

# 11

## Two Literary Papyri in an Archive from Panopolis

WILLIAM H. WILLIS

To the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists at Oxford in 1974 Professor G. M. Browne<sup>1</sup> and I in uncoordinated papers announced the separate acquisition by the University of Cologne and Duke University of papyri constituting an archive of documents deriving from an important family in Panopolis spanning the last decade of the third century and the first half of the fourth. Certain documents in fact were shared between the two collections. It was at once clear that the Cologne group and the Duke group derived from the same find, made apparently in Achmîm in the 1960's, though they traveled by separate routes through different dealers to their present homes. To Cologne had fallen some 30 papyri, mostly larger in size, while Duke's share comprised some 500 fragments, including a dozen texts of significant size, but mostly very small bits requiring reassembly, which by joins have now been reduced to about 150.

Through the statesmanship of Professor Ludwig Koenen it was arranged that the two collections would exchange lesser fragments in order that all parts of each divided document might be reunited in either of the two collections. This procedure is still in progress. But when Professors Koenen, Browne, John Oates and I spread the two groups side by side at the Duke Library during a memorable week in November 1975, it became clear that substantial parts of most of our documents are still missing, and are likely to have found their way elsewhere. We wish therefore to acquaint our papyrological colleagues everywhere with the existence and character of the archive and to enlist their aid in recognizing and reporting any other parts of it which may emerge.

So far as we have as yet ascertained, the new archive, though embracing

<sup>1</sup> G. M. Browne, "A Panegyrist from Panopolis," in *Proceedings of the XIV Int. Congress of Papyrologists* (E.E.S. Graeco-Roman Memoirs 61; London, 1975) 29-33.

the same period, has no connection with the Youtie–Hagedorn *Papyri from Panopolis*,<sup>2</sup> nor (except for sharing a few names) with *P. Panopolis-Beatty*<sup>3</sup> nor the Panopolite city register published by Martin<sup>4</sup> and Borkowski<sup>5</sup>; and the Panopolis documents at Vienna being edited by P. J. Sijpesteijn are of a quite different date, a century earlier. The Duke–Cologne archive comprises the papers of Aurelius Ammon son of Petearbeschinis, who styles himself “Scholasticus of Panopolis.” They include some papers of his father Aurelius Petearbeschinis, son of Horós, priest of the first-ranked temples of Panopolis; of Petearbeschinis’ first wife Senpasis, a priestess, and of his second wife, Senpetechensis, apparently not a priestess; of Ammon’s older half-brother Horion, the *archiprophetes* of the Panopolite nome; and of other relatives and connections, perhaps including Ammon’s full brother Harpocraton, who has pursued an extended career abroad—in Greece, Rome and Constantinople—as panegyrist to the emperors and as an *epitropos* and *logistes* in Greece. The family was wealthy, educated and distinguished, apparently leading members of the pagan Thebaid metropolis at a time when Christianity was rising there.<sup>6</sup>

The earliest dated documents preserved in the archive are three concerning the sale of part of a house and land to Senpasis, which she registered with the *bibliothèque enkteleon* of Panopolis in A.D. 289; these three Cologne papyri (to which Duke contributed two fragments), have now been published by Professor Browne.<sup>7</sup> Next in sequence is a large but incomplete *apographe* at Duke filed by the *archiprophetes* Horion in 299 for his tithe of all temple properties in the nome, in response to the first census ordered by Diocletian in 297. This is followed, again in the Duke collection, by a fragmentary roll containing a series of six returns filed in 303 by Petearbeschinis and his second wife Senpetechensis. There is the merest fragment of one such return filed in 308, together with undatable small fragments of other returns. A receipt at Duke is dated 326. Duke possesses an extraordinarily long but incomplete and undatable letter, the last five columns

<sup>2</sup> L. C. Youtie, D. Hagedorn, H. C. Youtie, “Urkunden aus Panopolis,” *ZPE* 7 (1971) 1–40, 8 (1971) 207–234, 10 (1973) 101–170.

<sup>3</sup> *Papyri from Panopolis in the Chester Beatty Library Dublin*, ed. T. C. Skeat (Dublin, 1964).

