

FOR BRUNO SNELL

Toward a New Edition of Philodemus' Treatise *On Piety*

Albert Henrichs

THE TREATISE *Περὶ εὐσεβείας*, the title of which has been inferred from a passage in the text, together with *Περὶ ῥητορικῆς* and *Περὶ ποιημάτων* belongs to the small number of works by Philodemus which are known not only by specialists but by philologists in general.¹ Those who are familiar with the major editions of the fragments of the Presocratics, of the Greek historians and of Hesiod are aware that the modern interest in this treatise derives to a large extent from Philodemus' characteristic method of composition by compilation.² He is lavish in his use of illustrative references, and it is to him as

¹ A shorter German version of this paper was delivered to the XIII International Congress of Papyrology at Marburg on 3 August 1971. I am indebted to several of my American friends and colleagues who read parts of the English draft.

² For the sake of convenience, I append an inventory of the passages from *De Pietate* (with the exception of *P.Herc.* 1428; see *infra* n.37) which appear in these editions:

Diels/Kranz, *Vorsokr.*: Musaeus 2 B 12–14 (for a new fragment see *infra* TEXT I); Epimenides 3 B 5 (see *infra* TEXT II), B 7–9 (for a new fragment see *infra* TEXT VI); Pherecydes of Syros 7 B 13 (see *infra* n.32); Acusilaus 9 B 1 (= *FGrHist* 2 F 5; see *infra* n.32), B 5 (= 2 F 9–10), B 6–8 (= 2 F 11–13), B 9 (= 2 F 18), B 9a (= 2 F 8), B 10 (= 2 F 19), 9 B 9b (= 2 F 16) and B 9c (= 2 F 32) are *fragmenta falsa* (Acusilaus' name was wrongly restored) and should be eliminated.

FGrHist: Acusilaus (see preceding section); Pherecydes of Athens 3 F 35c, 83, 91, 130, 165; Anaximander of Miletus 9 F 3 bis, a *fr. falsum* (see Jacoby's note in Part I A p.*9 of the *Neudruck*, where he finally decided in favor of Schober's *καὶ [Πείσαν]δροσ* [the latter's identity is uncertain] instead of the *καὶ [ἀξιμάν]δροσ* proposed by Wilamowitz, rightly so); Andron of Halicarnassus 10 F 2–3 and 17; Peisander (cf. R. Keydell, *RE* 19 [1937] 147) 16 F 11 (*fr. incertissimum*); Satyrus 20 F 2; Abaris 34 F 1 (see *infra* n.32); Aristodicus 36 F 1; Stesimbrotus 107 F 14–17.

Merkelbach-West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica*: 23 (b), 43 (c), 51, 54 (b), 72, 210, 295, 345 (*fr. incertissimum*), 346 (All that is left on the extant *P.Herc.* 1648 VII 3 [p. 60 Gomperz] is]ηοια[ι]ε[, which is obviously an express reference to the Hesiodic *Catalogue.*), 363 A (*fr. incertum*). The paraphrase of Hes. fr.150,17–18 in the extant *P.Herc.* 243 II 23–27 (p.10 Gomperz), which Merkelbach-West adduce *ad loc.*, should be quoted as follows:]δ' Ἡσιόδον καὶ | [τ]ῶν Μελέωνων | [καὶ τ]ῶν Αἰθι[όπ]ω[ν] | [καὶ τ]ῶν Κατοῦσαι|[ων κ]αὶ τῶν Πυγμαί|[ων] (cf. J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodica* [thèse Paris 1960] 109). Hes. fr.139 M.-W. owes its existence to a wrong interpretation of the *disegni* and should be eliminated (see *infra* TEXT VI).

compiler that we owe numerous fragments of Greek poets and writers who are otherwise lost. But those utilitarian individuals who see in a man like Philodemus little more than a necessary evil should not overlook his immediate relevance for the history of ancient theological speculation. It was because of a similar combination of learned curiosity and religious concern that Philodemus' contemporary Cicero composed his theological triad, which served as a bridge between the pagan religious thinkers and the Christian apologists.³

Previous Scholarship on *De Pietate*

Philodemus' *On Piety* is divided into two parts; the first deals with the Epicurean criticism of statements about the gods by poets and philosophers, and the second offers a summary of Epicurean theology itself.⁴ This treatise is thus as important for the history of ancient philosophy as it is for the history of ancient literature. Therefore it is all the more regrettable that the only complete text available is the *editio princeps* of Theodor Gomperz, published in 1866, which is hardly satisfactory according to modern standards and often almost useless because of its technical shortcomings.⁵ In this edition all the passages which did not make sense to Gomperz are printed, as if they were hieroglyphics, in *scriptura continua* and majuscules; whole lines of text are frequently, and one might even say unscrupulously, relegated to the critical apparatus. The attempt by Robert Philippson some fifty years after Gomperz to restore the lacunose fragments by sheer intuition, often neglecting the transmitted sequence of letters, must

³ It has long been recognized that many Christian writers from Athenagoras and ps.-Justin to Ambrosius and St Augustine borrowed Epicurean arguments against the traditional Greek concept of the gods to refute the polytheism of paganism in general. Most notable for his close affinity to the types of reasoning adopted in *De Pietate* is Clement of Alexandria, who must have had access to a source similar to the one used by Philodemus; see R. Philippson, *Hermes* 55 (1920) 225, 230ff, W. Schmid in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1962) 807ff.

⁴ Th. Gomperz was the first to recognize the bipartite structure of *De Pietate*. Later on, after inspection of the fragment that preserves the very end of the first part and the badly damaged *subscriptio* that follows (*P.Herc.* 1428), he rightly concluded that each of the two parts (or books) must have occupied a separate roll of papyrus; see Gomperz' letter to H. Diels in *Dox.Graec.* (Berlin 1879) 529f.

⁵ *Philodem über Frömmigkeit, bearbeitet u. erläutert von Theodor Gomperz. Erste Abteilung: Der Text* (Herkulanische Studien, Zweites Heft, Leipzig 1866). The commentary which Gomperz had promised was never published. Gomperz himself was careful to describe his edition as a "Versuch einer kritisch-exegetischen Gesamt-Bearbeitung" (*op.cit.* p. x).

be considered a failure.⁶ The damage done by Philippson—witness, for example, the numerous faulty conjectures in quotations of passages from *De Pietate* in standard works of reference—far outweighs the usefulness of the little that will survive scrutiny.⁷

But the most important contribution towards an understanding of *De Pietate* that was made after Gomperz' edition remained for the most part unknown because it was never published: a dissertation, written by Adolf Schober under Christian Jensen's direction and submitted to the University of Königsberg in 1923, in which Schober presented a completely revised text for the first part of Philodemus' treatise.⁸ His abiding achievement consists in having put together parts of columns which were transmitted separately and in having properly arranged several individual fragments which, because of unfortunate circumstances, have come down to us in chaotic disorder. In establishing the text of many passages, however, Schober was apparently unable to escape the spell of Philippson's restorations made two years earlier. This dissertation exists in one handwritten copy only, which was consulted by Jacoby for his *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* and by Merkelbach and West for their *Fragmenta Hesiodica*.⁹ The new edition of the first part of *De Pietate* which I am preparing will be based on the original copy of Schober's dissertation, which is at present under the care of Wolfgang Schmid; the new edition of the second part, *i.e.* the summary of Epicurean theology, on which no preliminary work was done by Schober and for which we have no extensive fragments on papyrus, has been undertaken by Wolfgang Schmid.

⁶ *Hermes* 55 (1920) 225–78, 364–72. It is hardly surprising that Philippson was not inclined to attach much value to the extant fragments on papyrus; *cf.* his rash dismissal in *RE* 19 (1938) 2462: "Der Schaden ist vielleicht hier (*i.e.* in the case of *De Pietate*) nicht sehr gross, da von den vielen sog. Papyri nur 1428 ganz erhalten ist (der dennoch nachgeprüft werden muss); von den anderen gibt es nur wenige 'scorze'." Wilamowitz, on the other hand, anticipated the future course of events (*Glaube der Hellenen*³ [Basel 1955] 413 n.1): "Es wird sich in diesem Buch Philodems viel weiter kommen lassen, aber dazu ist eine Vergleichung des Textes und eine Ordnung der Kolumnen nötig." Wilamowitz was apparently unaware of the existence of Schober's dissertation.

⁷ See *e.g.* *Vorsokr.* 2 B 12, 9 B 8 and 9 B 9b (= *FGrHist* 2 F 16, *cf. supra* n.2); *Hes. fr.* 139 (see *infra* TEXT VI) and 345 M.-W.

⁸ *Philodemi περὶ εὐσεβείας libelli partem priorem restituit* Adolf Schober. The day of the oral defense was 1 March 1923. The subsequent fate of Schober, who was born on 28 November 1891, is unknown.

⁹ See Jacoby in *FGrHist* Part II B p.1231=I A p.*13 of the *Neudruck*, and in Part I A p.*21 n.1 of the *Neudruck* (when Jacoby refers to Schober's edition as a 'Kollation', the latter term should not be taken at face value); Merkelbach–West in *Fragmenta Hesiodica* p.vi.

A New Approach

The contributions of Gomperz, Philippson and Schober, for all their differences, have one feature in common in that their text is *not* based on the papyrus, whether still surviving or lost, as the primary witness, but on modern copies of it. This negative fact, unusual as it is for a critical edition, is accounted for by the adverse fate which left its damaging mark on all *Herculanensia* since the day they were buried under the lava of Mt Vesuvius, and which during the pioneering stage of Herculanean scholarship in the late XVIII and the early XIX centuries resulted in the partial loss of the two papyrus rolls on which *De Pietate* was written. Still extant are some three dozen scraps of papyrus, each different in size and state of preservation, which are kept in the *Biblioteca Nazionale* in Naples. These fragments constitute less than one tenth of the known text of *De Pietate*; for the greater part of the total of *ca.* 4000 lines of papyrus, however, our only source of information are the copies (*disegni*) which were made by the *disegnatori* of the Naples Academy early in the XIX century and later engraved in copper. For *ca.* 800 lines of papyrus, *i.e.* for approximately the fifth part of the known text, we have, in addition to the Neapolitan copies, the so-called Oxford copies which were made by John Hayter and are now in the Bodleian Library.¹⁰ The text of these 800 lines, therefore, can be established from two independent and almost contemporary copies of the lost papyrus. The complete set of the Neapolitan copper plates for *De Pietate* was published in 1863 in the second volume of *Voluminum Herculanensium Collectio Altera* and, supplemented by the Oxford copies, formed the basis of all subsequent editions of and quotations from this text. But since the copper-plate engravers, in copying the original hand-drawn *disegni*, introduced errors of their own (often, but not always, of minor significance), as a matter of principle the *Collectio Altera* must be rejected by the modern critic as the basis of his edition if, as in the case of *De Pietate*, the original *disegni* are still extant.¹¹

¹⁰ Instead of using the derivative copies ("mit grösster Treue und Sorgfalt auf durchscheinendem Papier nachgezeichnet," Gomperz, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.5] p.ix) of the Oxford facsimiles in Gomperz' edition, I worked from xerox copies of the originals with which I was provided by S. West.

¹¹ There is a clear instance of such an engraver's error (although one that lent itself easily to emendation) in TEXT I line 961 as printed below, where the *Collectio Altera* misread the correct *καθεν-* of the original *disegni* and printed *καθεν-*.

All previous editors of *De Pietate* had to rely solely on the *Collectio Altera* for the purpose of establishing their text, thus reproducing the images of images. In order to form a clear idea of the true tradition one has to make use of the papyrus or, *faute de mieux*, of the *original disegni*, whether Neapolitan, Oxonian, or both. Wilhelm Crönert and Reinhold Merkelbach were, to the best of my knowledge, the only scholars who collated the text of individual fragments with the extant papyrus in the Officina dei Papiri in Naples.¹² One reason why an overall collation of all the papyrus fragments of *De Pietate* was never undertaken is that the Herculanean papyri have been virtually inaccessible during the past decades. Thanks to the initiative of the Centro Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Ercolanesi (CISPE), now in its fourth year, and thanks to the miraculous efficiency of its secretary, Marcello Gigante, the Officina dei Papiri was finally roused from the deep *Dornröschenschlaf* that had kept it dormant for such a long time.¹³ The palaeographer's difficult task is made easier by the use of modern technical equipment now available in the Officina, including binocular microscopes, which under strong magnification of the carbonized material yield results that were beyond the reach of conventional reading aids.

