

Volume 152

2024, fascicolo 1

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA

E DI ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA



*e bello dopo
il morire vivere.
anchora..*

2024

LOESCHER EDITORE
TORINO



0035 6220

PHILEMON'S GNOMIC LEGACY: POPYRI, STOBAEUS, AND BEYOND*

Abstract: The paper explores the presence of the comic poet Philemon in Stobaeus' *Anthology* by gathering and analyzing the available data and comparing them with other dramatic poets. The second part discusses Philemon's fragments attested both by Stobaeus and by the gnomonic papyri. These papyri are known to contain shared material with the *Anthology* and can be traced back to the same tradition. Lastly, the paper examines Philemon's quotations found in both Stobaeus and later gnomologia (14th-16th century), highlighting Stobaeus' centrality in later reception.

Keywords: Philemon; Stobaeus' *Anthology*; Papyri; Gnomologia.

The extraordinary amount of comic texts which survived sometimes only thanks to Stobaeus' *Anthology* has been often highlighted, as well as the chronological progression of the comic authors Stobaeus is interested in¹. He quotes very little material from old comedy (15 fragments of Aristophanes, no more than three from any other author), but his testimony is progressively more relevant for middle-comedy authors (10 fragments of Anaxandrides, 29 of Alexis, 51 of Antiphanes) and becomes crucial for new-comedy ones, given that Menander alone is represented by more than 350 attestations², being the most quoted dramatic author together with Euripides³. This progression is

* I am greatly indebted to Rosa Maria Piccione, with whom I extensively discussed these pages, and to Fausto Montana, whom I thank for their insightful thoughts.

¹ On Stobaeus as source of comic fragments see Nesselrath 2010 and 2014, Piccione 2019, Orth *forthcoming*. A survey on Menander's fragments in Stobaeus is in Millis 2020. Comic fragments are quoted following Kassel – Austin, *PCG* I-VIII, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1983-2001.

² Nevertheless, this account includes also the so-called *Menandri Sententiae*, which are not *stricto sensu* by Menander. See Pernigotti 2008.

³ It is worth pointing out that all calculations made on the material quoted by the *Anthology* have a margin of error. The collection in its trans-

no surprise: on the one hand, the simplicity of content and language that characterized new-comedy texts made them extremely suitable for the anthological and gnomological tradition; on the other hand, the ethical and everyday life concerns of new comedy and the frequent moralizing thoughts made it the perfect material for Stobaeus⁴.

This paper addresses the role of Stobaeus in the transmission of the comic poet Philemon⁵. The choice lies on a substantial datum: 46% of his fragments in the edition by Kassel–Austin⁶ come from Stobaeus' *Anthology*, that is, 92 out of 198 extant fragments, an impressive figure for its survival. These numbers make clear that the investigation of Stobaeus as source for Philemon is crucial for the study of the comic poet. It also might provide insights into Stobaeus himself, his methodology, and possibly his sources. Most interestingly, we shall see that several fragments quoted by Stobaeus are also transmitted by gnomonic papyri, which notoriously partake of common material as they can be traced back to the same tradition of the *Anthology*⁷.

The first part of the paper tackles Philemon's presence in Stobaeus' *Anthology*, collecting the available data and comparing them with other dramatic poets; the second part presents Philemon's fragments attested both by Stobaeus and by the gnomonic papyri; finally, the third part concerns Philemon's quotations shared by Stobaeus and later gnomologia (14th-16th cent.), showing the *Anthology*'s pivotal role in later reception.

mission was epitomized (Books 1-2) and probably also implemented with other material (Books 3-4). In addition to this, it is likely that in the copy individual eclogues were dropped, or even agglutinated with each other, due to the absence of the intermediate lemma. Thus, the numerical values are always indicative: they indicate above all a tendency with respect to the other authors in the collection. This consideration is valid also for the present investigation.

⁴ On comic moral authorities see Morgan 2007, 223-224. On Stobaeus' materials and working practice see e.g. Piccione 2003a, 241-253; 2004; 2010, 621-624, Piccione in *BNP* (last consulted on 29th March 2024) and, recently, Dorandi 2023, 115 and fn. 312.

⁵ On Philemon's transmission see Nesselrath 2010, 436; 2014, 676.

⁶ Kassel–Austin 1989, 221-317.

⁷ One of the characteristics of gnomonic anthologies (and anthologies in general) is that each one constitutes an autonomous product and a witness in its own right. They cannot be regarded as sources since they share common material and draw on the same tradition, but there is no vertical transmission, rather a horizontal contamination.

1. Philemon in the *Anthology*⁸

According to the purposes of the quoting work, the greatest majority of Philemon's fragments in Stobæus⁹ have a moralistic overtone¹⁰. This is also reflected in the length of the passages quoted: the common gnomic structure of one iambic trimeter (as the *Sententiae* attributed to Menander) or that of a distich of two iambic trimeters