<sup>4</sup> V. Martin, “Relevé topographique des immeubles d’une métropole,” *Recherches de Papyrologie* 2 (1962) 37–73.

<sup>5</sup> Z. Borkowski, *Une description topographique des immeubles à Panopolis* (Warsaw, 1975).

<sup>6</sup> For an illuminating account of Panopolitans of similar status in the following century see Alan Cameron, “Wandering Poets: a Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt,” *Historia* 14 (1965) 470–509.

<sup>7</sup> G. M. Browne, “Property Belonging to Aurelia Senpasis and Aurelius Petearbeschinis,” in *Collectanea Papyrologica* (Festschrift Youtie) II (Pap. Texte u. Abh. 20; Bonn, 1976) 489–500 = *P. Coll. Youtie* 71–73.

of a rhetorically elaborate account written to his mother by one of the sons (probably Ammon but possibly Harpocraton himself) reporting on his efforts to secure for his nephew the son of Horion, who is now dead, the *propheteia* of Panopolis, despite the opposition of the high priest. A number of other undatable fragmentary documents, especially petitions written by Ammon, must derive from the last two decades of the archive.

The latest dated document is an affidavit by Ammon on 9 December 348 addressed to the *catholicus* Flavius Sisinnius, edited by Professor Browne.<sup>8</sup> This is one of a series of petitions and drafts of petitions, some at Cologne, others at Duke, written in Ammon's own hand in preparation for his case before the *catholicus* asserting his right to inherit the slaves of his brother Harpocraton, who has died abroad intestate, a right hotly contested by a certain Eugeneios son of Menoraphis. How the case was decided, and whether other fragmentary petitions by Ammon on behalf of his clients are to be dated later than 348, we do not know.

Among Ammon's papers at Duke are found two broken papyri of an altogether different sort, literary fragments each assembled from several smaller pieces but each remaining quite incomplete. It is these which I wish to present here, not because they may be as interesting as some of the documentary texts in the archive, but rather because in archives it is rare to find literary texts and unusual for literary papyri to have ascertainable provenience and context. Besides, their character may throw some additional light on the personality of their owner Ammon. And most importantly, each presents problems in need of solution.

The first of the two texts (*P. Duk. inv. G 176*; see Plate I) is a fragment of *Odyssey* 9, bearing on one side the ends of lines 298–309 and on the other the beginnings of lines 344–384. No literary papyrus was ever easier to identify, for the 4th and 22nd lines of the verso begin *Κύκλωψ*, and lines 24 and 27 name *Οἰτις*. As much text as survives offers no surprises, for, as the apparatus attests, it is a properly written copy of the vulgate, except that the scribe has added a *nu*-movable at the end of 9.301 and has written line 354 twice. At 9.302 our text reads *ἔρ]υκῆ[ν]*, which modern editors prefer, against *ἀνῆκεν* given by a few MSS., the *Etymologicum Magnum* and some scholia. In the eight lines in which it overlaps the only other published papyrus containing this part of Book 9, it is in complete agreement with the Jouguet Papyrus<sup>9</sup> of the third century B.C. In line 370 apparently the scribe himself corrected his omission of *delta* by inserting it in place just

<sup>8</sup> G. M. Browne, "Harpocraton Panegyrista," *Illinois Classical Studies* 2 (1976) 184–196.

<sup>9</sup> Pack<sup>2</sup> 1081 = O. Guéraud, "Un nouveau papyrus de l'Odyssee," *Revue de l'Égypte Ancienne* 1 (1927) 80–130. The text of Pack<sup>2</sup> 1082 (*P. Oxy.* XI 1396, now *P. Princ.* A.M. 9049) remains unpublished.

under the line; and the *iota* added to τῆ in line 347, though omitted by modern editors,<sup>10</sup> is commonplace in other Homeric papyri and manuscripts. Otherwise the text, as far as it goes, is unexceptionable.

1. *Odyssey* 9.298–309, 344–384

*P.Duk.inv. G 176* (papyrus codex ca. 16.5 × 29.5 cm.) 4.8 × 22.0.  
Panopolis, III cent.