Bruno Snell very generously made it possible for me to participate directly in this renaissance of Herculanean studies and to collate the existing papyrus fragments of *De Pietate* as well as the original *disegni* in the Naples collection. Some of the results of Schober's important preparatory work and of my own research will emerge from the seven examples that follow, which as a whole have been selected to show an edition *in statu nascendi* and to demonstrate the multiple editorial techniques involved and the various problems connected with them.¹⁴

¹² W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Philosophen- und Literaturgeschichte* (C. Wessely ed., *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde* VI, Leipzig 1906; repr. Amsterdam 1965) 130 n.542, where he gives a new and correct text of the extant *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.16 (p.69 Gomperz); R. Merkelbach, *ArchPap* 16 (1956) 60 n.1.

¹³ See Gigante's "Premessa" in the opening volume of the new bulletin of the CISPE: *Cronache Ercolanesi* 1 (1971) 5f.

¹⁴ I am grateful to Dott. Massimo Fittipaldi, then director of the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples, for his official permission to work on the papyri and to use the facilities of this institution, and to Francesco Sbordone for several useful discussions. It would be difficult for me to give adequate expression to the gratitude I owe to Marcello Gigante; without his unflagging helpfulness my sojourn in Naples would hardly have been as successful and enjoyable as it was.

Two New Combinations

TEXT I¹⁵

XLVI A	[... καὶ τὸν		N 1088 II right (HV ² II 87 ^b)
948	*Ηλιον [καὶ ἄλλους	(4)	
	τινὰς [θεοὺς πολυ-		
	μόχθο[υς πεποιή-		
951	κασι, ὠ[ς		
	ἄλλης [δαι-	(8)	
	μόνω[ν		
954	ο[.]υπ[
+ XLVI B	ετε[.]τ[.....]παδε		+ N 433 II left (HV ² II 57 ^a)
	μνο[.]ι[.....]ξξεων	(12/2)	
957	τι[.....]ησιμηρ[.		
	τασατ[. Μι]μνερ[μος		Mimnermus fr.10,5ff. D. (cf.
	μ[ἐν οὐ δι]αφωνεῖν		fr.23 West)
960	δ[οκ]εῖ [κα]θ' ἐ{ς}κάς-	(16/6)	
	τ[η]ν [νύκ]τα καθεύ-		
	[δειν αὐ]τὸν λέγων.		
963	Μου[καῖος] δὲ πρὶν		Musaeus
	τὸν *Η[λιο]ν ταῦτό	(20/10)	
	ποιεῖν [τ]ὸν *Υπε[ρί]-		
966	ου[ά φ]η[σι]ν. ἐν δὲ τοῖς		
	ὑμ[ν]ρ[ε] [Ο]μηρος [ῆ]-		Hymn.Hom.Ap. 91
	μέ[ρας ἀλγ]ῆσαι κ[αὶ	(24/14)	

¹⁵ The presentation of TEXTS I and II is modeled upon the arrangement of text and apparatus in the future edition of *De Pietate*; the characteristic features of this layout are the following: (1) Continuous Roman numeration of the individual fragments. Portions of the same papyrus column which are separately transmitted in the *disegni* are counted as one fragment, but distinguished by the addition of capital letters. The manner of transmission (papyrus, Neapolitan *disegni*, Oxonian *disegni*, or combinations of these) is indicated for each fragment. (2) Continuous numeration of the lines in the papyrus; the line numbers within the column or the individual fragment are given in parentheses. This system should make quotation considerably easier in the future. It does not involve any serious disadvantages, because it is inconceivable that new fragments of *De Pietate* will turn up, and because any future need for a rearrangement of the fragments is unlikely (if only for the reason that the relative order of fragments within one thematic group is largely conjectural and therefore of no great consequence). (3) On the suggestion of R. Merkelbach a new critical sign, in the form of an asterisk underneath the letter, is introduced to mark those obvious cases of scribal error—peculiar to Herculanean papyrology—in which the modern copyist misread the letters in the papyrus. An asterisked letter in the text represents the corrected

- 969 *νύκ[τας ἐ]γνέα [τῆν
 Ἀη[τὼ πρὶν] τεκεῖν
 φη[σιν. K]αλλιμα-* Callim. *Del.* (= fr.783 Pf.)
- 972 *χο[ς δὲ τὰ] παρ' Ἀντι- (28/18) Antimachus
 μά[χῳι με]ταλαβῶν
 ἔγρ[αψε]ν [ὠ]ς οὐδὲ [τῆς
 975 Ἡρ[ακ] δ[ιέφυ]γε τὸ [μῖκος*

MARGIN

fr. XLVI A + B (p.38, p.29 Gomperz; + Schober, I. Boserup [see *ZPap Epigr* 8 (1971) 109ff]): Toils and troubles of the gods (Helios, Leto).

947–53 Gomperz. 956 *θεῶν* Gomperz. 957 *φ]ησὶν* Philippson. 958–59 Gomperz-Schober. 960–73 Schober. 961 *καθευ* N¹, Schober: *καθευ* N². 966–67 *ἐν δὲ τοῖς | [ῥ]μνοῖς Ὀ]μηρος* Gomperz. 966]π[N. 967]υ[N. 968]νθαυ[N. 970–71 *τεκεῖν | [φησιν]* Philippson. 971 *K]αλλιμα|[χ-* Gomperz:]γ- N. 974 Gomperz-Henrichs. 975 Henrichs e.g.: *πρ[* N.

The most ingenious and, since it does not require any material effort, the most economical way of improving the standard text of *De Pietate* is to combine fragments which obviously belong together but are transmitted separately. Schober discovered several such combinations. The one with the most far-reaching implications for the text of Philodemus and of three writers more widely read in antiquity was independently found by Ivan Boserup, Librarian at the Royal Library in Copenhagen.¹⁶ It is this combination which is under discussion here.

Their discovery consists in having put together the right-hand and left-hand half of the same column of writing. As an immediate result of this, all previous restorations of the fragments when they were still separated become invalidated,¹⁷ including (as Boserup has shown), one of Philippson's infelicitous manipulations with the *disegni* which

letter as it must have stood in the papyrus, whereas the erroneous reading of the copyist is given in the apparatus.

¹⁶ I. Boserup, "Mod en ny rekonstruktion af Filodems skrift *Om fromheden*," *Museum Tusulanum* 17 (1971) 26–39, esp. 35ff; this article, written in Danish, was brought to my attention by the author, who, during a recent conversation, summarized its content for me. Boserup has published his conclusions in more accessible form in *ZPapEpigr* 8 (1971) 109ff.

¹⁷ It is sufficient to quote R. Pfeiffer (on Callim. fr.783), whose suspicions about Philippson's supplements were fully justified: "omnino incerta suppl. et coniectura. Allen-Sikes, *Homeric Hymns*, p.lxvii (= p.lxix²) et Philippson, *Hermes* 55, 1920, 254." Pfeiffer adds, however, referring to line 971f: "post Homerum saepe Callimachus laudatur."

was meant to support the widely accepted conjecture of Diels in Heraclitus fr.80.¹⁸ In terms of gain, the combined text, within twenty lines of papyrus, does not only provide a new fragment—unfortunately, as is the rule in Philodemus, without direct quotation—of Musaeus and Antimachus respectively, but also confirms Gomperz' suggestion that Philodemus might be referring to a well-known passage in Mimnermus.¹⁹ In terms of loss, however, we have to give up what formerly passed as an independent fragment of Callimachus and now turns out to be but a very general reference to Callimachus' *Delian Hymn*.²⁰

In the present passage, Philodemus (or his source) has collected mythological evidence for the various hardships which, in the accounts of ancient poets, the gods were made to suffer (cf. line 949f [πολυ]μόχθο[υς], which I consider a very likely restoration). Thus Mimnermus and Musaeus are quoted as proof for the fact that Helios and Hyperion, after each day's hard work, take a full night's rest (lines 958ff). Furthermore, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is adduced to exemplify the travail of Leto—then pregnant with divine offspring—which lasted for nine days and nine nights (966–71). In the following sentence (971ff), likewise on the suffering of Leto, references to Callimachus and Antimachus are intentionally linked by Philodemus in order to prove that, worst of all, Leto was unable to evade the wrath of Hera. It is here that the context breaks off. One would imagine that the continuation took the form of a temporal clause: "Leto was unable to evade the wrath of Hera [before she reached the island of Delos]." Such, at least, is the main line of argument that can confidently be reconstructed from what little remains of the fragmentary last line in this column, if one admits the possibility of a copyist's error of a very common type and makes the first letter in the line read *H* instead of the *Π* offered by the *disegni*.

The sequence Homeric Hymn–Antimachus–Callimachus instantly

¹⁸ Vorsokr. 22 B 80 (Heraclitus fr.214 Kirk–Raven) εἰδέναι δὲ χρῆ τὸν πόλεμον ἔοντα ξυνόν, καὶ δίκην ἔριν, καὶ γινόμενα πάντα κατ' ἔριν καὶ χρεῶν (χρεῶν Diels: χρεώμενα Origen, *C.Cels*, 6.42); see Boserup, *Museum Tusulanum* 17 (1971) 38 n.2 and *ZPapEprigr* 8 (1971) 111ff, who, in the latter publication, offers a convincing interpretation of the transmitted χρεώμενα. R. Philippson's forced attempt, in *Hermes* 55 (1920) 254, to read κατ' ἔ[[ριν καὶ κατὰ] χρεῶν | [πάντα φ]ησὶν 'Ηρ[ά]κλειτος] into the ends of lines 955–57 was mistaken, as is proved by the other half of the column.

¹⁹ Mimnermus fr.10,1f D. 'Ἡέλιος μὲν γὰρ πόνον ἔλλαχεν ἡματα πάντα, οὐ δὲ κοτ' ἄμπαυσις γίγνεται οὐδεμία.

²⁰ See n.17 above, and Callim. *Del.* 55ff.

startles the historian of Greek literature, because each of these names represents a conspicuous landmark in the evolution of the epic language and in the structural development of Greek elegy. Philodemus' indication that Callimachus in his *Delian Hymn* imitated Antimachus—for it is precisely an *imitatio* on Callimachus' part that is implied by the participle [με]ταλαβών as restored by Schober, a restoration for which there is no reasonable alternative²¹—is of great interest and deserves closer consideration. We do not know for certain where and how Antimachus narrated the story about the wanderings of Leto. Most likely he did so in his *Lyde*, in which he had also treated of Demeter's search for her abducted daughter.²² Both subjects could easily be regarded as *exempla* of the sorrowful fate of divine or heroic women—ps.-Plutarch uses the phrase ἡρωϊκὰ καὶ κυμφοραὶ when speaking of Antimachus' poem²³—which would sufficiently account for their being exploited by a man as much in need of consolation as Antimachus.

Whatever Callimachus, according to Philodemus, has borrowed from Antimachus, logically there cannot have been any close parallel for it in the Homeric Hymn. Consequently a brief comparison between Callimachus and his Homeric model may help to narrow down

²¹ The restoration [K]αλλίμαχο[ς ...] παρ' Ἀντιμά[χου με]ταλαβών κτλ., although linguistically possible, would lead to serious difficulties, because it is obviously impossible to squeeze a suitable object and, preferably, also a connecting particle into the short lacuna of line 972, unless one is willing to accept something as trivial as [, δέ τι] παρ' Ἀντιμά[χου με]ταλαβών. Elsewhere in Philodemus, παραλαμβάνειν is used in the similar sense of adapting current notions or arguments to one's own purposes, as an orator does in a speech (*Rhetorica* vol.I p.208,5f and 218,22ff Sudhaus).