⁸ The present work relies on the last available edition, namely that of Wachsmuth and Hense (1884-1912); the limits of this edition have been discussed e.g. in Piccione 1999, 172; with a focus on the Books 1 and 2 see now Dorandi 2023 (esp. 38-40, 112-142). In this last work, Tiziano Dorandi offers the prolegomena to a forthcoming edition of Books 1 and 2 of Stobæus' *Anthology*, foreseeing a textual arrangement quite different from the one Wachsmuth adopted. The most significant differences are the inclusion in the stemma of the *Ambrosianus* A 183 sup. (A), previously neglected (see pp. 44-45, 50-53), and the exclusion in the text of the *Anthology* of sections attested only in later (or much later) florilegia derived from the *Anthology* (as the ones in the section 3.2. of the present work); for an overview of this material, with a focus on sacred-profane gnomologia, see e.g. Odorico 2004, 61-46. Particularly, this concerns the *Florilegium Laurentianum* (L) and Photius, see Dorandi 2023, 39: «Wachsmuth completò inoltre, sulla falsariga di L, le sezioni 1–8 del cap. 31 di Stob. 1 (I 242, 21–247, 13) e reintegrò nella loro interezza i capitoli 15, 31, 33 e 46 di Stob. 2 (II 185–196, 199–257, 260–264) mancanti in F P», and later, p. 112: «La caratteristica principale e nello stesso tempo la più problematica e discutibile dell'edizione di Wachsmuth consiste proprio nel suo impegno costante di cercare di restaurare uno stato del testo di Stob. 1–2 che vada al di là di quello trasmesso da F P e che si avvicini fin dove possibile a quello originale». Dorandi's cut interests two fragments by Philemon, namely fr. 4 ap. Stob. 2, 15, 10, and fr. 103 ap. Stob. 2, 31, 17 Wachsmuth (on the second one, see further Dorandi 2023, 157). These will be pointed out in the following analysis and printed in single angle brackets (<nr.>). Regarding Books 3 and 4, the same problematic in the *constitutio textus* has been highlighted e.g. by Taormina – Piccione 2010, 38-41 (see also Dorandi 2023, 81-83). However, since a systematic revision of the edition by Hense (i.e. Books 3 and 4) has not yet been carried out, I will still rely on it in this work.

⁹ An overview of the fragments by Philemon in Stobæus confirms the statements of previous scholars on the impossibility to detect any first-hand material with regard to dramatic quotations (cf. e.g. Piccione 1994a, 186 fn. 1, Orth *forth.*). For a broader overview of Stobæus' materials and quoting techniques see fn. 4 above.

¹⁰ Out of 92 quoted fragments by Philemon, 67 of them have been identified as 'gnomic' in a 1973 paper by Fabrizio Conca.

are the most present in Philemon's fragments quoted by Stobaeus¹¹. One-liners are attested 20 times¹², while we find distichs 26 times¹³. The frequency is inversely proportional to the length of the fragments: we find 12 fragments of 3 lines¹⁴, 7 fragments of 4 lines¹⁵ and 8 of 5 lines¹⁶, up to a few quite extended quotations peaking with a 15-line one¹⁷.

Regarding how fragments are introduced, unsurprisingly Philemon's entries are no exception in the extensive variety of introductory lemmas one can observe for the other authors Stobaeus quotes. Specifically, and like other anthological works, most frequently the author's name appears in genitive with no indication of the title¹⁸. For Philemon this is the case in more than half of the total instances, namely 57 lemmas¹⁹, followed by the name in genitive and the title in genitive with 11 occurrences²⁰. Name and title in genitive intro-

¹¹ With a reference to Menander, Millis (2020, 660) identifies for some of them a role akin to 'conversational filler' or 'conversational building blocks' in the original comedy, although this aspect is not decisive for their confluence in anthologies.

¹² Philem. fr. 21, 24, 27, 85, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174.

¹³ Philem. fr. 2, 6, 22, 37, 39, 59, 60, 72, 77, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 196.

¹⁴ Philem. fr. 47, 75, 77, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 195.

¹⁵ Philem. fr. <4>, 6, 23, 109, 110, 111, 112.

¹⁶ Philem. fr. 9, 56, 68, 78, <103>, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108.

¹⁷ Philem. fr. 178. Stobaeus quotes up to 48 comic lines, as it is the case for Ar. *Nub.* 961-1008 *ap.* 2, 31, 12. For average extensions of comic quotations in Stobaeus and the peaks he reaches see Orth *forth.*

¹⁸ This figure is not to be taken as a *modus operandi* or *usus scribendi* on Stobaeus' side but can reflect a number of external situations that happened before, during or after the compilation of the *Anthology*, for instance a title missing in the source, or a title dropped due to epitomization. Moreover, as Piccione (2003b, 251) points out: «L'apposizione dei lemmi nei codici è sovente subordinata all'arbitrio dei copisti, che hanno abbreviato, mutilato, a volte sostituito, soprattutto in relazione alle necessità di spazio, o per reintroduzione di lemmi omessi accidentalmente». This important concept is also reflected in the gnomological papyri, as we see e.g. from PSI XV 1476 discussed *infra* at §2.1.

¹⁹ Φιλίμωνος; Philem. fr. 6, 77 (x2), 78, 92-100, <103>, 104-112, 116-117, 119-124, 135-149, 156, 161, 164-169, 172-173, 178. To these one should add three instances where the fragment is introduced by τοῦ αὐτοῦ, namely Philem. fr. 151, 162, 163.

²⁰ Φιλίμωνος + Tit. Gen., Philem. fr. 2, 22-24, 31, 37, 47, 59, 72, 75, 77.

duced by ἐκ follows²¹, as well as no lemma at all²², with 6 instances each²³. As anticipated, although this data aligns with the other poets quoted²⁴, it should not be read as a rational or intentional arrangement criterion on Stobæus' side. As Rosa Maria Piccione (1999, cf. 2003b) has shown, even if one tries to find a logic behind the use of an introductory lemma, a broader look shows a huge inconsistency that is implied by the sources' stratifications and by the anthological genre itself²⁵.

Concerning the representation of Philemon's fragments in the *Anthology* and his frequency in single sections, most of Philemon's quotations are found in the fourth Book. It gathers 48 fragments, some of which are quoted up to three times (this is the case of fr. 77)²⁶, for a total of 52 mentions²⁷. Book three preserves 28 fragments²⁸, being the second richest book among the four. The *Eclogae* have

²¹ Φιλήμονος ἐκ + Tit. Gen., Philem. fr. 10, 27, 39, 60, 74, 78.

²² No lemma, Philem. fr. 95, 157, 171, 174, 195, 196.