<i>recto</i> ↓	<i>verso</i> →
	1 εὐν [δ' ὄ γε
	2 καὶ τό[τ' ἐγὼ 345
	3 κι[ε]κύ[βιον μετὰ
	4 Κύκλωψ, τῆι, π[ίε οἶνον
	5 ὄφρ' εἰδήεις οἶόν [τι ποτὸν
295 ] ..	6 ἡμετέρῃ· σοὶ δ['] αὐ λοιβῆν
] ..	7 οἰκαδέ πέμψεια[ε· εὐ δὲ 350
] ..	8 σχέτιε, πῶς κέ[ν τις εε
μήλ]ων	9 ἀνθρώπων πολ[έων;
μεγαλήτορ]α θυμὸν	10 ὡς ἐφάμην, ὁ δὲ [δέετο
300 παρὰ] μῆροϋ	11 ἡδὺ ποτὸν πίν[ων καὶ 354
ἦπα]ρ ἔχουσιν	12 ἡδὺ ποτὸν πίν[ 354 bis
ἔρ]υκε[ν]	13 δὸς μοι ἔτι πρ[όφρων
ὄλεθ]ρον	14 αὐτίκα νῦν, ἵνα [τοι δῶ
] ..	15 καὶ γὰρ Κυκλώπ[εεσι φέρει
305 προσέθη]κεν	16 οἶνον ἐριτάφην[λον, καὶ εφιν
δι]αγ	17 ἀλλὰ τὸ[δ' ἀ]μῆρ[οσίης
] ]	18 [ὡς ἔφατ'· αὐτὰρ 360
309 ἐκάστ]ηι	19 τρὶς μ[έν] ξέδ[ωκα
	20 αὐτὰρ ἔπει Κύ[κλωπα
	21 καὶ τότε δῆ μ[ιν ἔπεεσι
	22 Κύκλωψ, εἶρω[τᾶς μ' ὄνομα
	23 ἐξέρεω· εὐ δ[έ μοι δὸς 365
	24 Οὕτως ἐμοί γ['] ὄ[νομα·
	25 μήτηρ ἡδὲ [πατῆρ
	26 ὡς ἐφάμην, [ὁ δὲ μ' αὐτίκ'
	27 Οὕτως ἐγὼ π[ύματον ἔδομαι
	28 τοὺς ,δ', ἄλλους [πρόσθεν 370
	29 ἦ, κ[αὶ ἀνακλινθεὶς
	30 κεί[τ' ἀποδοχμῶσα
	31 ἦρει π[ανδαμάτωρ·
	32 ψωμ[οί τ' ἀνδρόμοι·
	33 καὶ τὸ[τ' ἐγὼ 375

301 ἔχουσι *codd.* 302 ἔρυκε(ν) *codd. plur., schol.* BT B 5, Z 524: ἀνήκεν *Paris.* 2894, *schol.* AB A 173, *Et. Mag.* 45B.15. 347 τῆ *codd. nonnulli*: τῆ *codd. plur.*, *Apoll. Soph.*, *Herod.*, *edd.* 348 ὄφρ' εἰδήεις *pap.*, ὄφρ' εἰδήεις *codd.*, *Ludwich*: ὄφρα ἰδήεις *Allen.* 351 αὐ *codd. pauci*, *Eust.*: κέν *codd. complur., edd.* 353 δ' ἔδεκτο *codd. pauci*: δὲ ἔδεκτο *schol.*: δὲ δέκτο *codd. complur.* 354 bis *ditto.* 370 τοὺς δ' ἄλλους *codd., edd.*

<sup>10</sup> See the editions of A. *Ludwich*, T. W. *Allen* and P. *Von der Mühl* *ad loc.*, and *LSJ s.v. τῆ* at end.