²² Antimachus fr.67 Wyss, on which see D. Del Corno, "Ricerche intorno alla Lyde di Antimaco," *Acme* 15 (1962) 57–95, esp. 85f. It is more than unlikely that Antimachus fr.182 Wyss (= *P.Mil.Vogl.* 17 col.ii 33f [Pack² 89]) ὄφρ' ὑπὸ μ[ὲν] Λαθρία θύσῃ λόχια τριθάλεια, possibly from his *Artemis*, refers to Leto's accouchement (cf. I. Cazzaniga, *PP* 112 [1967] 16ff esp.25). Although it is conceivable that Antimachus, *poeta doctus* that he was, substituted the rare Λαθρία (elsewhere attested only in *Anth.Pal.* 6.300= Leonidas of Tarentum xxxvi Gow–Page, undoubtedly as an epithet of Artemis) for the Homeric *Εἰλείθια* (*Hymn.Hom. Ap.* 97ff; cf. *P.Mil.Vogl.* 17 col.ii 2f), thus in a way creating "un' Artemis pre-Artemis" (Cazzaniga), or that he was acquainted with the tradition according to which Artemis was born first (cf. *Hymn.Hom.Ap.* 15f) and assisted Leto in the delivery of Apollo (Callim. fr.79 Pf., and the testimonia *ad loc.*), it would be impossible to think of Leto as offering a sacrifice to her daughter or, for that matter, to any other goddess of birth.

²³ [Plut.], *Cons. ad Apoll.* 9 p.106 b= Antimachus testim.7 Wyss. The extant fragments indicate that the *Lyde* was characterized by "un' assoluta predominanza dell'argomento mitologico" (Del Corno, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.22] 81). On the assumption that the reference in *De Pietate* is taken from the *Lyde*, one can assert with confidence that Antimachus' mythological collection of ἡρωϊκὰ καὶ κυμφοραὶ was by no means limited to ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα, as some modern critics would have us believe.

our possible choice for Callimachus' borrowings from Antimachus. Disregarding for that purpose the unmistakable differences in language and style and concentrating on details of content, one can argue that what constitutes the main divergence from the Homeric plot is the fact that in Callimachus the motive of the envy of Hera is introduced at a much earlier stage to explain the involuntary wanderings of Leto and the refusal of many places to give shelter to her, whereas in the Homeric Hymn it comes in only at a later point to account for the unnaturally protracted period of Leto's labor.²⁴ The words of Philodemus suggest that this motivation did not originate with Callimachus but goes back as far as Antimachus. We may conclude that what was borrowed by Callimachus from his predecessor was a minor mythological detail, around which, in making it more explicit, Callimachus structured the better part of his composition.

The notorious verdict concerning the *παχὴ γράμματα* (fr.398 Pf.) is aimed at the ponderous form of the *Lyde* as a whole and does not necessarily exclude the possibility that Callimachus decided to imitate the Colophonian in peculiarities of language, meter and subject-matter; in fact, several obvious instances of such an imitation can be collected from the extant fragments.²⁵ Likewise, there can be little doubt that the acute observation on the relationship of the two poets as reported by Philodemus is basically correct, whether it was taken from an earlier source or, less likely, is to be credited to Philodemus himself, who refers to Antimachus three times in Book 5 of *Περὶ*

²⁴ *Hymn.Hom.Ap.* 95ff vs. *Callim. Del.* 55ff. Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hel-lenistische Dichtung* II (Berlin 1924) 66: "Nichts war ihm (*sc.* Kallimachos) überliefert, als dass Leto nirgends niederkommen konnte, weil Hera es verboten hatte" (italics mine). This statement is incorrect, if Wilamowitz had the Homeric Hymn in mind (as he must have; see *op. cit.* 63), where the fear of Apollo's future power and recklessness is the only reason given for Delos' initial hesitation and, by implication (*cf.* *Hymn.Hom.Ap.* 47 vs. 66ff), for the outright refusal of the other places to be the birthplace of Apollo. *Ov. Met.* 6.332-36 naturally follows the Callimachean version.

²⁵ *Antimachi Colophonii reliquiae collegit disposuit explicavit* Bernh. Wyss (Berlin 1936) xlvii; Del Corno, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 85 n.89. As for Callimachus' dependence on Antimachus, I fully agree with M. Gigante, *RivFC* 82 (1954) 72. It has been suggested, for good reason, that Callimachus' criticism of Antimachus was directed against the epic *Thebais* rather than the elegiac *Lyde*, although there remains the undisputably negative judgement in fr.398 Pf. (on which Del Corno, *op.cit.* 59ff). If so, Callimachus is more likely to have imitated the *Lyde*, if only to outdo Antimachus. At a stage in contemporary scholarship where the literary technique of *arte allusiva* in Alexandrian epic poetry is being investigated in all its varieties (*cf.* G. Giangrande, *CQ* 17 [1967] 85ff and 21 [1971] 146ff; *AntCl* 39 [1970] 46ff), one is prepared to appreciate each additional piece of evidence which refers in unambiguous terms to obvious instances of such imitation or variation.

ποιημάτων.²⁶ Although copies of Antimachus' epic poetry must have been available to the Roman reading public until well after the middle of the first century B.C., there is no evidence of the survival of the *Lyde* into late Republican times.²⁷

TEXT II

XII	192	ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀνα]φερομένοις εἰς (16) Μο]υσαῖον γέγραπται	N 1610 III (HV ² II 137) Musaeus 2 B 14
	195	Τάρ]ταρον πρῶτον καὶ Νύκτα καὶ (19)	
XIII		τρίτον] Ἄερα γεγο- (1)	N 247 VI left (HV ² II 47)
	198	νέναι], ἐν δὲ τοῖς εἰς Ἐπι]μενίδην ἐξ Ἄερος] καὶ Νυκτὸς (4)	Epimenides 3 B 5
	201	τὰ πάντα ε]υετῆναι λέγεται].	

fr. XII+ XIII (p.61, p.19 G.; + Schober): Pre-philosophical cosmogonies and theogonies.

193–95 Nauck (*Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg* VII [1864] 219f = *Mélanges Gréco-Romains* II [St.-Petersbourg 1866] 625). 193 -μενωc N. 194]καιοv N. 196 Gomperz (*in app.*). 196–97 Transition from one column to the next. 197 Schober:]δερα N. 198–200 Bücheler (see *infra* n.29) coll. Damascius *Pr.*124 = *Vorsokr.* 3 B 5 = fr.40 Kirk-Raven (see *infra* n.33). 201 Gomperz. 202 Schober.

Our second example is a detached section from a wider context on

²⁶ Col. xiv 29ff p.35, xv 29ff p.37, and xvii 10ff p.41 Jensen (= Antimachus testim.16–18 Wyss); cf. C. Garaffoni, *Vichiana* 3 (Naples 1966) 339–59. These references are no evidence of a first-hand acquaintance with Antimachus' poetry, because all of them are quotations from Ariston of Chios and some other Stoic source. The fact that there is no *verbatim* quotation from Antimachus in *De Pietate* could well suggest that the passage is ultimately derived from the mythologically oriented prose summary of the *Lyde* which Agatharchides of Cnidos compiled towards the end of the second century B.C. (*FGrHist* 86 τ 2 = Antimachus testim.21 Wyss). Such an epitome would have appealed to an Epicurean critic of the traditional Greek pantheon as a handy source book of mythology.

²⁷ Del Corno, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 62f and 73ff, has shown convincingly that where Catullus, Cicero and Propertius mention Antimachus they refer to the *Thebais* and to nothing else. Such a conclusion is supported by the fragments of Antimachus on papyri of the II and III centuries (*P.Mil.Vogl.* 17 [Pack² 89]; *P.Oxy.* 2518–19), all of which are hexametrical.

early mythological beliefs concerning the formation of the universe out of primal entities of divine nature.²⁸

In the passage quoted above, the transition from line 196 to 197 marks the joint where two separate columns of writing have been connected by Schober.²⁹ By thus restoring the original order of these consecutive columns, he recovered a coherent doxographical catalogue which extends over 41 lines of papyrus and comprises the following series of names of poets, apparently in no systematic order:³⁰ *Anonymi* (τινές), author of the *Titanomachy* (fr.1 Kinkel, cf. his addenda p.312; fr.I Allen), Acusilaus (Diels/Kranz, *Vorsokr.* 9 B 1= *FGrHist* 2 F 5), Musaeus (*Vorsokr.* 2 B 14), Epimenides (*Vorsokr.* 3 B 5), Homer (*Il.* 14.201), Abaris (*FGrHist* 34 F 1),³¹ *Anonymi* (οἱ δέ), Pindar (fr.80 Snell; cf. *infra* TEXT IV) and Pherecydes of Syros (*Vorsokr.* 7 B 13).³²

²⁸ See M. L. West ed., *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 12ff; Kirk in G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge 1957) pp.17, 23 n.2 and 40, who takes it for granted (rightly, I think) that the summary of theogonic accounts in Philodemus is ultimately derived from Eudemus' synopsis of early theogonies and cosmogonies. (Cf. F. Wehrli on Eudem. fr.150. One should refrain from calling Eudemus' rather obscure work a 'history of theology'; see O. Gigon in *La notion du divin depuis Homère jusqu'à Platon: Entretiens Hardt I* [Vandœuvres-Genève 1954] 131). In Philodemus the cosmogonies of the Presocratics are treated separately from those of the early poets (see pp. 80f below); it took a modern mind to realize the continuity (see H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* [Berkeley-Los Angeles 1971] 79, and the bibliography quoted on p.184 nn.1-2).

²⁹ There was no explicit scholarly opinion on the relation of the two fragments before their connection was fully recognized by Schober. R. Philippson (*Hermes* 55 [1920] 271) and Kirk-Raven (*Presocratic Philosophers* fr.20-21) were content to print them as two separate but consecutive fragments. F. Bücheler was very close to the right solution when he wrote (*Jahrbuch für Philologie* 91 [1865] 517= *Kleine Schriften I* [Leipzig-Berlin 1915] 585): "ἐν δὲ τοῖς [εἰς Ἐπι]μενίδην [ἐξ ἄερος] καὶ νυκτὸς [τὰ πάντα ε]υστήναι, wo vorher ἐν τοῖς εἰς Ὀρφέα ἀναφερομένοις oder ähnliches gestanden haben wird." (Cf. *P.Herc.* 1428 col.VI N= III O [p.80 Gomperz], 17ff τὰ τε εἰς Ὀρφέα [καὶ] Μουσαίων ἀναφερ[όμενα].)

³⁰ The order in which the poetical works are quoted in Philodemus is consistent with the ancient chronological canon of the earliest Greek poets only in that Musaeus is placed before Homer; see West, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.28) 40 and 47.

³¹ See Jacoby's addenda in *FGrHist* Pt. II B p.1231, or Pt. I A p.+13 of the *Neudruck*. Jacoby did not mention that Jensen's [*Αβα]ρις is against the *disegni*, which read]ρις; but it would be very difficult to think of any other supplement; there is no room for Diels' [ἕτερός] τις. *Suda* α 18 ascribes a *Theogony* to Abaris (*FGrHist* 34 T 1).