²³ Other, less attested, introductory lemmas are: Φιλήμονος + Tit. Dat. attested 4 times in Philem. fr. <4>, 9, 28, 56; Φιλήμονος + Tit. Nom. attested twice in Philem. fr. 6 and 68; Φιλήμονος ἐν + Tit. Dat. attested once in fr. 21; Φιλήμων ἐν + Tit. Dat. attested once in fr. 85; finally, ὁ Φιλήμων with no title is attested once in fr. 170.

²⁴ See Orth *forth.* Appendix 5 for comic quotations. A broader, across-genres lemmatic analysis in Stobæus is found in Piccione 1999.

²⁵ See now also Dorandi 2023, 127 ff. (on Books 1-2), with the warning at p. 129: «Il restauro dei lemmi qualora non siano più presenti o la loro valutazione qualora siano conservati, è pertanto uno dei problemi più gravi con il quale l'editore si trova confrontato».

²⁶ Applied to florilegia, this phenomenon is called 'dittography', see e.g. Piccione 1994a, 178 and fn. 3. In what follows, I shall signal each dittography with an asterisk. Dorandi (2023, 140-142) poses this issue in a more critical way, discussing the possible origins of such repetitions (the use of sources which independently quoted identical eclogues; a horizontal contamination, i.e. an interpolation; for Books 1 and 2, an addition of the excerptor who realized the epitome) and how the editor of Stobæus should deal with them (with a follow-up in the conclusions, p. 170).

²⁷ Philem. fr. 6* (Tit. 1x), 22 (Tit.), 27 (Tit.), 28 (Tit.), 31 (Tit.), 39 (Tit.), 47 (Tit.), 59 (Tit.), 68 (Tit.), 72 (Tit.), 74 (Tit.), 75 (Tit.), 77** (Tit. 1x), 78* (Tit. 1x), 85, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 105-109, 112, 117, 120-124, 143-149, 165-172, 196.

²⁸ Philem. fr. 2 (Tit.), 21 (Tit.), 23 (Tit.), 24 (Tit.), 37 (Tit.), 60 (Tit.), 93, 97, 99, 104, 110-111, 116, 119, 138-141, 151, 156-157, 162-164, 174, 178, 195.

lower numbers: 6 fragments are transmitted in Book one²⁹, while only 5 fragments are found in Book two³⁰. Once again, the distribution of Philemon extant fragments aligns with other dramatic poets' ones³¹. This figure can depend on the strong epitomization that the first two books have undergone³², but it mostly seems to reflect the topics of each book of the *Anthology*³³. Books 1 and 2 deal mainly with themes such as physics and metaphysics (Book 1) and logic and epistemology (Book 2), while the *Florilegium* is focused on practical ethics, with political and economic sections in Book 4. This last book, which is richest not only in Philemon's quotation but also generally in comic ones, addresses pivotal topics for new comedy, as family relationships. Marriage alone is given a large section, as well as children and parent-child relationships, and household administration. Moreover, several chapters address more general topics, such as health and poverty, wealth and sickness, happiness and unhappiness, good and bad luck³⁴. If one looks indeed which sections preserve the highest number of quotations of Philemon, 4, 44 ὅτι δὲ γενναίως φέρειν τὰ προσπίπτοντα ὄντας ἀνθρώπους καὶ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν ὀφείλοντας «That we must nobly endure our lot, being mortal men obliged to live by virtue»³⁵ bears ten quotations. The second richest sections are 4, 34 περὶ τοῦ βίου, ὅτι βραχὺς καὶ εὐτελής καὶ φροντίδων ἀνάμεστος, «On life, that is short and mean and full of worries» and 4, 35 περὶ λύπης, ὅτι λίαν μοχθηρὰ καὶ ἐπόδυνος τοῖς φροντίζουσιν, «On pain, that it is quite hateful and agonizing to those who think anxiously on it», both with 5 quotations.

Consecutive quotations attributed to one author, a controversial figure for poets as Euripides or Menander³⁶, are not substantial for

²⁹ Philem. frr. 9 (Tit.), 95*, 135, 136, 161, 173.

³⁰ Philem. frr. <4> (Tit.), 10 (Tit.), 56 (Tit.), <103>, 137.

³¹ For comedy, see Orth *forth.*; for Euripides, see Piccione 1994a, 178.

³² On which see Wachsmuth and Hense I, xv ff. and now Dorandi 2023, 21 ff., 41-42, *passim*. The epitomization of Books 1 and 2 mainly involved verse quotations.

³³ See Piccione 1994a, 178, Orth *forth.*

³⁴ For a closer overview on the contents see e.g. Piccione 2010, 624-625.

³⁵ Translations of section titles are from Searby 2011.

³⁶ See Piccione 1994a, 197, cf. 2003b, 250-253 and Piccione in *BNP* (last consulted on 29th March 2024). Euripides shows not only extended groups of consecutive quotations, but also a series of consecutive quota-

Philemon³⁷. Consecutive fragments are very seldom quoted with the title of the comedy (and the fact that they are mostly quoted only by Stobæus makes it difficult to assign them to any particular comedy). This means that even if the content of consecutive quotations is similar and could resemble a single block in the original, there is no way to prove it.

To sum up this overview, the statistics align with the general tendencies one can observe from other dramatic poets quoted in the *Anthology*. The length of the fragments reflects the gnomic interests of the source, being them most often quoted as *monosticha* or *disticha*. The lemmas' recurrence is similar to other poets' one and in line with the anthological habits. Even the distribution of Philemon in the *Anthology* as well as in single sections is no surprise, if one thinks about the chapters' contents.

