreans as *ὁ ὑπεράνω θεός*.⁶ A similar view is referred to Pythagoras or Pythagoreans by Aetius,⁷ Hippolytus,⁸ Athenagoras,⁹ Clement of Alexandria,¹⁰ and Iamblichus,¹¹ and is implied in the fluctuation between *εἷς καὶ μόνος* and *ἔν καὶ μόνον* in the Neopythagorean formula which we have just been considering.

Now, whereas in view of the platonizing character of Ammonius' discourse it is not surprising that Plutarch equates Apollo with *τὸ ὄν* (i.e. Platonic reality), his identification of that god with *τὸ ἔν* is of greater significance to our inquiry. Since Albinus avoids equating his supreme deity with *τὸ ἔν* it may be assumed that this identification was not simply a Middle Platonic commonplace. Its presence in our passage is a further indication of Neopythagorean influence thereon. It seems that whereas Plutarch was susceptible to Neopythagorean influence the more orthodox Albinus was not.

We may then conclude on the basis of the above evidence that the supreme

¹ Cf. (as Flacelière notes) J. Carcopino, *De Pythagore aux Apôtres* (Paris, 1956), pp. 45 ff.

² Cf. *De Iside* 369 D-371 B.

³ Cf. *De Iside* 370 E; Simplicius' report of Eudorus' views, in *Ph.* 181. 22 ff. Diels; Porph. *V.P.* 38, p. 37. 2 ff. N.

⁴ Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 61.

⁵ Deity and intelligible reality are similarly identified at *De Iside* 352 A. Cf. *De def. orac.* 433 D-E where Plutarch identifies Apollo with the Form of the Good.

⁶ Cf. Simplicius, in *Ph.* 181. 17 ff. Diels. Cf. Philo, *Leg. alleg.* 2. 3 *τέτακται οὖν ὁ θεός κατὰ τὸ ἔν καὶ τὴν μονάδα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἢ μονὰς*

κατὰ τὸν ἕνα θεόν. Cf. Festugière, loc. cit. (p. 188, n. 2, above).

⁷ I. 3. 8 (D 280 f.) = DK 58 B 15; I. 7. 18 (D 302) *Πυθαγόρας τῶν ἀρχῶν τὴν μονάδα θεὸν καὶ τὰγαθόν* . . .

⁸ *Haer.* I. 2, PG 16, col. 3024 *μονάδα μὲν ἀπεφάνητο* (sc. Pythagoras) *τὸν θεόν*.

⁹ *Suppl.* 5, p. 6 Schwartz = DK 46. 4 *μονὰς ἔστιν ὁ θεός, τοῦτ' ἔστιν εἷς*.

¹⁰ *Protr.* 6, PG 8, col. 180 *οὐκ ἀποκρυπτεύον οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Πυθαγόραν, οἱ φασιν "ὁ μὲν θεὸς εἷς . . ."*

¹¹ *Theol. ar.* p. 3. 21 f. de Falco *λέγουσιν οὖν ταύτην* (sc. *τὴν μονάδα*) *οὐ μόνον θεόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ νοῦν καὶ ἀρσενόθλην*.

deity who is invoked by Ammonius as $\epsilon\upsilon\nu$ is the Neopythagorean $\tau\acute{o}\ \epsilon\upsilon\nu$ endowed with personality as $\delta\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, and that consequently, as we set out to show, the phrase $\epsilon\upsilon\nu\iota\omicron\iota\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$ refers to the Pythagoreans.

To attempt to define Plutarch's source more precisely may seem rash. Nevertheless, the following tentative line of argument seems worthy of mention. At 392 A ff. Ammonius, in dwelling upon the mutability of mortal beings as contrasted with the unshifting reality of the deity, makes reference both to Heraclitean flux and to the theme of the ages of man.¹ This combination of ideas was evidently a Middle Platonic commonplace² for we meet it again in Seneca³—whose form of expression strikingly resembles that of Plutarch⁴—whilst Maximus of Tyre expresses himself somewhat similarly but without explicitly contrasting human instability and divine immutability.⁵ Again, in the *De Josepho* of Philo we meet the ages of man (128) and the instability of mortal affairs (130 ff.), backed up with similes which seem reminiscent of Heraclitus,⁶ contrasted with the permanence of the

¹ On this latter topic see Fr. Boll, 'Die Lebensalter: Ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethologie und zur Geschichte der Zahlen' (*Kleine Schriften zur Sternkunde des Altertums* (Leipzig, 1950), pp. 156 ff.).