³² The whole passage runs: . . . τινές δὲ τούτ[ους | τὰ] ζύμπαντά [φα]σι τ]ξεῖν. ἐμ μὲν | [τις]ιν ἐκ Νυκτὸς καὶ | [Ταρ]τάρου λέγεται | [τὰ π]άντα, ἐν δὲ τι[[ειν ἐ]κ *Αἰδου καὶ Αἰ[[θέρ]ου· ὁ δὲ τὴν Τι[[τανο]μαχίαν γρά[ψας ἐξ] Αἰθέρος φη[[σὶν], *Ακουσί[λ]αος | [δ' ἐκ] Χάους πρώτου | [τᾶ]λλα· ἐν δὲ τοῖς | [ἀνα]φερομένοις εἰς | [Μο]υσαίων γέγραπται | [Τάρ]ταρον πρώτον | [καὶ Ν]ύκτα καὶ | [τρίτον] *Ἄερα γεγο[[νέναι]. ἐν δὲ τοῖς | [εἰς Ἐπι]μενίδην | [ἐξ Ἄερος] καὶ Νυκτὸς | [τὰ πάντα ε]υστήναι | [λέγεται]· *Ὀμηρος | [δ' ἀποφαί]νεται *Ὠκεα[[νὸν ἐκ] Τηθύος | [τοὺς ἄλλ]οις γενῶν | [θεοὺς "Ὠ]κεανὸν τε | [θεῶν γέ]νεσιν καὶ | [μητέρα] Τ[ηθύ]ν" (*Il.* 14.201) εἰ[[πών·

The only change that results from this combination affects the fragment of Musaeus: in the new text *Aer* figures besides Tartaros and *Nyx* as *πρῶται ἀρχαί*. Insignificant as it might at first appear, this piece of new information nevertheless gains considerably in importance if seen against the background of the cosmogony ascribed to Epimenides (*Vorsokr.* 3 B 5) in both Philodemus and Damascius, where the same three cosmogonical principles occur, with one slight modification, however: in Epimenides' account Tartaros is the product of *Aer* and *Nyx*.³³ Although the exact genealogical relation of Musaeus' first principles to one another remains uncertain, the addition of *πρῶτον* and, presumably, [*τρίτον*]³⁴ in Philodemus *could* imply that in Musaeus *Aer* was produced by the pair Tartaros and *Nyx*.³⁵ If this inference is correct, the relation of Tartaros and *Aer*, as posited in Epimenides, is reversed in Musaeus. Interestingly enough, the one figure in the primordial pair that is the same in both accounts is *Nyx*, who was accorded absolute priority in the *Theology* assigned to Orpheus.³⁶ This affinity between various cosmogonical accounts of comparatively early (though most probably post-Hesiodic) date suggests that many of the anonymous hexametrical poems on theogony and cosmogony which later tradition ascribed to semi-historical figures like Orpheus, Musaeus and Epimenides were hardly more than closely related variations of the same theme.

*Αβ[α]ρις δὲ Κρό[υ]νον τε καὶ [᾿Ρ]έαν, οἱ δὲ | [Δία καὶ] Ἡραν πατέ[ρ]α καὶ μητέρα θε[ῶ]ν νομίζουσι, Πίν[δαρος] δ' [ἔκ] Κυβέ[λλης μ]ητρὸς ἐν τῶι | "[δέσπ]οι[αν] Κυβέ[λλαν] ματ[έρα]" (fr.80 Snell), Φερε[κῦδ]ης δ' ὁ [Σύ]ριος . . .

³³ Damascius, *Princ.* 124 (I 320,17ff Ruelle)= *Vorsokr.* 3 B 5=Kirk-Raven, *Presocratic Philosophers* fr.40 τὸν δὲ Ἐπιμενίδην δύο πρῶτας ἀρχὰς ὑποθέσθαι Ἀέρα καὶ Νύκτα . . . ἐξ ὧν γεννηθῆναι Τάρταρον οἶμαι τὴν τρίτην ἀρχήν. The corresponding reference to Epimenides in *De Pietate* (*supra* n.32) shows clearly that Damascius has written out Eudemus (*cf. supra* n.28) more fully than Philodemus or his source.

³⁴ *Cf.* the antithesis δύο πρῶτας ἀρχὰς . . . τὴν τρίτην ἀρχήν in Damascius (*supra* n.33).

³⁵ The alternative is that in Musaeus, Tartaros, *Nyx* and *Aer* were introduced as monistic and genealogically equivalent world-constituents in the Hesiodic fashion (*cf. Theog.* 116–20). Such an interpretation could claim support from one of the preceding sentences in Philodemus in which *Anonymi* are quoted for the opinion that everything came into being from the pair *Nyx* and Tartaros (see *supra* n.32); Musaeus' theogony as reconstructed above would evidently fall into that category, and to have an additional reference to him might therefore seem unnecessary. But a certain amount of repetition is in keeping with the catalogue-like character of the passage under discussion.

³⁶ *Vorsokr.* 1 B 12 (Damascius, *Princ.* 124=Eudem. fr.150 Wehrli)=Kern, *Orph.* fr.28. *Cf.* *Phld. Piet.* p.81, 18ff Gomperz (*P.Herc.* 1428 col. VII N=Col. IV O)=*Dox.Graec.* 548,18=

An Additional Fragment

TEXT III

P.Herc. 1428 fr.23a upper
half (*deest* in Gomperz
and Schober)

For comparison: *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.11
= N 1428 fr.11 (HV² II 4)= O 1428
A 23 (p.67 Gomperz)

MARGIN

	[3-5 τ]ὸν οὐρανό[ν τε]	-----
2	[καὶ τὴν γ]ῆν οὐ μόν[ον]	
	[.....]ισο[.]ωνα[1-3]], αρου[
4	[...] θεοὺς ὑπάρ[χειν]	2], οὐδὲ ε[
	καὶ τὸ μήτ[ε 2-4]	[3-4]νεῖν οὐδ[
6	μήτε αἰσθη[ε ἔ-]	4 [2-3]ιν οὐδὲ μέγ[εθος]
	χε[ι]ν τοὺς θε[οὺς μή-]	[οὐ]δὲ κάλλος οὐδ[3-4]
8	τε μορφὴν [4-6]	6 [.]ν ἔχειν οὐδὲ σύν-
	αυ ἀλλ' ε[[ε]ιν οὐδὲ φίλον οὐ-
10	βουλων[
	[.]α[.]λε[MARGIN

8 e.g. [μηδεμί-] or [ἀνθρωπεί-].

Modest gains which add to the number of known fragments have been made possible by means of the binocular microscope. Sometimes this technical device enables us to read passages which, owing to their deplorable condition, had been given up for lost by the *disegnatori* of the past century and are therefore lacking in the *disegni*.

The above text (fr.23a), which is the most substantial instance of this kind of progress, forms part of the longest and most famous series of fragments in *De Pietate*. These fragments, known as *P.Herc.* 1428 and extracted from the innermost layers (*midollo*) of the first of the two papyrus rolls on which the text of *De Pietate* was written, constitute the very end of the first (*i.e.* the critical) part of that treatise and contain a detailed catalogue of philosophers from Thales down to Cleanthes in chronological order. This doxography has a very close

SVF II 636=*Orph.* fr.28a. The following text is based on the *disegni* and on my collation of the extant papyrus: καὶ δ]ὴ κἀν τῶι πρώτ[ι]ωι (sc. Περὶ φύσεως) τὴν Νύκτα | θεάν φησιν (sc. ὁ Χρύσιππος) [ε]ργα[ι] | πρωτίστην.

parallel in the first book of Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*, whose version provides important criteria for the reconstruction of the content and especially the sequence of the corresponding fragments in Philodemus.³⁷

The newly discovered fr.23a is preceded by fr.23 of the *Collectio Altera* (HV² II 7^o= p.73 Gomperz) in which Theophrastus is treated (cf. *infra* TEXT VII); the two fragments are linked by a blank strip of papyrus, doubtless the margin between two consecutive columns of writing.³⁸

In Cicero's catalogue Theophrastus is followed by his disciple Strato of Lampsacus, who concludes the list of Peripatetic philosophers. According to Cicero, Strato regarded Nature as the seat of divine power (*vis divina*) and as the cause of everything that comes into being and passes away; but in Strato's definition, Nature is devoid of either

³⁷ For a general discussion of the relation of the *Philosophenkritik* in Cicero and in Philodemus see M. Tulli Ciceronis *De Natura Deorum Liber Primus*, ed. A. S. Pease (Cambridge [Mass.] 1955) 39–42; R. Philippson, *Hermes* 55 (1920) 364–66. On the basis of the available evidence, a very plausible theory is still that of H. Diels (*Dox.Graec.* 126–27; for an opposing view see R. Philippson, *SymbOslo* 19 [1939] 27–31), according to which both Philodemus and Cicero copied from Phaedrus' *Περὶ θεῶν*. I am well aware, however, that the ascription of *De Pietate* to Philodemus is hardly more than a time-honored convention, as there is no absolute proof of his authorship; palaeographically there remains the possibility of Phaedrus' being the author, on which see A. Nauck, *op.cit.* (*supra* p.77) 191ff=II 585ff. The argument that the style as well as the content of *De Pietate* are in keeping with Philodemus' other treatises could well be fallacious as long as we have no examples of the productions of either Zeno of Sidon or Phaedrus (Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.33.93 portrays Phaedrus as a model of Attic *elegantia*, Zeno as a malicious mocker).

The inspection of the extant fragments of *P.Herc.* 1428 has not only produced additional portions of text which are not in the *disegni* (cf. Dom. Bassi, *RivFC* 37 [1909] 508) and which are consequently lacking in the editions of Gomperz and Schober, but has also yielded more accurate information concerning the content and the order of these fragments. We now have, *inter alia*, an explicit mention of Cleanthes in *P.Herc.* 1428 col.ii line 8f (not in N 1428 col.ii [HV² II 9]=O 1428 fr.2). These new findings call for a revision of the traditional arrangement and attribution of some of the fragments by Gomperz, Philippson and Schober, which I am prepared to undertake elsewhere.

³⁸ The fact that the ends of lines 3–5 of *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.23 (=N 1428 fr.23: *deest* in O; cf. *infra* TEXT VII), which come from the bottom of the fragment, clearly protrude into the margin of the following fr.23a proves that the *lower* halves of these two fragments constitute the remains of two consecutive columns in the papyrus. However the alignment of lines in the *upper* half of fr.23a (*i.e.* the part of the fragment with which we are here concerned and which is not linked to fr.23 by a joint margin) differs considerably from that of the preceding and following fragments (fr.23 and fr.24 respectively). This observation and, in addition, a close examination of the surface structure of the upper half of fr.23a have led me to the conclusion that the first 11 lines of fr.23a (*i.e.* TEXT III above) cannot belong to the same layer of writing as the text of fr.23, fr.23a (lower half) and fr.24.

sensation or form (*sed careat omni et sensu et figura*).³⁹ Any Epicurean interpreter of Strato, accustomed as he must have been to an extremely anthropomorphic concept of divinity, was bound to misunderstand this, as if Strato had declared Earth and Sky to be gods—an interpretation expressly stated by Tertullian⁴⁰—and had denied his gods, in Epicurean terminology, *αἰσθησις* as well as *μορφή*. Such an Epicurean interpretation of Strato would correspond exactly to the Epicurean criticism which we read in lines 1ff of fr.23a, all the more so if [γ]ῆν is supplied in line 2. As for the continuation in lines 9ff, one would expect a reference to Strato's well-attested doctrine that the origin of the world was not due to some deliberate act of divine planning (*cf.* [συ]-*βουλαί* in the present passage from Philodemus, *consilium et ratio* in Lactantius⁴¹), but was accomplished spontaneously (*αὐτομάτως, sua sponte*⁴²).

If we consider the mere content of fr.23a, a strong case can surely be made for attributing it to Strato; from a palaeographical or—if we were not dealing with a papyrus roll one might say—codicological point of view, however, this attribution presents insurmountable difficulties in that the new fragment turned out under strong magnification not to belong to the same layer of writing as the preceding fragment of Theophrastus but gave the impression of being rather a *sottoposto*.⁴³ If this observation is correct, the fragment has to be placed somewhere *before* the fragment of Theophrastus and can no longer be ascribed to Strato. In fact the doxographical catalogues in Cicero and Philodemus respectively record for several of the Presocratic philosophers the belief in a divine principle without *sensus* and *forma* or

³⁹ Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.13.35 (=Strato fr.33 Wehrli [*Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Heft V, von F. Wehrli, Basel 1950]).

⁴⁰ Tert. *Adv.Marc.* 1.13 (=Strato fr.39 Wehrli) *ut Strato caelum et terram (sc. deos pronuntiauit)*; *cf.* Strato fr.37 Wehrli.

⁴¹ As a tentative restoration for lines 9–11, a text like ἀλλ' εἰ[κτός (or εἰ[ρήμους) συμ]]βουλῶν [αὐτοὺς εἰ]ν[α] λ[ε]γ[ει]] would probably be acceptable. *Cf.* Lactant. *De Ira* 10.34 *at enim, sicut alii dicunt, natura mundus effectus est, quae sensu et figura caret. hoc vero multo est absurdius. si natura mundum fecit, consilio et ratione fecerit necesse est; is enim facit aliquid qui aut voluntatem faciendi habet aut scientiam. si caret sensu ac figura, quomodo potest ab ea fieri quod et sensum habet et figuram?* In *De Ira* 10.1 = Strato fr.34 Wehrli, Lactantius copies Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.13.35.