2. The comparison with gnomic papyri

As anticipated, an interesting and peculiar figure for Philemon's fragments in Stobæus is that four of them are also attested by gnomic

tions from tragedies which seem to be quoted alphabetically. Even more interestingly, clusters from the same named tragedy are quoted in the original progression of verses. This has led some scholars (Bernhardt for Euripides, but similarly Görler for Menander) to think that, among the sources of the *Anthologium*, there was an alphabetical collection of *gnomai*, possibly derived from a complete edition of the tragedies or the comedies. Similar alphabetical collections are found on papyrus, not only for Euripides, but also for Menander. The idea of only one or two alphabetic *Ursammlung(en)* has been now proven to be oversimplistic: «Sia Bernhardt che Görler partono dall'idea di una raccolta statica e basata su procedimenti costitutivi lineari: grandi raccolte complete sarebbero il punto di partenza dell'opera, confezionata in base a principi coerenti fra di loro e che non avrebbe subito alterazione alcuna. Dubito fortemente che teorie monogenetiche possano risolvere il problema delle fonti dell'*Anthologion* di Stobeo» (Piccione 2003, 252).

³⁷ Bundles of consecutive quotations count up to three passages and are found in Book 3, for instance in 3, 2; 3, 18; 3, 20; 3, 29. We find an alphabetical sequence at 4, 19, where a single quotation (#8) plus a bundle of two (#21, 22) appear. The sequence is alphabetical, as the Euripidean titles are. However, they are separated by comic passages that do not follow a progressive alphabetical order. Therefore, it is more likely (with Piccione 1994a, 202-203) that an alphabetical Euripidean collection has been mixed with another collection of comic passages, more likely arranged *pro capita*, that is thematically.

papyri³⁸, which share common material with the *Anthology* that can be traced back to the same tradition³⁹. Even if the number is not gigantic, at least a couple of them show interesting features.

2.1. Philem. fr. 56 *ap.* Stob. 2, 8, 6 and PSI XV 1476 (= CPF 2.3, GNOM 54 Bastianini)

καὐτόν τι πράττειν· οὐ μόνον τὰς ἐλπίδας
ἐπὶ τῇ τύχῃ <χρῆ>, παιδίον, πάντως ἔχειν
ῶν βούλεται τις, ἀλλὰ καὐτόν τῇ τύχῃ
συλλαμβάνεσθαι· ῥῶνον ἢ τύχῃ ποιεῖ,
ἐὰν μεθ' ἐτέρου τοῦτο, μὴ μόνη, ποιῇ 5

1 καὐτόν Grotius 1623, 191 : καὶ τὸν P : (κ)αὶ τὸν F μόνον FP : μὲν οὖν Meineke in ed. Stob. (II [1864] p. cxcvi) 2 τύχῃ χρῆ, παιδίον Grotius : τύχῃ παιδίον Stob. :]η π[α]ιδιον Pap. πάντως Stob. : παν[Pap. : πάντων Meineke FCG IV p. 17 3 ἀλλὰ καὐτόν Herw. 1864, 37 : ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ Stob. : ἀλ[Pap. τῇ τύχῃ Grotius : τὴν τυχην Pap. : τῇ ψυχῇ Stob. 4 συλλαμβάνεσθαι Stob. P, συλλαβ- F : συνλ[α]μ[Pap. ῥῶνον Stob. (interpunctit Herw.) : βαιον· Pap. (frustra commendat F. Perusino) ποιεῖ Stob. : πο[[ι]ει· Pap : πονεῖ Wachsmuth, rec. Kassel – Austin 5 αν Pap. : καὶ ἐὰν Stob. P, ἐὰν sed καὶ in marg. F τοῦτο μὴ μόνη ποιῇ Stob. : τουτον η τυχη ποη Pap.

«Do something yourself too: with fortune surely one / mustn't have just hopes, my boy, for what one / wants, but must oneself collaborate / with fortune: fortune acts more easily / if it does it with another, not alone»⁴⁰.

³⁸ This material is now collected in CPF 2.2 (*Sentenze di autori noti e Chreiai*) and CPF 2.3 (*Gnomica*). This new editorial arrangement allows a more reasoned evaluation of these witnesses in relation to Stobaeus' *Anthology*, and it is of great relevance from a methodological point of view. For a framework see e.g. Pernigotti 2007 and Piccione in CPF 2.3.

³⁹ A similar investigation was conducted by Piccione (1994b) on Euripides, where she offers a cataloguing of Euripidean quotations on papyri, ostraca and wooden tablets: «Un'indagine accurata delle copiose testimonianze papiracee può tuttavia, a nostro avviso, essere d'ausilio per ampliare le nostre conoscenze e intravedere vestigia di raccolte anteriori a quelle di Stobaeo» (p. 282). On the relationship between anthologies survived on papyrus and Stobaeus, see further Piccione 2003a; 2010; 2017; 2019; Dorandi 2023, 94 and fn. 267.

⁴⁰ Transl. D. Konstan in Rusten 2011, 608, modified.

The fragment⁴¹ is quoted in the second Book of the *Anthology* (codd. FP), in the section περὶ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν «on things in our control». The section has forty-eight quotations, the first fourteen in verse, the rest in prose, according to the usual separation. Among the verse quotations, seven occurrences bear the title of the source work, including Philemon's fr. 56, from the *Pankratiastēs*. Another fragment by Philemon is quoted in this section (fr. 94), the only other passage by the playwright in this section, while the remaining comic quotations, five, are from Menander.