34	εἴω[ε θερμαίνουτο·	
35	θάραυ[νον, μή τίς μοι	
36	ἀλ[λ' ὅτε δῆ	
37	ἄψε[εθαι, χλωρός	
38	καὶ τ[ότ' ἐγών	380
39	ἴστα[ντ' αὐτὰρ	
40	οἱ μ[έν μοχλὸν	
41	ὄφθ[αλμῶ ἐνέρεϊσαν·	
42	δίψ[εον, ὡς ὅτε τις	

376 εἴωε *codd.*, Ludwich: εἴοε, ἦοε *corr. edd. plur.* 379 ἄψαεθαι *codd. nonnulli*: ἄψεεθαι P<sup>31</sup> (Pack<sup>2</sup> 1081), *codd. plur.*

The format and date of the fragment are questions of some interest. On the side bearing horizontal fibres the text preserved (*Od.* 9.344–84) is sharp and clear, running from a top margin of 1.5 cm. down a left margin of 2.0 cm. (steadily increasing to 2.7 at the foot) along what appears to be the original left edge of the papyrus; the fragment breaks off at the forty-second line. The side with vertical fibres is badly abraded, preserving only a few letters and scattered traces of ink near the middle of its height. The discernible letters are of the same size and form, spaced at the same line-intervals, as those of the text on the other side, thus suggesting a codex rather than a roll. But only four consecutive letters are clear and certain—YCIN. Within the hundred lines of *Odyssey* 9 immediately preceding and following the text overleaf, the sequence -υειν occurs only in the middle of line 421 (εἴ τιν' ἐταίροιειν θανάτου λύειν ἦδ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῶι) and at the end of line 301 (οὐτάμειναι πρὸς ετῆθος, ὅθι φρένεε ἦπαρ ἔχουει) if the scribe's addition of an otiose *nu*-movable be allowed. Line 421 would require for its last three words more space than the papyrus affords; and the traces of ink above and below -υειν do not conform to words in the lines immediately preceding and following line 421. If we assume ἔχουειν in line 301, however, all other traces of ink fall neatly into place in the surrounding passage, and we are enabled to read with some confidence other words faintly preserved.

We have, then, part of a codex leaf whose recto with vertical fibres precedes its verso with horizontal fibres. The interval between corresponding points on recto and verso would accommodate 54 lines of text, a rather large number per page. Extrapolating from the preserved height and width and allowing for margins all round,<sup>11</sup> we may estimate an original

<sup>11</sup> I calculate the average length of line at slightly less than 12 cm. The preserved top margin of the verso is 1.2 cm.; the left margin progresses from 2.0 to 2.7 cm. I assume a bottom margin of 2 cm., a right margin averaging 2.5 cm. Forty preserved lines on the verso occupy a height of 19.4 cm.; 54 lines would thus require 26.2 cm.

page size of ca. 16.5 × 29.5 cm.—a codex nearly twice as tall as wide. At 108 lines per leaf, Book 9 would have required only five leaves and a fractional page, and 112 such leaves would accommodate the entire *Odyssey*.

Other codices of similar dimensions are known, as Eric Turner has shown in his papers at the Marburg and Oxford congresses.<sup>12</sup> This format falls within his Marburg Group 6, most members of which are assigned by palaeography to the third and fourth centuries. Two of them, like ours, offer a large number of lines per page; both are *Iliads* (*PSI* II 140 [15 × 28 cm.] with 63 lines, *PSI* X 1169 [15 × 29 cm.] with 59 lines), written in a sloping hand characteristic of the third century. In his Oxford paper Turner has compiled a useful list of two dozen papyrus codices of tall format, all dated to the second and third centuries, most of which have 50 or more lines to the page; six contain the *Iliad*, two more Hesiod's *Theogony*. Of the thirteen of which photographs have been published, only one (*P. Mert.* I 3, an *Iliad* leaf 13.7 × [32.5] cm.) bears a hand at all resembling ours—a small, sharp, irregular capital, dated by Bell and Roberts to the third century; and it also has 54 lines to the page.

The hand of Ammon's *Odyssey* is written in tiny upright oval capitals, sharp and clear in black ink, nearly always bilinear, formal though irregular and occasionally ligatured. The only diacritical mark preserved is an apostrophe indicating elision at verso line 5; opposite verso lines 38–40 is the faint trace of a sort of coronis. I have not succeeded in finding a close parallel to the hand: that of the Merton *Iliad* is not bilinear and is even less regular, though none seems closer. Two noteworthy peculiarities of our hand, the tall narrow *omicron*, which sometimes forms a point at the bottom or even a chiasmus, and an occasionally exuberant *kappa* the lower oblique stroke of which swings below the line, are both paralleled in the Oxyrhynchus fragment of Menander's *Kolax* (*P. Oxy.* III 409; plates II and III), which Grenfell and Hunt assigned to the mid-second century. Regrettably, few photographs have been published of the early papyrus codices listed and classified by Turner, especially of the tall copies of Homer and Hesiod. Hesitantly, therefore, I should assign Ammon's *Odyssey* to the first half of the third century, and attribute to Ammon the possession of a copy written a century earlier than his own time.