⁴² Strato fr.34–35 Wehrli; see Wehrli, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.39) p.52 *ad loc.*

⁴³ See n.38 above. Owing to the extreme thinness of the papyrus material on which *De Pietate* is written and to the damaging effects of carbonization, it is impossible for the naked eye to distinguish different layers of papyrus. This is the reason why previous editors of *De Pietate* were not aware of the existence of numerous *sottoposti* (in contrast to the *sovraposti*, which as a rule are much easier to recognize).

figura (as for Parmenides and Diogenes of Apollonia), or simply without *sensus* (as for Empedocles) or without *forma* (as for Anaximenes).⁴⁴ The only conclusion to be drawn from this striking over-simplification is that the common Epicurean source for the doxography in both Philodemus and Cicero looked at the monotheistic and rather sublime theology of the Presocratics through Epicurean spectacles and, in so doing, criticized the absence of certain divine attributes which were essential features of the Epicurean gods, namely *pulcherrima forma* and *actio atque agitatio mentis*,⁴⁵ the latter being based on sense perception.⁴⁶ This type of *interpretatio Epicurea*⁴⁷ emerges clearly from a comparison with fr.11 of *P.Herc.* 1428, which Philippson and Schober without compelling reason ascribed to Pythagoras.⁴⁸ The fragment gives, also in negative form, a list of the most characteristic attributes of Epicurean gods; the connection with fr.23a becomes all the more

⁴⁴ Parmenides: Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.11.28 (= *Vorsokr.* 28 A 37); Diogenes: *Nat.D.* 1.12.29 (= *Vorsokr.* 64 A 8); Empedocles: *Nat.D.* 1.12.29; Anaximenes: *Nat.D.* 1.10.26 (= *Vorsokr.* 13 A 10).

⁴⁵ Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.17.45 and 1.18.47.

⁴⁶ For the close interrelation in Epicurean theology of divine *sensus* and divine *prudentia* (*cónecis* in *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.11,6f) see Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.12.30 (against Plato) *quod vero sine corpore ullo deum vult esse . . . , id quale esse possit intellegi non potest; careat enim sensu necesse est, careat etiam prudentia, careat voluptate* (see *infra* n.49); *quae omnia una cum deorum notione comprehendimus*. By equipping their gods with sense perception, the Epicureans laid themselves open to harsh criticism; cf. Philodemus, *De Dis* III col.xiv 38ff *καὶ κοινῶς ἡμῶν ἐπιδειξάντων ὅτι καὶ τὰς ἐκ[με]μορφωμένας διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων καθόλ[ο]υ τέρψεις ἀπολαμβάνου[σ]ιν* (sc. the gods), [ἀ]παιτῶσι (sc. the opponents) *καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ μέρους, διὰ τί αἱ τέρψεις* (H. Diels, *AbhBerlin* 1916 Nr.4 pp.38f, Nr.6 pp.53ff; see also *De Dis* III fr.27, *ibid.* Nr.4 p.50).

⁴⁷ In evaluating Cicero's doxographical catalogue, a careful distinction must be drawn between the genuine Epicurean bias which he found in his source (*supra* n.37) and which can be paralleled from the corresponding passage in *De Pietate*, and the sporadic outburst into open invective, which he added on his own (Diels, *Dox.Graec.* 122–27, whose conclusions have to be slightly modified, however, in the light of *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.11 and fr.23a, both of which were, in their present form, unknown to Diels; cf. R. Philippson, *SymbOslo* 19 [1939] 30). Whatever the relation between Cicero and Philodemus, it should be obvious that any scholarly comment on Cicero's exposition of Presocratic theology is worthless if it fails to take into account Philodemus (a recent instance of such failure is O. Gigon, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.28]).

⁴⁸ R. Philippson, *Hermes* 55 (1920) 367, based his ascription on the observation that *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.11, both in the *disegni* and in the mounted papyrus, is preceded by a fragment on Pythagoras and followed by one on Xenophanes, two names which are consecutive in Cicero's catalogue. But we are not obliged to regard the traditional order of these fragments as binding: it can be proven, on the basis of fibre structure, that when the smaller fragments of *P.Herc.* 1428 were mounted many of them were artificially connected to one another at their lower margins to create the impression of a coherent roll of papyrus. Schober, adopting Philippson's restoration *οὐδὲ εἴνεεν ἢ | φρόν]ησιν* in line 2f of fr.11, considered this an explicit criticism of the Pythagorean *μονάε*=*νοῦς*, an interpretation which has to be discarded altogether.

obvious if we adopt [μορ|φή]ν as supplement in lines 5f.⁴⁹ Considerations like these should have been a warning to those scholars who believe that indisputable certainty can be obtained in ascribing fragments like fr.23a or fr.11 to one or another of the philosophers who are mentioned in the biased doxographical catalogue which is reproduced in Philodemus and Cicero.

New Readings

TEXT IV

N 247 VI left (HV² II 47^a), 17–21
(p.19 G.)

For comparison: Pindar fr.
80 Snell

Πίν-

Πίν-

214 δαρος] δ' [έκ] Κυβέ- (18)
λης μ]ητρὸς ἐν τῶι·

δαρος] δ' [έκ] Κυβέ-
λης μ]ητρὸς ἐν τῶι

216 'δέσπ]οιυ[αν] Κυβέ- (20)
λαν] ματ[έρα]·

ὑμνω]· 'θεῶ[ν] Κυβέ-
λαν] ματ[έρα]' (sc. τοὺς
θεοὺς εἶναί φησιν).

214–15 Bücheler (*Kl. Schriften* I 585).
216 Henrichs. 217 Snell.

We now come to examples illustrating new readings and similar gains. The fragment printed above is a section from the passage on cosmogony and theogony which we have discussed before (see *supra* TEXT II). The text is based on the Neapolitan copy only.

The innovation (which is not a new reading in the proper sense of that term) consists in granting recognition to the transmitted sequence of letters for line 216 as they stand in the *disegni*. Editors of

⁴⁹ On the basis of μορφήν in *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.23a and the repeated reference to *figura* and *forma* in Cicero's catalogue. R. Philippson, who might have had in mind Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.12.30 (*supra* n.46), preferred [ἡδο|νή]ν (*Hermes* 55 [1920] 367), a restoration which may still be the right one if the key words follow each other in the sequence: εἰῶμα (line 2; εῶμα would equal μορφή), [αἰε|θηε]ν (line 3–4, proposed by Philippson, *loc.cit.*), μέγεθος, κάλλος, [ἡδο|νή]ν (line 5f), σύνεσιν and φίλον. (The Epicureans believed in friendship among the gods; see Philodemus, *De Dis* III col.c fr.84,5f, in H. Diels, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.46] Nr.4 pp.15f, Nr.6 pp.6ff. The concept of divine φιλία is one of several corollaries that follow from the more comprehensive Epicurean doctrine of divine ἀρεταί; cf. W. Schmid, *RhM* 94 [1951] 109 and 140ff.) In any case this criticism in *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.11, which is so reminiscent of the attack against Plato's supposed ἀκόματος θεός in Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.12.30 (Cicero notoriously abbreviated his Epicurean source), is attributable to the section on Plato (most of which is lost) rather than to that on Pythagoras (see preceding note).

Pindar have obscured these letters by unjustified conjectures to such an extent that the actual tradition is almost forgotten. Theodor Bergk is ultimately to blame for this gradual distortion of the evidence, because he was the first to include this passage in his edition of Pindar, assuming that some noun had to be added to the phrase ἐν τῶι.⁵⁰ He supplied ἐν τῶι [προ]οιμ[ίωι] and was wrong in identifying this putative ‘Proem’ with a dithyramb on Dionysos and Cybele which is attested in Strabo; in the meantime a large portion of this dithyramb has come to light on papyrus.⁵¹

The actual words of Pindar were given by Bergk in the form Κυβέλα μᾶτερ θεῶν,⁵² which used to be accepted as canonical until recently, when Bruno Snell in his version of the same fragment—in fact his is the only attempt to advance beyond Bergk—substituted the no less conjectural [ῥῳμῶ] of H. Diels for Bergk’s [προ]οιμ[ίωι] and changed the transmitted letters to θεῶ[ν].⁵³ The truth is that any alteration of the *disegni* is unnecessary if one makes the quotation from Pindar start with the first letter in line 216 and reads [δέσπ]οιν[αν] Κυβέ[λαν] ματ[έρα].

Metrical analysis seems to reveal a Glyconic or Pherecratean expanded by a choriambus; consequently Pindar’s composition would have been in Aeolic meter, contrary to what most previous editors

⁵⁰ *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, rec. Th. Bergk, I⁴ (Lipsiae 1878) fr.80, and his note *ad loc.*: “. . . ubi legendum videtur Πίνδαρος δ’ ἐκ Κυβέλης μητρὸς ἐν τῶ προοιμίῳ· Κυβέλα μᾶτερ θεῶν . . . Philodemus prooemium dicere videtur illud ipsum carmen quod Strabo dithyrambum vocat, vid. fr.79 A et B” (= *Dith.* 2.1–3, 8–11 Snell). Only after the discovery of the papyrus (see following note) did it become clear that the Pindaric passage quoted in Strabo is indeed part of an elaborate prooemium; cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 344f, who uses the same term.

⁵¹ *P.Oxy.* 1604 (Pack² 1367)=*Dith.* II fr.70b Snell. Bergk’s suggestion of a possible connection between the quotation in Philodemus and Pindar fr.70b,9ff Snell=Strabo 10.3.13 p.469 *Ματέρι πᾶρ μεγάλα κτλ.* was tacitly rejected by F. Bücheler, *Kl.Schriften* I (*supra* n.29) 586: “Das Zitat aus Pindar ist neu, kann wenigstens nicht auf die blosser Erwähnung der μᾶτηρ μεγάλα bezogen werden.”

⁵² In lines 217f the *disegni* read MAT[. . .] ΦΕΡΕ|[κύδ]ης δ’ ὁ [Σύ]ριος (*Vorsokr.* 7 B 13). Needless to say, there is no room for any supplement longer than ματ[έρα] (see F. Jacoby in *FGrHist* Part I A p.13 n.5 of the *Neudruck*). O. Schroeder (fr.80) and C. M. Bowra (fr.77) in their respective editions of Pindar exercised wise restraint in reproducing the very letters of the *disegni* without any attempt at restoration, whereas A. Turyn (fr.148) and A. Puech (fr.15) gave an utterly deceptive picture of the actual spacing in the *disegni* by printing μᾶτ[ερ θεῶν].

⁵³ Cf. H. Diels *ad Vorsokr.* 7 B 13. Snell’s θεῶ[ν] was obviously inspired by Bergk’s μᾶτερ θεῶν, but does not take into account the actual letters in the *disegni* and the available space after]οιν[. In turn, Snell’s correct supplements in line 217 guided me in restoring 216.

had supposed.⁵⁴ The same sequence of quantities, however, is also compatible with a dactylo-epitritic pattern of a less common type.⁵⁵ Although the new text is too short to render the metrical data conclusive, it provides us with a fresh starting point from which to approach the question from what work of Pindar the fragment might have been taken; I leave the answer—if there is any—to the *Πινδαρικότεροι*.

TEXT V

P.Herc. 243 III= N 243 III (HV² II 39; p.11 G.)

κα[ὶ τὸν
3 μὲν Ἀπόλλω[να τὸν
Μουση{ι}γέτη[ν ἐ-
ρασθέντα τῆ[ς Μακα-
6 ρέως θυγατρὸ[ς Εὐ-
βοίας Ἀργε[ῖον αὐτῆι
μειχθέν[τα γεννηῖσαι

Schober's restoration:

πλησιά[σας δέ τινα
παρθέν[ωι, καθάπερ Ὀ-
μηρος λ[έγει, μαται-
οτέρως {ι} ε[ύρών τινα ἴ-
12 σον ἀπέ[στη τῆς παρα-
νομι[ί]α[ς]. καὶ [Φιλιάμ-
μωνα δ' ἐκ [Φιλωνί-
15 δος τῆς Ἐ[ωσφόρου κοι-
νῆς τὰδελφ[ῶι γεν-
νῆσαι, τὸν δ' Ἀσκλη-
18 πιὸν] ἐξ Ἀ[ρ]ε[ῖ]ος.