² Cf. W. Theiler, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus* (rp. Berlin/Zürich, 1964), pp. 12 ff. Theiler draws attention (op. cit., p. 38) to Cicero, *Acad.* I. 30 f., where *id quod semper esset simplex et unius modi et tale quale esset* is contrasted with the objects of sense perception which are *ita mobiles et concitatae ut nihil umquam unum esset constans, ne idem quidem, quia continenter laberentur et fluereant omnia*. However, Cicero is here no longer dealing with deity (cf. *Acad.* I. 28 f.) but with the simplicity of the individual Forms as can be seen from the context (cf. *Pl. Phd.* 78 d). Thus in Cicero the contrast is impersonal in that impersonal Forms are contrasted with impersonal physical objects, whereas in Plutarch the contrast is between the stability of the deity and the impermanence of man.

³ *Ep.* 58. 22 f. Quaecumque videmus aut tangimus Plato in illis non numerat quae esse proprie putat; fluunt enim et in adsidua deminutione atque adiectione sunt. Nemo nostrum idem est in senectute qui fuit iuvenis; nemo nostrum est idem manet qui fuit pridie. Corpora nostra rapiuntur fluminum more. Quidquid videtur currit cum tempore; nihil ex iis quae videmus manet; ego ipse, dum loquor mutari ista, mutatus sum. Hoc est quod ait Heraclitus: 'in idem flumen bis descendimus et non descendimus.' Manet enim idem fluminis nomen, aqua transmissa est. Hoc in amne manifestius est quam in homine; sed nos quoque non minus velox cursus praetervehit, et ideo admiror dementiam nostram, quod tantopere amamus rem fugacissimam, corpus, timemusque ne quando moriamur, cum omne momentum

mors prioris habitus sit: vis tu non timere ne semel fiat quod cotidie fit!

Cf. also *Ep.* 58. 27 Inbecilli fluvidique inter vana constitimus: ad illa mittamus animum quae aeterna sunt. Miremur in sublimi volitantes rerum omnium formas deumque inter illa versantem. . . .

⁴ Cf. *De E* 392 B-D "Ποταμῷ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμβῆναι δις τῷ αὐτῷ" καθ' Ἡράκλειτον, οὐδὲ θνητῆς οὐσίας δις ἀψαθαι κατὰ ἔξιν· ἀλλ' ὁξύνῃται καὶ τάχῃ μεταβολῆς σκιδνησι καὶ πάλιν συνάγει, μᾶλλον δ' οὐδὲ πάλιν οὐδ' ὕστερον ἀλλ' ἅμα συνίσταται καὶ ἀπολείπει καὶ πρόσσεισι καὶ ἀπεισιν. "Ὅθεν οὐδ' εἰς τὸ εἶναι περαίνει τὸ γιγνόμενον αὐτῆς τῷ μηδέποτε λήγειν μηδ' ἴστασθαι τὴν γένεσιν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ σπέρματος αἰεὶ μεταβάλλουσιν ἐμβρυον ποιεῖν εἴτα βρέφος εἴτα παῖδα, μειράκιον ἐφεξῆς, νεανίσκον, εἴτ' ἄνδρα, πρεσβύτην, γέροντα, τὰς πρώτας φθείρουσιν γενέσεις καὶ ἡλικίας ταῖς ἐπιγιγνομέναις. Ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἓνα φοβούμεθα γελοῖως θάνατον, ἥδη τοσοῦτους τεθνηκότες καὶ θνήσκοντες. Οὐ γὰρ μόνον, ὡς Ἡράκλειτος ἔλεγε, "πυρὸς θάνατος ἀέρι γένεσις, καὶ ἀέρος θάνατος ὕδατι γένεσις", ἀλλ' ἐτι σαφέστερον ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἡμῶν φθίρεται μὲν ὁ ἀκμάζων γιγνόμενον γέροντος, ἐφθάρη δ' ὁ νέος εἰς τὸν ἀκμάζοντα, καὶ ὁ παῖς εἰς τὸν νέον, εἰς δὲ τὸν παῖδα τὸ νήπιον· ὁ τ' ἐχθὲς εἰς τὸν σήμερον τέθνηκεν, ὁ δὲ σήμερον εἰς τὸν αὔριον ἀποθνήσκει.