Finally we come to the second of Ammon's two "literary" texts (*P. Duk. inv.* G 178; see Plate II). About it we can have hardly any question

<sup>12</sup> E. G. Turner, "Some Questions about the Typology of the Codex," in *Akten des XIII. Int. Papyrologenkongresses (Münchener Beiträge* 66 [1974] 427–438; "Early Papyrus Codices of Large Size," in *Proceedings of the XIV Int. Congress of Papyrologists* (London, 1975) 309–312.

of date, for it is written in Ammon's own hand—the large rough informal hand, using dark brown ink, in which he wrote also the several drafts of petitions preserved in both the Cologne and Duke collections, not the more elegant hand he used in documents intended for eyes other than his own. Even without the dated record of his activities in the 340's, we should have assigned this hand to the mid-fourth century.

## 2. LIST OF PHILOSOPHERS

*P. Duk. inv. G 178* 9.7 × 18.1 cm. Panopolis, IV cent.

col. i

col. ii

1	.[ ] . [ ]	1	Σπεύσιππος Ἀθηναῖος
2	Ἀναξιμένης Μιλήσιος	2	Πλάτωνος ἀδελφιδού
3	Ἀναξαγόρας ἐκ Κλαζο-	3	Ξενοκράτης [Χαλκηδόνιος
4	]μενῶν	4	Πολέμων Ἀθηναῖος
5	Ἀρχέλαος Ἀθηναῖος	5	Ἀρκεσίλαος [ἐκ Πιτάνης
6	Φερεκύδης Σύριος	6	Καρνεάδης [Κυρηναῖος
7	Παρμενίδης Ἐλεάτης	7	Ἀκαδημίας μέσης ?
8	Διογένης ἐξ Ἀπολλωνιάς	8	Κλιτόμαχος Καρχηδόνιος
		9	Φίλιππων [ἐκ Λαρίσσης
		10	Ἀγρίοχος [Ἀσκαλώνιος
		11	.φωναρχηγ[
		12	τρ[ί]της Ἀκαδημίας
		13	Κυνικοί [
		14	Διογένης ὁ Σ[ι]νωπ[εύ]ς
		15	Μόνιμος ἀπὸ δουλίας
		16	Κράτης Βοιωτῆς
		17	Περιπατητικοί
		18	Ἀριστοτέλης Σταγειρίτης
		19	Θεόφραστος Ἴων
		20	Στράτων ἐκ Λαμφιάκου
		21	Πραξιφάνης [Ἰ]όδιος
		22	Κριτόλαος Φα[σ]ηλίτης
		23	Στωϊκοί μετ[ε] . . . Κυνικ( )
		24	Ζήνων . [
			(Margin)

It is a list of Greek philosophers. Originally it must have contained three narrow columns, the first listing the Presocratics, the second the succession of Academics, Cynics and Peripatetics; and no doubt there was a third column, now missing, to list Stoics and Epicureans and perhaps others. While column ii retains part of its lower margin and most of its height, at