Revised text:⁵⁶

πλησιά[ζοντα τῆι
παρθέν[ωι ὡς φησιν Ὀ-
μηρος ἐ[ν (τε) τοῖς ὑ-
12 περώοις [
13 σωναπε. [
νομα.σαι Φ[ιλιάμ-
μωνα δ' ἐκ [Φιλωνί-
15 δος τῆς ἐρ[ωμένης κοι-
νῆς τὰδελφ[ῶι γεν-
18 νῆσαι, τὸν δ' Ἀ[σκλη-
πιὸν] ἐξ Ἀρ[ε]ῖος.

⁵⁴ For the fragments of Pindar, Snell follows the traditional order established by Bergk and Schroeder. But in a note on fr.80 he makes it quite clear that the content of this fragment favors its being placed in the vicinity of fr.95 (which is in Aeolic meter); such a grouping of the fragments was first suggested by Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.50) 271 n.3: "Fr.80 gehört natürlich in dieses Gedicht (i.e. the Hymn on Pan); die Versuche der Herstellung scheitern an dem, was sicher bei Philodem gelesen ist." As it turns out, Wilamowitz' prediction regarding the restoration of fr.80 was too pessimistic.

⁵⁵ E.g. e₋d¹e (mostly found at the end of a period) or e₋d¹D in Maas's terminology, though there are various other possibilities, depending on what element preceded and followed the sequence d¹. I am indebted to Joel B. Lidov for pertinent advice.

⁵⁶ The revision is based on the present condition of the papyrus. The *disegni* were used as

- μηδ' Ἀκακαλ[λίδα καί-
 21 τοι τὴν Ἑρμ<ο>[ὕς τὸ πρὶν
 γενομένην περιφρο-
 νεῖν, ἐρασθῆν[αι δὲ
 24 καὶ Κυρήνη[ς καὶ Αἰ-
 <θ>ούς{οι}ης καὶ γ[
 Ἀστρηῖδος κ[αὶ
 27 Τροφωνείου μ[η-
 τρὸς Ἐπ[ι]κάς[της

MARGIN

2 Gomperz. 3 ἀπολλ[pap(yrus): ἀπολλο[N, corr. Bücheler, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.29) 516 = 583.⁵⁷ 4–6 Bücheler. 7 Dietze–Schober. 8 Bücheler–Schober. 9–12 *cf.* the following marginal note written below the preceding column *P.Herc.* 243 II = N 243 II (HV² II 38; p.10 G.): . . . Ὀμηρος ἔν τε τοῖς ὑπερῶ[οις . . . | . . . πλησιάζοντα ταῖς πα[ρθένους . . . (εν τε pap.: εἶπε N, edd.).⁵⁸ 10–11 [Ὀ]μηρος Bücheler. 12 περωοι[pap.⁵⁹ 13 vague traces of ink above πε[(interlinear correction or addition?). 14 [ὦ]|νομάσθαι (Philippson, *Hermes* 55 [1920] 246) *non quadrat*: νομα και palaeographically possible but syntactically unfit.⁶⁰ 15 Gomperz. 16 ἐρ[ωμένης Merkelbach. 16–17 [κοι]νῆς Philippson, *op.cit.* 247.⁶¹ 17 νης pap.: νην N/Bücheler–Philippson–Schober. 18 τὸν δ'α[pap.: τὸνα[N: τὸν δ' [Ἀ. *coniec.* Schober/Bücheler. 19 Gomperz. 20 Ἀκακαλ[λίδα Philipp-

supplementary evidence only inasmuch as they preserve some letters immediately preceding the lacunae which are now lost (lines 3, 4, 12 [see *infra* n.59] and 26). On the other hand, there are a dozen instances of letters still extant in the papyrus but not reproduced in the *disegni* (lines 2, 7, 14, 16–20, 23, 25–26 and 28).

⁵⁷ Ἀπόλλω (or Ἀπόλλω{ι} with superfluous *iota*, as in *P.Herc.* 1428 col.v 25f) is the accusative form commonly used in *De Pietate* and adopted by Gomperz, and may therefore be preferable to Schober's Ἀπόλλω[να]. The latter, however, accounts better for the available space in the lacuna.

⁵⁸ The *disegnatori* of the early XIX century could still read a few letters which are no longer extant: ὑπερῶ[οις and πλησιάζοντα.

⁵⁹ The *disegnatori* read στερωσιε[instead of περωοι[. The letter that preceded the lacuna, obviously a *sigma*, is now lost.

⁶⁰ The blank space before φ[looks like an intentional *spatium* which is used as a punctuation mark throughout the papyrus of *De Pietate*. If so, και is excluded, because it cannot form the end of a sentence.

⁶¹ The alternative restoration τῆς ἐρ[ωμέ][νης τὰδελφ[οῦ] would make line 16 unusually short.

son. 20–21 Henrichs.⁶² 21 ερμε[pap., N⁶³/[τὸ πρίν] Philippson–Schober. 22 π[or ρ[. 22–23 π[εριφρο]νεῖν Henrichs (I realize that an aorist infinitive would be preferable). 23 γειν, πειν or κειν N/Philippson–Schober. 24 Philippson. 25 εουσαιης pap.: corr. Philippson. 25 perhaps ρ[ύμφης] coll. Hes. fr.185,8 M.-W.]c Ἄστρον ἕδος ἠνκόμοιο, and fr.141,10 νύ]μφης πάρα καλλικόμοιο. 26–28 Henrichs.

The fragment *P.Herc.* 243 III, of which the original is extant, contains a list of some of Apollo's love affairs which is ultimately based on the Hesiodic *Catalogue*.⁶⁴ As usual, the names of the mistresses and, occasionally, of the children who resulted from each liaison are given.

First comes Euboea, the daughter of Macareus (lines 2–8). Philodemus is the earliest witness for the name of Euboea's son by Apollo, Argeus ('*Αργεῖος*').⁶⁵ J. Dietze was apparently the first to recognize that the only manuscript of Hyginus, now lost, gave an impeccable Latin transliteration of this Greek name: *Argeus*.⁶⁶ Recent editors of Hyginus, however, for some mysterious reason, saw fit to improve upon

⁶² There seems to be no exact parallel for the elliptic phrase ἡ Ἐρμοῦ(ς), which must mean 'mistress of Hermes'; for combinations of the type ὁ τοῦ δαίμονος see E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griech. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* II.2 (Berlin–Leipzig 1934) pp.118f; for the ellipsis of nouns to be supplied from the context, *ibid.* II.1 pp.20ff on *Nominalellipse*. Philippson, *Hermes* 55 [1920] 247, restored μηδ' Ἀκακα[λλίδα εἶ]κοιτιν Ἐρμο[ῦ πρίν] | γενομένην, which will not do.

⁶³ Ερμε[, the reading of the *disegni*, is confirmed by the papyrus, but must be wrong. The only other instance of the genitive of Ἐρμῆς in *De Pietate* is Ἐρμοῦς in *P.Herc.* 433 IV line 8 (HV² II 59; p.31 G.), on which see W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (Lipsiae 1903) 163 n.1; Nauck, *op.cit.* (see p. 77 above) 614 n.4, refers to *Anecd.Oxon.* III 251,23 Cramer ἀμαρτάνουσιν οἱ λέγοντες . . . Ἐρμοῦς. It is unlikely that the genitive used in the present passage was the hybrid Ἐρμέ[ου(ς)], either a formation on the analogy of proper names ending in -κλής (Mayser, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.62] I.1 280), or the result of a confusion with the Attic name Ἐρμέας (genitive Ἐρμέου), which ancient grammarians liked to link with Ἐρμῆς Ἐρμοῦ (cf. Herodian. II 620,36, 703,36 and 712,21 Lentz).

⁶⁴ J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodica* (thèse, Paris 1960) 288f. The recent discovery of the name Ἄστρον, which was unattested except for a passage in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr.185,8 M.-W.; see *infra* n.76), is final proof of the Hesiodic origin of the list in Philodemus.

⁶⁵ The papyrus reads Ἀργε[ῖον] (in contrast to ἀρ[in the *disegni*), thereby confirming the supplement of J. Dietze, *NJbb* 153 (1896) 220 n.3.

⁶⁶ Hyg. *Fab.* 161 (a catalogue of *Apollinis filii*, which coincides to some extent with the list in *De Pietate*; see Dietze, *loc.cit.* [*supra* n.65]) *Argeus ex Euboea Macarei filia*. In Latin, Ἀργεῖος could be transliterated as either *Argivus* or *Argeus* (for *Argeus* see Serv.Auct. [DS] on Verg. *Aen.* 8.345, and Prisc. *Inst.* 2.48 [in Keil, *Gramm.Lat.* II 74,5] on Hor. *Carm.* 2.6.5), the latter form being more correct according to ancient scholiastic tradition; cf. J. Tolkiehn, *Phil-Woch* 43 (1923) 44ff, esp.48, and 68ff; G. P. Goold, *HSCP* 69 (1965) 12 [I owe this reference to Charles E. Murgia]; W. S. Allen, *Vox Latina* (Cambridge 1965) 53ff, *id.*, *Vox Graeca* (Cambridge 1968) 69.

the transmitted *Argeus* by making it *Agreus*, which if intended to reproduce the Greek Ἄγρευς is an epithet rather than a regular name.⁶⁷

The second mistress mentioned (lines 14ff) is Philonis, her son being Philammon.⁶⁸ During the same night in which Apollo cohabited with Philonis, his brother Hermes begot Autolycus by her, a tradition which is reflected in lines 16–17 of the papyrus.⁶⁹ The collation of the fragment has shown, however, that contrary to what Philippson had guessed, the name of Heosphoros, the father of Philonis as attested in Conon, cannot have occurred in the lacuna at the end of line 16; it was rather the appositional participle ἐρ[ωμένης], which confirms a conjecture of R. Merkelbach and provides the necessary antecedent for the following [κοι]νής.⁷⁰

The catalogue continues with Arsinoe—in a different mythographical tradition she is called Coronis⁷¹—and her son Asclepius, followed by Acacallis,⁷² Cyrene,⁷³ Aethusa,⁷⁴ Astreis and Epicaste,⁷⁵ the mother of Trophonius. The name Ἀστρηΐς, though clearly legible on the papyrus, was badly disfigured by the *disegnatori* and remained unrecognized. Astreis, as mistress of Apollo, has been known for several years through an Oxyrhynchus papyrus and an exact parallel in a Milan papyrus, both containing the same passage from the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, in which Astreis was apparently preceded by Aethusa, as in Philodemus.⁷⁶

⁶⁷ Joh. Scheffer's edition of Hyginus (Hamburg 1674) still printed the correct *Argeus*. M. Schmidt introduced *Agreus* in his edition (Jena 1872), in which 'emendation' is abundant, and was followed by H. J. Rose² (Leiden 1963).

⁶⁸ Conon, *Narr.* 7; cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 161 (but *Philammon ex Leuconoe Luciferi filia*).

⁶⁹ Hes. fr.64 M.-W. (from the *Catalogue*); cf. schol.D on *Od.* 19.432=Pherecydes of Athens, *FGrHist* 3 F 120, and Hyg. *Fab.* 200.

⁷⁰ Merkelbach's supplement (in form of a handwritten note in Schober's dissertation) was based on the ε[of the *disegni* and is now confirmed by the emergence of the next letter in the papyrus, which is clearly a rho. Cf. *supra* n.61.

⁷¹ Hes. fr.50 M.-W. The reference in *De Pietate* does not help in answering the question which of the two hexametrical couplets quoted in schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 3.14 [II 64, 11ff Drachmann] should be assigned to the *Catalogue*; cf. J. G. Frazer on *Apollod. Bibl.* 3. [118] 10,3 (vol. II p.13 n.5).

⁷² Schol. *Ap.Rhod.* 4.1490/9=Alex.Polyh., *FGrHist* 273 F 30; Jacoby *ad loc.* compares schol.D on *Od.* 19.432=Pherecydes of Athens, *FGrHist* 3 F 120, which is also derived from the *Catalogue* (*supra* n.69). Cf. Paus. 10.16.5, and *Ant.Lib. Met.* 30.1.

⁷³ Hes. fr.215–16 M.-W.