The contrast between god and man is explicit: ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ ὄντως τοῦ εἶναι μέτεστιν οὐδέν (392 A)—ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ θεός (393 A).

⁵ p. 117. 18 ff. Hobein πάν γὰρ σώμα βεί, καὶ φέρεται ὁξέως, Εὐρίπου δίκην, ἄνω καὶ κάτω (cf. *Pl. Phd.* 90 c), νῦν μὲν ἐκ νηπιότητος εἰς ἡβην οἰδαῖνον· νῦν δὲ ἐξ ἡβης εἰς γῆρας ὑπονοσσοῦν καὶ ὑποφερόμενον. Cf. p. 3. 20 ff. n.

⁶ 141 καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς τὰ πρῶτα παρέρχεται φεύγοντα τὰς ὀψεις κὰν τοῖς χειμάρροις τὸ φερόμενον ῥεῦμα φθάνει παραδραμὸν ὁξύνῃται τάχους τὴν κατάληψιν, οὕτω

heavens (145 ff.).¹ That this whole complex of conceptions had a Pythagorean ring is suggested by its presence in Ammonius' discourse and rendered likely by the occurrence also in Ovid in a 'Pythagorean' context of the theme of the four ages of man, corresponding to the four seasons, in combination with Heraclitean formulations.² It is in this connection worth remarking that the notion of the four ages of man, linked together with that of the four seasons,³ occurred in a Hellenistic compilation entitled *Παιδευτικόν, Πολιτικόν, Φυσικόν* and ascribed to Pythagoras,⁴ that Diodorus Siculus refers the same notion, similarly phrased, to the Pythagoreans,⁵ and that Theo of Smyrna lists the four seasons and the four ages of man consecutively as the tenth and eleventh Tetraktys.⁶

In Plutarch this conception of man's mutability is closely linked with the Pythagorean interpretation of the name Apollo which we have been considering. Deity is one, but man, by reason of his mutability, is many: 392 D μένει δ' οὐδείς οὐδ' ἔστιν εἷς, ἀλλὰ γιγνόμεθα πολλοί.⁷ Thus it is not unlikely that the references to Heraclitus and the ages of man in connection with the notion of man's mutability derive from the same source as does the passage of Plutarch which we have been considering. Since this passage presents, as we have seen, a Neopythagorean interpretation of Platonic doctrine and is closely related to *Timaeus* 37 c-38 c, it is not improbable that Plutarch's source was a work dealing specifically with the *Timaeus*.⁸

Now in the first century B.C. the eclectic Platonist Eudorus of Alexandria, to whom reference has already been made, wrote a commentary upon the *Timaeus* which we know to have been utilized by Plutarch.⁹ Moreover Boyancé

καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ πράγματα φερόμενα καὶ παρεξίοντα φαντάζεται μὲν ὡς ὑπομένοντα, μένει δ' οὐδ' ἐπ' ἀκαρές, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ὑποσύρεται.

¹ Cf. *De Cherub.* 114 ff. Cf. the Hermetic *Exc. Stob.* 2 A. 11 ff.

² *Met.* 15. 176 ff. In particular, 214 ff. should be compared with the passages of Plutarch and Seneca quoted above (p. 190, nn. 3 and 4).

On the relationship between *Met.* 15. 199 ff., Philo, *De aetern.* 58, and Ocellus Lucanus 16 see Theiler (*Gnomon* i (1925), 151 and ii (1926), 588 ff.).

³ See Boll, op. cit., pp. 171 ff.

⁴ Cf. Diog. Laert. 8. 6 ff., in particular 8. 10 Διαιρείται δὲ καὶ τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου βίον οὕτως: "Παῖς εἴκοσι ἔτεα, νεηνίσκος εἴκοσι, νεηνίης εἴκοσι, γέρον εἴκοσι. αἱ δὲ ἡλικίαι πρὸς τὰς ὥρας ὥδε σύμμετροι παῖς ἕαρ, νεηνίσκος θέρος, νεηνίης φθινόπωρον, γέρον χειμῶν." ἔστι δ' αὐτῷ ὁ μὲν νεηνίσκος μεράκιον, ὁ δὲ νεηνίης ἀνὴρ. On the *Παῖδ. πολ. φυσ.* see Thesleff, op. cit. (p. 188, n. 7 above), pp. 20 and 32.