least one line is lost at the top along with the top margin, and possibly two (or more) if Ammon inscribed a comprehensive title. If we assume two lines and a margin of a centimeter, and a third column but no more, the original sheet would have been approximately square, measuring about 21 × 21 cm. The sheet was folded vertically into six panels apparently, of which the top part of the second, most of the third, and the lower part of the fourth have survived.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, Ammon's *philosophorum index* is unique, in that its sole purpose appears to be to list the principal philosophers (each with his *polis*) in teacher-pupil sequence, and from the Academy onward by school, citing only those who were appointed heads of each school. The list of Academics ends with Antiochus, who died in 68 B.C.; of Cynics with Crates, to 285 B.C.; and of Peripatetics with Critolaus, in the second century B.C. The only other list of philosophers (and of physicians) among the papyri is *P. Vars. inv. 5* (Pack<sup>2</sup> 2088) dated to the third century; but that is the catalogue of a library, and its purpose is to record the number of rolls by each author held. The two so-called *indices philosophorum* among the fragmentary Herculanean rolls<sup>13</sup> are doxographical histories of the Academy and the Stoa, respectively, in scope and detail somewhat resembling Diogenes Laertius; only at the ends of biographies of principal figures are found lists of names (with ethnics) of their minor students. Laertius remains our only extant full example of this genre, since the worthier predecessors whom he mentions as sources (e.g., the φιλοσόφων διαδοχαί of Hermippus, Hieronymus of Rhodes and Hippobotus of the third century B.C., Antisthenes of Rhodes, Sosicrates and Sotion of the second) all have perished. Sextus Empiricus in his more scholarly and extensive *Πυρρώνειοι ὑποτυπώσεις* and *Adversus Mathematicos* now and again mentions most of Ammon's philosophers but only to defend Skeptic doctrines against their own.

Somewhat closer in spirit to Ammon's index are the later doxographers collected by Hermann Diels in *Doxographi Graeci*. But these too were composed to summarize doctrines, *placita*, however briefly. Nevertheless they are useful in providing some parallels to the sequence of personalities in Ammon's list. None, however, presents the schools in precisely the same order, nor did Diogenes Laertius:

LAERTIUS	AETIUS	GALEN	HIPPOLYTUS	EPIPHANIUS	AMMON
Sages	Presocratics	Milesians	Presocratics	Presocratics	Presocratics
Milesians	Plato	Academy	Plato	Plato	?

<sup>13</sup> For *P. Herc. 1018*, often cited as "Index Stoicorum," see D. Comparetti, *Papiro Ercolanese inedito* (Turin, 1875); for *P. Herc. 1021* see the edition of S. Mekler, *Academicorum Philosophorum Index Herculensis* (Berlin, 1902).

Socratics	Aristotle	Cynics	Aristotle	Cyreneans	Academy
Academy	Zeno	Stoics	Stoics	Cynics	Cynics
Peripatetics		Socratics	Epicurus	Middle Academy	Peripatetics
Cynics		Peripatetics	Pyrrho	Peripatetics	Stoics?
Stoics		Presocratics		Stoics	?
Presocratics		Skeptics		Epicurus	
Epicurus		Epicureans			

Column i doubtless listed the Presocratics, beginning with Thales; our first line no doubt contained *Ἀναξίμανδρος Μιλήσιος*, within which the three surviving dots of ink could fit almost anywhere. The first three Milesian philosophers would have been given in the traditional order, then, followed by Anaxagoras, the only early candidate from Clazomenae, whom "some" named as a pupil of Anaximenes and the teacher of Archelaus of Athens, whom in turn some doxographers list as a teacher of Socrates.

In line 6 Pherecydes comes as a surprise, but as an early cosmogonist and as an alleged contemporary and possible "pupil" of Anaximander, he is the only candidate from Syros. We have no testimony that he taught Parmenides—rather Pythagoras or Heraclitus, depending on one's doxographer. At this point the list might have progressed in any one of several directions: the *De Placitis*<sup>14</sup> proceeded directly to Pythagoras, then Heraclitus, Xenophanes, the Atomists and Empedocles, omitting Parmenides since he was not concerned with material *archae*; the fragments of Galen's *Περὶ φιλοσόφου ἱστορίας* skip directly from Archelaus to Socrates and the Academy, returning separately to the Presocratics. But Hippolytus, who inserted Pythagoras, Empedocles and Heraclitus between Thales and Anaximander, gives Parmenides next after Anaximenes, Anaxagoras and Archelaus almost in our order, before going on to Leucippus. Closest to our list is the *Ἑλλήνων διαφοραὶ* of Epiphanius, the Palestinian Christian monk and bishop in the generation following Ammon, bitter foe of Hellenic education and so of Origen and John Chrysostom.<sup>15</sup> Through Parmenides his list of targets contains the same names in the same order as ours, except that he inserted Socrates after Archelaus and Pythagoras and Xenophanes after Pherecydes.