⁷⁴ *Apollod. Bibl.* 3. [111] 10,1.

⁷⁵ Paus. 9.37.4; cf. schol. *Ar. Nub.* 508=Charax, *FGrHist* 103 F 5.

⁷⁶ Hes. fr.185 M.-W. (*P.Oxy.* 2496 and 2497 fr.i; *P.Mil. Vogl.* 204). *Ἀστρηΐδος* is fully extant only in *P.Oxy.* 2497 fr.i,8.

The discussion of lines 9–14 has been postponed, because the reproduction of line 12 in the *disegni* is incorrect and extremely misleading, and has proved to be a serious obstacle for all previous editors.⁷⁷ Schober, in an attempt to make sense of it, took up a suggestion of Philippson and interpreted the passage as a reference to the fight between Apollo and Idas for Marpessa, in which Idas was the victor.⁷⁸ But Schober was carried away by his own imagination; he reconstructed a sentimental love-story, markedly different from the Homeric original, and phrased it in a rather peculiar Greek: Apollo approached the girl he desired, but gave up his evil attempt in frustration as soon as he discovered that he had a rival (*τινα ἴσον*, according to Schober); Homer's version, on the other hand, is more in keeping with the basic rules of behavior in the Heroic Age: that the issue be decided by a fierce duel between the two antagonists. In dealing with these and similar liberties taken by some editors of Philodemus, one feels compelled to emphasize that any tampering with isolated pieces of ancient evidence, mythographical or otherwise, is hardly a convincing and very rarely a successful means of textual criticism.

After inspection of the papyrus, we now stand on much firmer ground than previous editors. As it turns out, their apparent failure resulted not so much from their inability to cope with the textual problems presented by the erroneous transcript of line 12 in the *disegni* as from an intriguing inconsistency in the very content of this whole disputed passage, for which the ancient author himself must be held responsible. The immediate conclusion to be drawn from the revised text of line 12 as it now stands is that the substance of lines 9–12 is basically identical with a marginal note added by another and rather cursive hand below the preceding column (*P.Herc.* 243 II) and only partly preserved.⁷⁹ The occurrence of the key-words *Ἄμνηρος* and

⁷⁷ See *supra* n.59. The *disegnatori* misread three letters out of seven, a score far below their average performance.

⁷⁸ Il. 9.557. The refined version of that story (schol.BT *ad loc.* = Simonides PMG 58 [563]; cf. schol.D [B] *ad loc.*, and Apollod. *Bibl.* 1. [60] 7,8f), according to which Zeus himself put an end to the fighting and allowed Marpessa to choose the lover she liked best, is clearly secondary (cf. *RE* 14 [1930] 1916f).

⁷⁹ The marginal note in *P.Herc.* 243 II (see critical apparatus on *P.Herc.* 243 III 9–12 above, and *supra* n.58) was adduced as evidence in the ill-considered attempt by scholars earlier this century to identify traces of a *manus Philodemi* in Herculanean papyri; for a history and criticism of this vain romanticism see G. Cavallo, "Un secolo di 'paleografia' ercolanese," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 1 (1971) 16 n.41.

*ὑπερῶν*⁸⁰ in both the marginal note and the text of lines 9–12 establishes an allusive but unmistakable reference to two passages in the *Iliad* in which the amorous adventures of Ares and Hermes are mentioned; the location of each rendezvous is in the women's quarters.⁸¹ The two Homeric passages referred to seem to fit in nicely with the general argument of *P.Herc.* 243 III in that they enumerate instances of a god falling in love with a mortal woman; however, they could hardly be considered to offer illustrations relevant to the specific context in Philodemus, because they lack the connection with Apollo and would therefore unduly interfere with the homogeneous character of the catalogue of Apollo's mistresses. And yet the intrusive reference to Homer could well have been occasioned by a confusion on Philodemus' part, who vaguely recalled the Homeric passages and erroneously transferred the location *ἐν ὑπερώῳ* to one of Apollo's love affairs.⁸² This conspicuous flaw in Philodemus' account did not escape some ancient scribe or student of our text, who adopted an unusual means of critical annotation to caution other prospective readers: he bracketed the puzzling sequence of lines 9–12 by marking it off with what could be best described as an angle-shaped paragraphos, certainly of his own invention. The purpose of the corresponding marginal note must have been to point out the author's inconsistency rather than to correct some scribal error.⁸³

Be that as it may, a definite restoration of the content of lines 9–12 is hardly possible, because the marginal note, which alone would have provided the final clue, is incomplete. And there remains the even more baffling problem of lines 13–14, which should either be the direct continuation of lines 9–12 or, if this latter section was to be deleted completely, should be syntactically linked with the infinitive in line 8.

⁸⁰ The term *ὑπερῶν* (or *-ῶα*), apparently borrowed from Homer by Philodemus, continued to be used in Attic, Hellenistic and later Greek; the most characteristic examples are *Lys.* 1.22 (cf. 1.9), *Men. Sam.* 232, and Lollianos, *Phoinikika* in *P.Oxy.* 1368 verso 54f.

⁸¹ *Il.* 2.513ff (*παρθένος . . . ὑπερώιον εἰκαναβᾶα*) and 16.184f *εἰς ὑπερῶν' ἀναβάς παρελέξατο λάθρη* | *Ἑρμείας*, first recognized by Bücheler, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.29) 516=583.

⁸² M. Gigante, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 1 (1971) 66, has drawn attention to a similar slip of the mind in *Phld. Rhet.* IV col.vi 15: "per errore viene dato *Στέφανος* nome del figlio di Tucidide di Melesia come del padre."

⁸³ The angular *paragraphoi* which occur three times in *P.Herc.* 1021 at the very bottom of a column, apparently to mark the end of misplaced passages, are different in size, shape and function; see *Academicorum Philosophorum Index Herculensis* ed. S. Mekler (Berlin 1902) p.x, and W. Crönert's addendum in *Hermes* 38 (1903) 367.

TEXT VI

N 243 IV (HV² 40 upper fragment) 3–12 (p.12 G.)

[εἶ-
4 τὰ τε [᾿Αφροδίτην
ἀν]αἰς[χύντως ἐρᾶν

Restoration A:⁸⁴

ἀνθρώ[πων, τοῦ ᾿Αδώ-
νιδος[ς ὡς μὲν ᾿Αντίμα-
χος καὶ Π[ανύασσις
καὶ ᾿Επιμ[ενίδης καὶ
πλείους ἄλλ[λοι, τοῦ δὲ
᾿Αγχε[ίκο]υ [ὡς ᾿Ομηρος
καὶ ᾿Ησί[ο]δος φασι.

Restoration B:⁸⁴

6 ἀνθρώ[πων ὡς ᾿Αδώ-
νιδό[ς φασι]ν ᾿Αντίμα-
8 χος καὶ Π[ανύασσις
καὶ ᾿Επιμ[ενίδης, ὡς
10 πλείους ἄλλ[λοι καὶ
᾿Αγχε[ίκο]υ. [᾿Ομηρος δὲ
12 καὶ ᾿Ησί[ο]δος φασι
κτλ.

3–4 Philippson, *Hermes* 55 [1920] 248. 5 Philippson, *coll. P.Herc.* 243 V 7f ἀναί-
χύν[τως ἐρώ]σας. 6–7 Henrichs (A), Philippson (B). 7–8 ᾿Αντίμα]χος Vogliano
ap. Antimachus fr.102 Wyss: (cf. fr.102 West) Καλλίμα]χος Philippson (cf. Pfeiffer
ad Callim. fr.783). 8 C. Robert *ap. Philippson coll. Apollod. Bibl.* 3. [183] 14,4 =
Panyassis fr.25 Kinkel. 9–10 The underlined letters are identical with a *sontra-*
posto in *P.Herc.* 243 II 18–19. 9 Henrichs: επιμ[*P.Herc.* 243 II 18, οπιλλ[N 243 II
18, επιολ[N 243 IV 9. 10 Philippson (A), Schober (B): πλειουσαλ[N 243 IV 10,
]ειουσαλ[*P.Herc.* 243 II 19,]λειουσα[N 243 II 19. 11 ᾿Αγχε[ίκο]υ Gomperz/
Philippson–Henrichs (A), Schober (B). 12 Philippson: ηελ[N.

The above passage, most of which is transmitted by the Neapolitan *disegni* only, is taken from a context devoted to goddesses like Aphro-

⁸⁴ Translation: (A) “Furthermore, (they say) that Aphrodite engaged in shameless love with mortal men, with Adonis according to (ὡς . . . φασι) [Anti]machus, P[anyassis], Epimenides and many others, with Anchises according to [Homer] and Hesiod.” (B) “. . . according to [Anti]machus, P[anyassis] and Epimenides, according to many others also with Anchises.” With regard to their content, the two alternative restorations differ in lines 10–12 only: in version A (based on Philippson’s punctuation), the series of authors attesting to Aphrodite’s love for Adonis is continued by the anonymous group of πλείους ἄλλοι, and [Homer] (*Hymn.Hom.Ven.* 53ff) and Hesiod (*Theog.* 1008ff) are quoted as witnesses for Anchises being her other favorite; in version B (Schober’s punctuation), the πλείους ἄλλοι would be the sole authority for the case of Anchises, whereas [Homer] and Hesiod would be adduced as evidence for Demeter’s love of Iasion, the next example in Philodemus’ list (cf. *Od.* 5.125ff, *Theog.* 969ff).

dite and Demeter who loved mortals.⁸⁵ The section presented here is that concerning Aphrodite and was so identified by Philippson, whose restoration of it is perhaps his capital contribution to the text of *De Pietate*.

Despite all the ingenuity which Philippson and other scholars lavished on this text, they were outwitted by the dual but incongruous transmission in which the text of the crucial line 9 has come down to us in the *disegni*. After the *disegnatori* had copied fragment 243 IV, they had to destroy it, as usual, in order to get down to the next layer of writing. But luckily, a small residue comprising lines 9–16 of the upper text survived destruction and remained as a *sovrapposto* on top of the lower. This lower text happened to be *P.Herc.* 243 II, which is extant not only in the *disegni* but also in the original papyrus.⁸⁶ Consequently lines 9–10 of fr.243 IV were copied twice, first in their original position and then as *sovrapposto* in the transcript of *P.Herc.* 243 II.⁸⁷ These two copies of lines 9–10 are identical with the exception of five letters preceding the lacuna in line 9, which were read as $\epsilon\pi\iota\omicron\lambda$ in N 243 IV 9, but as $\omicron\pi\iota\lambda\lambda$ in the *sovrapposto* on N 243 II 18. The name of the poet to which this sequence of letters refers was conjectured to be $\text{E}\ddot{\upsilon}\mu\omicron\lambda[\pi\omicron\varsigma]$ by G. Schmid⁸⁸ and $\text{H}\zeta\iota\omicron\delta[\omicron\varsigma]$ by Philippson;⁸⁹ both restorations are a far cry from those letters that are substantially the same in both copies. The correct name is $\text{E}\pi\iota\mu[\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\varsigma]$. This could have been easily guessed on the basis of the misreading $\text{O}\Pi\text{I}\Lambda\Lambda$ (in N 243 II 18) for $\text{E}\Pi\text{I}\text{M}$, the original sequence of letters which I was able to verify upon collation of *P.Herc.* 243 II.⁹⁰

Although there is no way of deciding which of the two alternative

⁸⁵ Cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 233 *Quae immortales cum mortalibus concubuerunt*. (The catalogue that followed this title is lost.)

⁸⁶ Incidentally, the survival of part of fr.243 IV as *sovrapposto* in *P.Herc.* 243 II proves that in the original arrangement of the text 243 II must have preceded 243 IV (with several columns intervening, only one of which is extant as *P.Herc.* 243 III), and that the individual fragments were numbered in reverse order after they had been detached from this specific segment of the original roll (i.e. the highest number was assigned to the fragment which had been recovered first).

⁸⁷ The *sovrapposto* was recognized as such by G. Schmid, "Philodemea," *Jahresb. d. St. Katharinenschule* (Petersburg 1885) (*non vidi*).