Philemon fr. 56 is also transmitted by the *verso* of PSI XV 1476⁴², a gnostic papyrus dated to half of the 2nd century AD⁴³. It consists of an anthology of poetic passages (with the possible only exception of a prose writer, an undetermined Potamon) grouped in thematic sections. The title of only one section is still legible, namely περὶ ἀρετῆς, «on virtue», but based on the content of the fragments quoted the other sections were likely «on wealth», «on fortune», and «on word». The excerpts preserved in the papyrus are by Euripides (quoted eight times), Aeschylus, Sophocles (whose only names survive), and Moschion for the tragedy; four quotations by Menander, two by Philemon and by Antiphanes respectively, one by Apollodorus for the comedy. The only titles quoted by the papyrus are those from Menander and, sometimes, Euripides, which can hint to a stronger circulation of these two authors, considered the gnostic ones *par excellence*. The anthology is a private copy, and it is quite unpolished; it contains many mistakes, both phonetical and morphological ones⁴⁴. Interestingly enough, the papyrus shows the lack of a uniform criterion in quoting passages. While the author's name almost always appears (in genitive), as I mentioned the titles are present only for Euripides and Menander, but sometimes the title appears without the author's name. The title appears sometimes with ἐκ + genitive, sometimes in the nomina-

⁴¹ The text printed above is that of Kassel – Austin VII (1989) (see *supra* fn. 1), as well as the apparatus criticus, slightly modified. The same structure is reproduced also for the following examples.

⁴² More precisely, the *verso* of two rolls previously assembled. The *recto* of both of them preserves documentary texts dated to the 1st AD.

⁴³ See Bastianini in CPF 2.3 pp. 376-388 with previous bibliography.

⁴⁴ See Bartoletti 1966, 2, Perusino 1978, 156, Bastianini in Bartoletti et al. 2008, 54, Bastianini in CPF 2.3 p. 378.

tive⁴⁵. The position of the author's name in the line also varies from time to time.

It is relevant to mention that several other excerpts from this papyrus are also found in Stobaeus. From fr. 1, the section «on richness», Eur. fr. 462 Kn. is also partly quoted by Stob. 4, 31, 1 in the section ἔπαινος πλούτου «praise of wealth», as well as in 4, 31b, 39 in the caput ὅσα πλοῦτος ποιεῖ διὰ τὴν τῶν πλείστων ἄνοιαν «all that wealth causes due to the folly of most people». From fr. 2, the section «on fortune», beside Philemon's fr. 56, Apollodorus' fr. 16 is also quoted by Stob. 3, 16, 2 in the section περὶ φειδωλίας «on stinginess», in a longer form of 4 lines instead of just one as in the papyrus. From fr. 4 (supposedly περὶ λόγου), Philem. fr. 94, 9-10 is also quoted by Stob. 4, 44, 24 in the section ὅτι δεῖ γενναίως φέρειν τὰ προσπίπτοντα κτλ. «that we must nobly endure our lot etc.» (see *infra*), again in a longer version of eleven lines instead of two; in the same papyrus' fragment, col. II, Euripides' fr. 140 Kn. is also attested by Stob. 2, 4, 7 in a section <περὶ λόγου καὶ γραμμάτων>⁴⁶ «on speech and letters».

A comparison of the text of fr. 56 as transmitted by Stobaeus and by the papyrus provides insightful clues. For the sake of clarity, the text of the papyrus (fr. 2 col. II 1-7) with Bastianini's supplements from Stobaeus follows⁴⁷:

[Φιλήμο]νος· [1 καὸτόν τι πρῶττειν· οὐ]
 [μόνο]ν τ[ᾶς ἐλ]π[ί]δας /² [ἐπὶ τῆ]
 [τύχη] δεῖ , π[α]ιδίον, πᾶν[τως ἔ]χειν] /

⁴⁵ Piccione 1994b, 296-298 recalls to the variety of introductory lemmas in this papyrus and compares the same situation for Stobaeus' work: «già anteriormente a Stobaeo si riscontra una varia caratterizzazione dei *lemmata* nell'ambito di uno stesso florilegio, e tale varietà [...] sembra riconducibile ad una vera e propria *polimorfia dei lemmata* delle fonti dell'*Anthologion*» (p. 298, italics in the original). See also Pernigotti 2007, 536-537.

⁴⁶ The title of the section is supplied by the editors from Photius and the *Florilegium Laurentianum*.

⁴⁷ For the text and the papyrological apparatus see CPF 2.3 p. 381. I print here a slightly revised transcription that the one in CPF which has a few misprints regarding the parenthesis, following the one in PSI XV (2008) 79 (= Bastianini in Bartoletti et al. 2008). For the papyrus see <http://www.psi-online.it/images/orig/PSI%20XV%201476%20r%20c-d.jpg> (last consulted on 29th March 2024).

³ ὄν βούλε[τ]αί τις, ἀλ[λὰ καὺτὸν]
 τῆ τύχη /⁴ συλλαμ[βάνεσθαι] 5
 βαίόν· ἢ τύχη ποεῖ, /⁵ ἐὰν μεθ' ἐ-
 τέρου τοῦτον ἢ τύχη ποῖ.

As anticipated, the first three lines are very fragmentary on the papyrus and are restored with Stobaeus, therefore they tell us little about the text the papyrus' scribe was copying⁴⁸. Line 4 is more interesting. Beside a phonetical error (συνλ[α]μ[instead of συλλαμβ-), we have two variants, ῥῶον in Stobaeus and βαίόν·, followed by interpunctuation, in the papyrus. The possibility of a paleographical error due to confusion of majuscule P/B generating two different readings cannot be ruled out, and ῥῶον (without punctuation) is probably to be preferred in the edition of Philemon⁴⁹ to avoid the absolute construction of ποιέω (without accusative or adverb), unattested in comedy⁵⁰. Nevertheless, βαίόν of the papyrus is a more ancient and

⁴⁸ As already noted from Perusino (1978, 157) onwards, at line 3 the papyrus confirms Grotius' correction of ψυχῆ in τύχη. Interestingly enough, the same exchange recurs repeatedly in this section, cf. #1 Philem. fr. 137 (τύχη Grotius : ψυχῆ FP), #3 Men. fr. 686 (τύχης Canter : ψυχῆς FP), #4 Eur. fr. 601, 3 Kn. (~ MS 462 Jä. = Perm., τύχη Men. : ψυχῆ FP), #5 Men. fr. 687 (τύχης Clericus : ψυχῆς FP), #17 Anaxim. FGrHist 72 F 31, 3 (ὄνομα <τῆς> τύχης Heeren : ὀνόματα ψυχῆς F : ὄνομα τύχης P), #18 Epandr. (τύχην Canter : ψυχῆν FP), #21 Diog. (τύχην Canter : ψυχῆν FP), #32 Plut. *Tranq. an.* 475d 7 (τύχην F : ψυχῆν P), #46 Iambli. (τύχην Canter : ψυχῆν FP).