At any rate Elea and the traces of ink in line 7 seem to guarantee Parmenides, and I can find no other suitable candidate for line 8 from a city ending in *-ία* but Diogenes of Apollonia, whom "some" named as a

<sup>14</sup> For "Aetius," *De Placitis* see H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin & Leipzig, 1929) 276–289; for Galen, *Περὶ φιλοσόφου ἱστορίας*, pp. 599–601; for Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, pp. 553–564.

<sup>15</sup> For Epiphanius' list see Diels, *Dox.Graec.* pp. 587–593; for his life see Jülicher in *RE* 6 (1907) 193 f., *s.n.* Epiphanius 3.

pupil of Anaximenes, a younger contemporary of Anaxagoras who shared his doctrine of *Nous*. In the remainder of column i there will have been room for other Eleatics, Pythagoras and some of his followers, Xenophanes, Empedocles and Heraclitus, the Atomists and Socrates. A minimal list of these would leave space for four or five others.

Presumably the line preceding the first preserved line of column ii contained the name of Plato as founder of the Academy. My supplements in this column are of course *exempli gratia*, after the analogy of column i. Nobody will object to Speusippus, Xenocrates and Polemon in the straight line of succession of *archegoi* in the Old Academy, though after Polemon, Krates of Athens is omitted; also omitted is Crantor of Soli, named by most doxographers though he was never *archegos*. Arcesilaus is credited by Galen and Laertius with founding the Middle Academy; and Carneades is said by Galen (Lacydes by Laertius) to have begun the New Academy. The only *paragraphus* interrupting the sequence of Academics in our text, however, separates Arcesilaus and Carneades, and the list of Academics ends at line 12 with clear reference to the "Third Academy," whose founder is not specified. There is no sign of recognizing Philo of Larissa as head of a "fourth Academy" or Antiochus of Ascalon of a "fifth," to which Sextus Empiricus (*Pyr.* 1.220–21) says that "some" authorities attributed them; of such authorities we possess only Galen (*Phil. Hist.* 3.227). Ammon seems to know only three Academies, so that in line 7 I suggest μέσης (or δευτέρα) for Carneades. In line 9 Ammon makes his only error by misspelling Philo ΦΙΛΙΩΝ: surely Philo of Larissa is meant.

Line 11 might be of great interest if it could be confidently read. Traces of ink protruding into the left margin may represent the final letter of a line lost in col. i (cf. col. i 8) or the first letter of the line in col. ii. If the latter, an apparent ligature curves downward as if from *sigma* or *upsilon*, very doubtfully *epsilon* or *alpha*. The descending hasta of the second letter is characteristic in this hand only of *iota*, *rho*, *phi* and *psi*, but not *tau*. Of the final letter the surviving stroke would conform to *gamma*, *eta*, *iota* or *nu*. Professor Jean Bingen astutely suggests as a possibility ἐφ' ὧν ἀρχὴ γ[ίνεται] τρ[ί]της Ἀκαδημίας, "in whose hands was the governance of the Third Academy." This may be right, but is open to the objection that nowhere else does the list offer a verb or syntactical clause.

After another *paragraphus* we begin the Cynics. Line 14 hasn't room for Antisthenes, but Diogenes would fit the traces. Monimos of Syracuse is a name rarely met, though he is mentioned by Menander (fr. 215 K.) and taken seriously by Sextus Empiricus (*adv. Math.* 7.48, 88; 8.5). He is remembered by none of the doxographers in Diels' collection, but Diogenes Laertius (6.82 f.) cites Sosicrates to the effect that he was a pupil of

Diogenes the Cynic, and was once in service to a Corinthian banker until he feigned madness and was dismissed—whence no doubt Ammon's phrase ἀπὸ δουλίας. He is credited with two books *Περὶ ὀρμῶν* and a *Protrepticus*. Of Diels' doxographers only Epiphanius mentions Crates, next after Diogenes, where he is styled ἀπὸ Θηβῶν. This Crates was a teacher of Zeno the Stoic (D.L. 7.4), one of whose books was entitled *Κράτητος Απομνημονεύματα*.