⁵ 10. 9. 5.

⁶ p. 98. 11 ff. Hiller.

⁷ Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 4. 23, PG 8, col. 1360 μυστικῶς οὖν ἐφ' ἡμῶν καὶ τὸ Πυθαγόρειον ἐλέγετο, "ἕνα γενέσθαι καὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπων δεῖν." Plot. *Enn.* 6. 9. 3 ἐπὶ τε τὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀρχὴν ἀναβεβηκέναι καὶ ἐν ἐκ πολλῶν γενέσθαι. The sentiment goes back to the Old

Academy at least; cf. *Epin.* 986 D and 992 B (ἐκ πολλῶν ἕνα γεγονότα). The same conception occurs in the Valentinian Gospel of Truth (*Evangelium Veritatis*, ed. by M. Malinine, H. C. Puech and G. Quispel (Zürich, 1956)) at, e.g., p. 25. 10 ff. On the Platonic-Pythagorean background of Valentinianism see now H. J. Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik* (Amsterdam, 1964), pp. 238 ff. For the general significance in Gnostic religion of the conception in question see H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (2nd ed. Boston, 1963), pp. 58 ff. On μοναδικὸν γενέσθαι in Clem. Alex. see Krämer, op. cit., p. 245.

⁸ ἐκμαγεῖον at 392 D recalls *Timaeus* 50 c. As Theiler points out (*Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, pp. 14 f.), there are reminiscences of *Ti.* 41 A-B at *De E.* 393 E and at *Sen. Ep.* 58. 27 f. Furthermore, E. Bickel (*Rheinisches Museum* ciii (1960), 1 ff.) has shown convincingly that *Ep.* 58. 16-22 (i.e. the portion immediately preceding that quoted in p. 190, n. 3, above) is closely related to the *Timaeus* and no doubt derives from a commentary thereon. Bickel identifies this commentary with that of Posidonius. But Seneca's source might equally well have been the commentary of Eudorus; cf. below.

⁹ Cf. *De procr. an. in Ti.* 1013 B, 1019 E, 1020 C.

has shown¹ that the comments in Philo and Lydus on the relationship between the One and the Hebdomad, involving the identification of the former with Apollo,² derive from a platonizing Pythagorean source which might well be this very commentary of Eudorus. The importance of Eudorus in the history of Middle Platonism has been stressed by W. Theiler³ who has also shown that where resemblances occur between Philo, Seneca, and Maximus a common source must be presumed and that in all probability this source is in some cases Eudorus.⁴ In the present instance where related themes occur in Philo, Ovid, Seneca, Plutarch, and Maximus we are evidently faced with commonplace combinations of ideas which it would be dangerous to attempt to trace back to any particular author. Nevertheless, in the case of Seneca and Plutarch the resemblances, even in matters of detail, are so great that some common source must be presumed and there are sufficient indications to suggest that this source was Eudorus.

But however that may be, we may safely conclude that the main content of Ammonius' discourse is of Neopythagorean inspiration—Ammonius, himself a Platonist with pronounced Neopythagorean interests, presents us with a restatement and reinterpretation in Neopythagorean terms of Platonic doctrine, which no doubt represents the most sublime that contemporary Alexandria could offer.

Memorial University of Newfoundland

JOHN WHITTAKER

¹ Loc. cit. (p. 187, n. 15, above).

² The texts in question are Lyd. *De mens.* 2. 12, pp. 33 f. W.; Ph. *De opific.* 100 and *De Dec.* 102–5. It is worth remarking that Ammonius opens his discourse with a reference to ἡ ἱερὰ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἑβδομάς (391 F); cf. *Qu. conv.* 738 D ἡ δ' ἑβδομάς τῷ Μουσηγέτῃ προσκεκλήρωται.

³ See 'Philo von Alexandria und der

Beginn des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus' in *Parusia*, Festschr. für J. Hirschberger, hrsg. von Kurt Flasch (Frankfurt, 1965), pp. 199 ff.

⁴ Op. cit.; cf. in particular pp. 216 f. For a possible link between Seneca and Eudorus see Theiler, loc. cit., and Zeller, *D. Phil. d. Griech.* iii. i⁵. 635 Anm.