⁴⁹ What to do in the edition of the papyrus is a different issue. Bastianini *l.c.* keeps βαίόν, although he points out in the apparatus criticus that Stobaeus' ῥῶον is to be preferred for Philemon («ῥῶον Stob. recte ut videtur»). This discrepancy is not unique to anthologies, and editing the text of the anthology is not the same as editing the text of the author included in the anthology. See e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 403-404, 406-407, 407a, 408-410, 413-423 in GNOM 3 Piccione (CPF 2.3 pp. 54-76). The passage from *Hippolytus* quoted in the papyrus presents numerous discrepancies—omissions and insertions of verses together with syntactic-linguistic variants—compared to the medieval tradition. Piccione (*l.c.*, esp. pp. 73-74) points out that such discrepancies are not mere traces of a bad tradition. Rather, the omissions seem to respond to a need for simplification, characteristic of the processes of reduction and adaptation. Sometimes the papyrus seems to bear witness to an intentional reworking, perhaps out of a need for adaptation to an anthological context.

⁵⁰ See Bruzzese 2011, 163 fn. 189.

refined word, attested in poetry and tragedy, the adverb being virtually absent from comedy⁵¹. Therefore, some scholars suggested that the alternative words could be not just an error of transcription, but two ancient variants of the text⁵². For the present analysis this point could hint that, despite the several texts that the papyrus has in common with Stobaeus, they drew from different sources⁵³. Rather different is the situation in Philemon's line 5 (line 7 in the papyrus), where the papyrus' reading is almost certainly due to inaccuracy: the repetition of ἡ τύχη here is redundant and it probably originated by dittography from the line above⁵⁴. It also probably caused the addition of the -v to the neuter τοῦτο (which we read in Stobaeus and is required by the syntax), possibly to avoid the hiatus⁵⁵.

⁵¹ The only occurrence was in adesp. com. fr. *299 Austin (= P. Ber. deperd. 2), which is not included in PCG 8 by Kassel – Austin, who identify it as a scholarly exercise. The line reads: ὅταν δὲ βαίον ἡ τύ[χ]η πταίση βίου | κτλ. The adjective registers few comic occurrences, on which see Orth 2015, 283.

⁵² Bartoletti 1966, 5 «varianti di notevole antichità», see also Perusino 1978, 157-158. Although Perusino *l.c.* tried to defend the reading βαίον over ῥᾶον, later editors did not support her view (see Kassel – Austin 1989, 255 and Bastianini in Bartoletti et al. 2008, 79) and preferred the second one. Although more prosaic, it is probably to be preferred both for the construction of the verse and for the style of Philemon's fragment. Although lines 2-3 seem to recall—as already spotted by Kassel – Austin *l.c.*—a tragic passage (Eur. fr. 432 Kn. αὐτός τι νῦν δρῶν εἶτα δαίμονας κάλει / τῷ γὰρ πονοῦντι καὶ θεὸς ξυλλαμβάνει), the style is otherwise quite flat and, as often, rich in repetitions.

⁵³ On the presence of variants suggesting the intrusion of different sources see Piccione 1994a, 203 fn. 4 on Euripidean quotations in Stobaeus: «Questo è, d'altro canto, quanto avviene nella letteratura florilegistica di età bizantina ed umanistica, dove le raccolte sono spesso assemblate ed integrate fra di loro, dando origine continuamente a nuove recensionii».

⁵⁴ As in the case of βαίον/ῥᾶον discussed above, the choice of the reading to print in the papyrus' edition is a different issue. Indeed Bastianini *l.c.* decides to preserve the repetition of ἡ τύχη, which is syntactically and linguistically unproblematic. He nevertheless expresses in the apparatus a preference for Stobaeus' variant («τοῦτο, μὴ μόνη, Stob. recte ut videtur»).

⁵⁵ See also Perusino 1978, 159. -ov terminations for neutral pronouns are attested already in Classical Greek and are also found in papyri, see e.g. Mayser 1906, 309-310 and Gignac II (1981) 174-175.

2.2. Philem. fr. 94 ap. Stob. 4, 44, 24 and PSI XV 1476 (= CPF 2.3, GNOM 54 Bastianini)

As already mentioned, the same papyrus preserves another excerpt by Philemon which is also found in Stobæus (4, 44, 24 ὅτι δεῖ γενναίως φέρειν τὰ προσπίπτοντα), namely fr. 94, 10-11. The text as transmitted by Stobæus follows:

μεῖζω τὰ κακὰ ποιοῦσι πολλοί, δέσποτα,
 αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς ἢ πέφυκε τῇ φύσει.
 οἷον τέθνηκεν υἱὸς ἢ μήτηρ τινὶ
 ἢ νῆ Δί' ἄλλων τῶν ἀναγκαίων γέ τις·
 ἂν μὲν λάβῃ τοῦτ' "ἀπέθαν', ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἦν," 5
 τοσοῦτο γέγονε τὸ κακὸν ἡλίκον περ ἦν,
 ἐὰν δ' "ἀβίωτος ὁ βίος, οὐκέτ' ὄψομαι,
 ἀπόλωλ'," ἐν ἑαυτῷ τοῦτ' ἐὰν σκοπῇ, κακὰ
 πρὸς τοῖς κακοῖσιν οὗτος ἕτερα συλλέγει.
 ὁ δὲ τῷ λογισμῷ πάντα παρ' ἑαυτῷ σκοπῶν 10
 τὸ κακὸν ἀφαιρεῖ, τὰγαθὸν δὲ λαμβάνει