⁸⁸ *Supra* n.87. Cf. N 433 IV (HV² II 59; p.31 G.) 4f $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ [$\delta\acute{\epsilon}$] | $\tau\omicron\nu\text{ν}$ $\text{E}\ddot{\upsilon}\mu\omicron\lambda\pi[\omicron\nu]$ =Musaeus, *Vorsokr.* 2 B 12.

⁸⁹ Philippson, *Hermes* 55 [1920] 248=Hes. fr.139 M.-W. (*fragmentum falsum*, see *supra* n.2).

⁹⁰ In an attempt to recover the underlying text I removed part of the *sovrapposto*. A detailed account of how much of the *sovrapposto* was left when I examined the papyrus will be given in the final edition.

supplements in line 7f is the right one, Antimachus or Callimachus, the name of Antimachus seems to provide better company for Pan-yassis (cf. fr.25 Kinkel) and Epimenides, who follow. That Epimenides, who is referred to several times in *De Pietate*,⁹¹ should have mentioned Adonis as a favorite of Aphrodite in his *Theogony* or in one of the other poems ascribed to him is hardly surprising, for he is reported to have also included the similar case of Endymion.⁹²

Removal of *sovrastoti*

TEXT VII

P.Herc. 1428 fr.23= N 1428 fr.23 (HV² II 7; p.73 G.)

Schober's version:

 ἐναν]τιο[λ]ογί[α]ς δει-
 ν]οτάτη[ς]. ἐν Ἀθηνᾶι (sic)
 γὰρ φ[η]σιν εἶναι τὸν
 Δία πῦρ, νοῦν ..εἰ
 νε. φικ <ἐν> Ἐγκωμίω[ι
 τῶν θεῶν π.μ
ουσα καὶ μ

MARGIN

Revised text:⁹³

 [...]ρη[.]δο[...]. ν[
]δε[...].ν ἐν δὲ
 [...]ε[...].τ[...].ο[...].ιαικ
 [τ]ὸ τῆν μὲν Ἀθηνᾶν
 [φ]ρόνησιν εἶναι, τὸν
 [Δ]ία δὲ νοῦν. ἐν
 δὲ τοῖς Ἐγκωμίοις
 τῶν θεῶν πάμ-
 πολλα ὄσα καὶ μ[.]

MARGIN

The previous example (TEXT VI) was one of the rare instances in which a *sovrastoto* is instrumental in constituting the text of a given fragment; we happened to know the original location of the *sovrastoto* and were thus able to make efficient use of the letters preserved on it. More often, however, the very opposite holds true: most of the *sovrastoti* being of small size and of rather disintegrating condition,

⁹¹ See *supra* n.2.

⁹² Schol. Ap.Rhod. 4.57= *Vorsokr.* 3 B 14 Ἐπιμενίδης δὲ αὐτὸν (sc. Ἐνδυμίονα) παρὰ θεοῖς διατρίβοντα ἐρασθήναι φησι τῆς Ἥρας. διόπερ Διὸς χαλεπαίνοντος αἰτήσασθαι διὰ παντὸς καθεύδειν (cf. Lucian, *Deor. Conc.* 8 p.532, where Anchises, Tithonus, Endymion and Iasion [see *supra* n.84] are enumerated as lovers of goddesses). The descent of Aphrodite from Kronos is referred to in Epimenides, *Vorsokr.* 3 B 19.

⁹³ This fragment is not in the Oxonian *disegni*. The first two lines are lacking even in the Neapolitan copies and are known through the papyrus only.

they have practically no virtues of their own; all they tend to do is obstruct the access to and the reading of the letters which the editor can expect to find beneath them. If the extremely delicate operation of removing a *sovrapposto* without damage to the underlying layer of papyrus is carried out successfully he can hope to make substantial headway and to throw fresh light on a text which was necessarily incoherent and incomprehensible before.

The above passage, with which we conclude our presentation of Herculanean case histories, illustrates the benefit that can be derived from the proper application of such papyrological surgery. This text is another fragment from the catalogue of philosophers discussed before (cf. *supra* TEXT III). It was ascribed to Theophrastus by Gomperz, who based his ascription on the occurrence of *ἐγκωμίων τῶν θεῶν* in line 7f of the Neapolitan *disegni*; one book of *Ἐγκώμια θεῶν* is listed by Diogenes Laertius in his catalogue of Theophrastus' works.⁹⁴ Philippson and Schober, on the other hand, decided that the fragment should be ascribed to Heraclides Ponticus, although their restorations of it differ.

The remaining doubts were removed together with the *sovrapposto*. Chance has it that Philippson all but found the correct text for lines 4–6 and that Schober here, of all places, preferred not to accept Philippson's restoration. The latter's text, though ascribed to Heraclides, under whose name nothing of the kind is attested, runs as follows: τῆ[ν μ]ὲν Ἀθηνᾶν φρό[νησ]ιν εἶναι, τὸν [δὲ Δ]ία πῦρ [καὶ] νοῦν.⁹⁵

That someone had interpreted Athena as *Phronesis* and Zeus as *Nous* is indeed consistent with the wording of the papyrus that emerged after removal of the *sovrapposto*. The mention of a book by Theophrastus in line 7 proves beyond reasonable doubt that this someone must have been Theophrastus.⁹⁶ But the Theophrastean interpretation—a notable anticipation of well-attested Stoic associa-

⁹⁴ Diog.Laert. 5.47 (first recognized by Gomperz [*supra* n.5] p.158, index of authors s.v. Theophrast); cf. H. Usener, *Analecta Theophrastea* (Diss. Bonn 1858, Leipzig s.a.) 1–24. The *disegnatori* misread the plural *Ἐγκωμίοις*, which is clearly the reading of the papyrus.

⁹⁵ *Hermes* 55 (1920) 370.

⁹⁶ Each time a new philosopher is mentioned in *P.Herc.* 1428, the transition is marked by a combination of *diple* and *obelos* (>—) in the left-hand margin, set against the first two lines of the ensuing section; the name of the philosopher is given first, the quotations follow. The absence of both the marginal note and the name in *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.23 makes it clear that we are dealing with the middle of a section, and the known book-title in line 7f proves that this is the section concerning Theophrastus.

tions⁹⁷—of Athena and Zeus as personifications of the rational principle of the universe was not taken from the *Ἐγκώμια (τῶν) θεῶν* mentioned in line 7, but from another of his works, the title of which was given after the *spatium* in line 2f.⁹⁸

None of the attested titles is fully reconcilable with the traces of ink in line 3. The only title worthy of consideration is the *Τῶν περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἱστορία* in six books,⁹⁹ the exact content of which is not known; the latter part of this title could indeed give the impression of resembling very much the letters in the papyrus.¹⁰⁰ But apart from the

⁹⁷ The equations propagated by Theophrastus presuppose a pre-Stoic allegorization of the birth of Athena from the head of Zeus. The key passage for the later Stoic interpretation is a long quotation from Diogenes of Babylon's *Περὶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς* in *De Pietate* (cf. Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.41): *P.Herc.* 1428 col.ix 6–x 8 (p.83f G.) = SVF III Diogenes 33 = *Dox.Graec.* 549f (the following text is based on the extant papyrus and both the Oxford and Naples *disegni*): *τοῦτο γὰρ λέγ[ε]σθαι τὸ 'ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς' καὶ 'Ζεὺς ἄρρην Ζεὺς θῆλυς'* (cf. Orph. fr.21a and 168; *P.Derveni* [Pack² 2465a] at R. Merkelbach, *ZPapEpiGr* 1 [1967] 21ff, esp. 23f, where *Μοῖρα* is interpreted as *φρόνησις τοῦ Διός*). *τινὰς δὲ τῶν Στωϊκῶν φάσκειν ὅτι τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ φρόνησιν γὰρ εἶναι, διὸ καὶ Μῆτιν καλεῖσθαι. Χρύσιππον* (SVF II 910, cf. 908–09) *δ' ἐν τῷ στή[θ]ει τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν [εἶ]ναι κακεῖ τὴν [Ἀθ]ηνᾶν γεγονένα[ι] φρόνησιν οὖσαν, τῷ δὲ τ[ῆ]ν φωνὴν ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐκκρίνεσθαι λέγειν ἐκ τῆς κεφα[λ]ῆς, ὑπὸ δὲ Ἡφαίσ[του] δ[ι]ότι τέχνη γίνεθ' ἢ φρόνησις. καὶ Ἀθηνᾶν μὲν οἶον Ἀθ[η]νᾶν εἰρήσθαι, Τ[ριτω]νίδα δὲ καὶ Τριτ[ο]γέ[μ]εια διατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν ἐκ τριῶν συνεστηκέναι λόγων, τῶν φυσικῶν καὶ τῶν [ῆ]θικῶν[υ] καὶ τῶν λογικῶν. καὶ [τ]ὰς ἄλλας δ' αὐτῆ[ς] προ[ο]ρηγορίας καὶ τὰ φορήματα μάλα καταχρῦσως τῇ φρονήσει συνοικειοῦ.* For similar but later passages see Pease's commentary on Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.41 (*supra* n.37).

⁹⁸ The exact parallel in Cic. *Nat.D.* 1.35 is too summary to throw much light on the text of *De Pietate*, whereas the latter is of considerable help in understanding Cicero, who writes: *nec vero Theophrasti inconstantia ferenda est; modo enim menti divinae* (v.l. *divinum*, see below) *tribuit principatum, modo caelo, tum autem signis sideribusque caelestibus.* Cicero's *principatus* is a translation of the Greek term *ἡγεμονικόν* (Cic. *Nat.D.* 2.29, and Pease *ad loc.*; cf. the juxtaposition of *ἡγεμονικόν* and *Athena-Phronesis* in the Stoic allegorization quoted *supra* n.97). There can be little doubt that Theophrastus identified the *Nous* of Zeus and the *Phronesis* of Athena (*mens divina* in Cicero) with what became later known as *ἡγεμονικόν τοῦ κόσμου* (Diog.Laert. 7.139). Therefore the variant reading *divinae* in *Nat.D.* 1.35, offered by some 'inferior' mss and known to Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 19.9) but rejected by Pease, must be the right one (I am unconvinced by J. Beaujeu's innovation, who in his edition of Minucius Felix [Paris 1964] substituted *divinum* for the *divinae* of the mss). The revised text of *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.23 proves that Cicero's summary of the Theophrastean theology is based on quotations from at least two of the lost works of Theophrastus. O. Regenbogen, *RE Suppl.* 7 (1940) 1511, who thought otherwise, did not take into account the identification suggested by Gomperz (*supra* n.94).

⁹⁹ Diog.Laert. 5.48 *Τῶν* (*om. cod.Laur.* 69,13 *ante corr.*) *περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἱστορίας* 1–6; Usener, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.94) 17, compared Damascius, *Princ.* 124 (*supra* nn.28 and 33) and concluded, unconvincingly, that Eudemus of Rhodes could well be the real author of this book.

¹⁰⁰ This line reads in the Neapolitan *disegni* as follows: [8 litt.]*τιο[.]ογι[. . .]*. Mario Arman, who was commissioned by Dom. Bassi to re-collate all that was extant of *P.Herc.* 1428 in the summer of 1915 and who examined fr.23 on May 22, was no longer able to verify these letters, as is shown by his comment "*TIO . . . OPI caduti*" jotted in the margin of the

often beyond our control, the textual critic is confined within dangerously narrow limits, and that the future edition, like its predecessors, is bound to produce to a large extent hardly more than unsatisfactory patchwork.¹⁰³

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
November, 1971

¹⁰³ ADDENDUM TO p. 75 n.21 *supra*. For the scholiastic use of *μεταλαμβάνειν* G. Giangrande refers me to K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*³ (Leipzig 1882) 19–21. Cf. J. Baar, *Index zu den Ilias-Scholien. Die wichtigeren Ausdrücke der grammatischen, rhetorischen und ästhetischen Textkritik* (ed. G. Walser, *Deutsche Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* XV, Baden-Baden 1961) 112 s.v.

ADDENDUM TO p.86 n.54 *supra*: L. Lehnus, in a critical note forthcoming in *ZPapEpigr* 9, argues convincingly that the revised text of Pindar fr.80 (*supra* TEXT IV) must be the exordium of a hymn to Cybele and should not be connected with fr.95.

Finally, I wish to thank the anonymous referee for an acute observation.