To the Peripatetics Ammon gives rather short shrift. Theophrastus is identified not as Ἐρέσιος from his home city on Lesbos but as Ἴων, if I have read the line correctly. If Ammon thought of all Aegean islands as Ionian, one might have expected the more ordinary Ἰώνιος. He has omitted such notables as Lycon and Ariston but has included the less well known Praxiphanes of Rhodes. Diogenes Laertius (10.13) quotes Apollodorus' *Chronica* as saying that Praxiphanes was one of the teachers of Epicurus, though Epicurus denied it. At any rate, the only one of Diels' doxographers who mentions him is again Epiphanius, who gives precisely the same list of five Peripatetics in precisely the same order. Immediately afterward Epiphanius goes on to list Ζήνων ὁ Κιτιεὺς ὁ Στωικός, then a succession of seven other Stoics before arriving at Epicurus.

At line 23 we have a subtitle by which, with line 24, I am baffled. Zeno and the Stoics should come next, and only Στωικοὶ would seem to fit the space. But μες . [ seems to follow, and we might force the faint traces after that to yield a reading of the line as Στωικοὶ μέσσοι καὶ Κυνικοί—but this cannot be right, for we are hardly ready for the Middle Stoa, which should begin with Ariston of Chios. The only convincing word is Κυνικ(οί), and the Cynics are often associated with the Stoics; but we have had the Cynics already in lines 13–16. Moreover, the ἡνωρ of line 24 would seem to require Ζήνων, although his name would be unexpectedly indented, like that of Plato (in line 2) who we assumed had already been mentioned two lines before. To be sure, Zeno followed Critolaus in Epiphanius' diatribe, but only there; and Zeno can hardly be called a "middle Stoic."

Ammon's index breaks off with a puzzle. Equally puzzling is the source from which he derived it. Clearly he is following a doxographical tradition, but one differing at points from all the traditions attested in earlier and contemporary sources. In selection and order of names Epiphanius offers the closest parallel, though he does not designate the schools. Epiphanius became bishop of Constantia in Cyprus in 367, some 20 years after Ammon's attested activity, and is believed to have composed his *Panarion* 10 years still later. If Ammon were still alive then, he would have been very old; and in any case we could hardly imagine the proud *scholasticus* of Panopolis, scion of the rich and educated family of priests of the old gods,

to learn his Greek philosophers from a hostile Christian monk from Judaea. We may suspect that Ammon and Epiphanius drew their lists from a common source, one current in the third or early fourth century. While Epiphanius made use of his source to attack the Greek philosophical tradition, we may be sure that Ammon's sentiment in constructing and preserving his list was quite the opposite. It may, indeed, represent not an index extracted from a single contemporary doxography but rather his own effort to organize his recollections of the tradition he had acquired in a local school at Panopolis.

In the draft of a Cologne petition addressed to the *catholicus*,<sup>16</sup> Ammon the Scholasticus describes himself in the eloquent phrase ἡσυχίαν τοίνυν ἀπράγμονα τοῖς ἐν φιλοσοφίαι καὶ λόγοις ἀνηγμένοις πρέπειν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιστάμενος—"since I myself too know that a quiet life free from intrigue befits those educated in philosophy and rhetoric." In a letter at Duke, Ammon introduces himself to the *catholicus* with the same phrase. The hypomnematic list before us at least attests his private concern to keep the philosophers straight, and may indicate that his interest in philosophy was something more than the gilded phrase in his letter.

*Duke University*

<sup>16</sup> Browne, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 8) 193 and n. 32.

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with faint, mostly illegible traces of text.

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with faint, mostly illegible traces of text.

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with faint, mostly illegible traces of text.

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with faint, mostly illegible traces of text.

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with faint, mostly illegible traces of text.

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with faint, mostly illegible traces of text.

Fragmentary text in a cursive script, possibly from a manuscript. The text is arranged in several vertical columns, with some lines appearing to be part of a list or a series of entries. The script is dark and somewhat faded, making some characters difficult to discern. The fragments are located in the upper left, center, and lower center of the page.

Fragmentary text in a cursive script, possibly from a manuscript. The text is arranged in several vertical columns, with some lines appearing to be part of a list or a series of entries. The script is dark and somewhat faded, making some characters difficult to discern. The fragment is located in the lower right of the page.