2 αὐτοὺς A : αυ- S : αὐ- M 3 τέθνηκεν S : τεθη- M (v superscr. man. pr.) : τέθει- A 4 ἄλλων SMA : ἄλλος Richards 1909, 63 5 ἂν Meineke : εἰ SM : ὁ A λάβῃ SMA : λαλή Bentley ap. Meineke 1923, 553 : λέγει Blaydes 1896, 185 τοῦτ' SMA : τότ' Kock : οὕτως Edmonds ἀπέθαν' Grotius 1623, 453 : -εν SMA 6 τοσοῦτο Bentley : -ον SMA 7 δὲ SM : om. A 8 ἀπόλωλ' Jacobs 1809, 57 : -λεν SMA κακά ex vers. 9 fin. huc translit Jacobs 9 κακοῖσιν οὗτος Jacobs (preeunte Bentley) : -οῖς οὖ- SMA : -οῖς τοῖς οὖσιν Kock : -οῖς ὁ τοιοῦτος Hense συλλέγει κακά SMA 10 ἑαυτῷ SM : -οῦ A

«Many people make their troubles greater, master, all by themselves, than they naturally are. For example, someone's son or mother has died, or one of his other relatives, by Zeus. If he takes it as, "He's died; well, he was human", the trouble has stayed just the size it was. But if it's "Life's unlivable, I'll see no more, I'm destroyed" – if he considers this himself, he's gathering extra troubles on top of troubles. One who considers rationally all that rests with him subtracts the trouble and takes the good»⁵⁶.

The fragment is a speech of a servant addressing existential considerations to his master (see δέσποτα, line 1). Specifically, the

⁵⁶ Transl. D. Konstan in Rusten 2011, 614.

message is that men must surrender to the inevitable and try to react to the reality with the λογισμός, so as not to add grief to that which nature already provides (line 2) and try to make the best of life's events (line 11). Lines 10-11 are also attested in our papyrus (fr. 4, col. I 13-16)⁵⁷:

Φιλίμο]νος·
¹ ὁ δὲ τῷ [λογισ]μῷ πάντα παρ' ἑαυτῷ
 σκοπῶ[ν] /² [τὸ] κακὸν ἀφαιρ[εῖ],
 [τ]ἀγαθὸν [δὲ] λαμβάνει.]

— — —

The papyrus does not provide relevant textual differences. Notably, as it is for many excerpts in the same papyrus⁵⁸, Stobaeus has a longer version than the papyrus, that is 11 lines instead of just 2. Once more, this figure testifies to a circulation of materials of which both the *Anthology* and the gnomic papyrus are independent products. The cut of the two lines we read in the papyrus is not fortuitous, if one looks to the structure of the fragment as transmitted by Stobaeus. As already detected by Conca (1973, 142): «Il frammento comprende tre parti: la gnome iniziale (vv. 1-2), l'esemplificazione (vv. 3-9) e la gnome finale (vv. 10-11)». The final gnome shows syntactic and logical independence, which guaranteed its autonomous reuse (and survival) in a collection with gnomic interests, such as the one testified by the papyrus.

2.3. Philem. fr. 85 ap. Stob. 4, 15^b, 27 and P.Oxy. 2661 (= CPF 2.2, MS 23 Funghi – Martinelli)

A third example of shared material between Stobaeus and the gnomic tradition on papyrus concerns Philem. fr. 85, transmitted in the *Anthology* as *monostichon* in a sub-section περὶ γεωργίας ὅτι ἀγαθόν. εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον, «on agriculture, that it is good. To the contrary». The fragment reads:

ἀεὶ γεωργὸς εἰς νέωτα πλούσιος
 «A farmer's always rich next year»⁵⁹.

⁵⁷ See CPF 2.3 p. 386.

⁵⁸ See the list above at §2.1.

⁵⁹ Transl. D. Konstan in Rusten 2011, 612.

The same line, in a strongly fragmented status is also testified by P.Oxy. 2661, a gnostic papyrus dated 3rd century AD⁶⁰:

— — —

]I[

Ἀφόρητός ἐστι εὐτυχῶν μαστιγίας [Men. fr. 441 = MS *891Jäk. = Pern.]
 Ἄνηρ ὁ φεύγων καὶ πάλιν μαχήσεται [MS 56 Jäkel = Pernigotti]
 Ἄ μὴ προσή[κ]ε[ι μὴτ' ἄκουε μὴθ' ὄρα [MS 48 Jäkel = Pernigotti]
 Αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτ[ο- [MS *1033 Jäkel = Pernigotti] 5
 Ἄει γεωργὸς εἰς νέωτα πλούσιος [Philem. fr. 85 = MS *878 Jäk. = Pern.]
 Ἄνδρὸς χαρακ[τήρ] ἐκ λόγου γνωρίζεται [Men. fr. 72 = MS 27 Jäk. = Pern.]
 ...

This is a small papyrus fragment (7x12 cm) bearing 23 lines with *monostichoi gnomai*, of private or scholastic use. The order of the *gnomai* is alphabetical as regards the first letter until line 13, then follows a mixed order of initials (ΤΘΩΟΟΤΘΟΤ). The themes are varied, and authors are never mentioned by name. Identified authors include Menander, Philemon, Antiphanes, and Euripides. It is clear that this material has now lost any aspect of authorship and is cited not so much because of its author, but because of its sententious content, which makes it a consumable text and now completely independent from its original context⁶¹. In this sense, the present example suggests a channel of circulation of Philemon's gnostic one-liners similar to the one better attested for Menander, namely collections of maxims and sayings as scholarly exercises⁶².

2.4. Philem. fr. 93 ap. Stob. 3, 2, 26, P.Stras. W.G. 306 and P.Cair. 56226

One last example, yet an interesting one. Philemon's fr. 93 discusses a difference between human beings and animals: while the latter group has one τῶπος, one nature, per kind, men are all different and each one has his character.

⁶⁰ See CPF 2.2 pp. 180-184.

⁶¹ On this material, see the preface by Funghi in CPF 2.2.

⁶² See Morgan 1998 (esp. 120-151), Cribiore 1996 and 2001, Bastianini 2003. Morgan (1998, 279-281) registers over sixty gnostic ^{texts} connected to school hands from the 3rd BC to the 7th-8th AD. With a focus on Menander, see Nervegna 2013, 201-211, who stresses that «both maxims and longer poetic excerpts found their way into anthologies as early as the Classical period», as it is also testified e.g. by Pl. *Leg.* 810e-12a, *Isocr. Nic.* 44.

τί ποθ' ὁ Προμηθεύς, ὃν λέγους' ἡμᾶς πλάσαι
 καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα ζῶα, τοῖς μὲν θηρίοις
 ἔδωχ' ἑκάστω κατὰ γένη φύσιν μίαν;
 ἅπαντες οἱ λέοντές εἰσιν ἄλκιμοι,
 δειλοὶ πάλιν ἐξῆς πάντες εἰσὶν οἱ λαγοί· 5
 οὐκ ἔστ' ἀλώπηξ ἢ μὲν εἴρων τῆι φύσει
 ἢ δ' αὐθέκαστος, ἀλλ' ἐὰν τρισμυρίας
 ἀλώπεκάς τις συναγάγη, μίαν φύσιν
 ἀπαξαπασῶν ὄψεται τρόπον θ' ἓνα.
 ἡμῶν δ' ὅσα καὶ τὰ σώματ' ἐστὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν 10
 καθ' ἑνός, τοσοῦτους ἔστι καὶ τρόπους ἰδεῖν

1 ποθ' ὁ Pap. Stras., Niceph. :]το Pap. Cair. : ποτ' ὁ Stob. M^d Br : ποτε
 ὁ A : δὴ ποτε ὁ Mac. λέγουσ' Stob. Br, Niceph. : -σιν Pap. Cair., Stob.
 M^d A, Mac. : λέγου[Pap. Stras. 3 ἔδωχ' Niceph. : -κε Pap. : -κ' Stob.
 Br : -κεν Mac. : -κε δ' M^d : -κ (superscr. α) A γένη Pap. : γένος Stob.,
 : Niceph. φύσιν μια[ν Pap. : μίαν φύσιν Stob., Niceph. 5 ἐξῆς Stob.,
 Niceph. : εἰσιν (superscr. εξῆς) Pap. πάντες εἰσὶν Stob. M^d A Mac.,
 Pap. : εἰσὶ(ν) πάντες Stob. Br, Niceph. λαγοί Stob. M^d, Niceph., λαγοί
 Pap. : -οῖ Stob. ABr Mac. : -ὦ Meineke 8 συναγάγη Stob. A Mac., -η[
 Pap. : -οι M^d Br 9 ἀπαξαπασῶν Stob. Mac., -απα[.]ν Pap. : -άπασιν
 A : ἄπαξ ἄπασιν M^d : ἐξ ἀπασῶν Br 11 καθ' ἑνός Stob. Br Mac.,
 καθενος M^d A :]ν[Pap. : καθ' ἓνα Meineke (prob. Richards 1909, 70)
 καὶ τοὺς τρόπους Br

«Why ever did Prometheus, who they said fashioned us and all other creatures, give animals a single nature each according to their kinds? / All lions are brave all hares in turn are cowardly. One fox isn't craftly by nature while another's aboveboard: no, if somebody collects 30 thousand foxes, he'll see one nature, one temperament in every one of them. With us, however, one can see as many temperaments as we have individual bodies in number»⁶³.

The fragment is quoted by Stobaeus 3, 2, 26 in the section περὶ κακίας in the third Book of the *Anthology*⁶⁴. The connecting element with the theme discussed in the section resides in the figure of Prometheus: he is responsible for distributing such different temperaments and characters to humans, unlike what he did with animals; indeed, this variety seems to be treated as an element of man's dis-

⁶³ Transl. D. Konstan in Rusten 2011, 613-614.

⁶⁴ Immediately before fr. 93, Philemon's fr. 2 and 195 are cited.

advantage over beasts. The 11 lines available are also preserved by a papyrus (P.Stras. W.G. 306v col. II), belonging to the Strasbourg collection and first edited by Snell⁶⁵. Dated at the latest to 2nd-1st BC⁶⁶, it is the earliest evidence of Philemon's text overall. The papyrus is of cartonnage provenance and presents a Hellenistic anthology on the *verso* of what Snell renamed «der Tragödienliederpapyrus»: the *recto* in fact preserves excerpts from Euripides' *Phoenician Women* and *Medea* and a number of tragic *adespota*⁶⁷.

It is unclear whether we are dealing with a gnostic papyrus⁶⁸. Francisca Pordomingo includes it in the section «miscelâneas»⁶⁹, while LDAB 1051 has it as «anthology»⁷⁰. The papyrus has been excluded from the collection of *gnomica* in CPF 2.3, not without hesitation on the editors' side⁷¹. To this uncertainty contributes the quotation by Philemon, present elsewhere in the gnostic tradition: not only is the fragment quoted by Stobæus, but the first five lines are also found in Nicephorus Gregoras⁷² (who attributes them to Euripides) and by a papyrus from the Archive of Zenon (currently preserved in Cairo)⁷³, a school exercise dated to the 1st century AD⁷⁴. This latter papyrus

⁶⁵ Snell 1937, 90, cf. MP³ 1340 (http://www.cedopalmp3.uliege.be/cdp_MP3_display.aspx?numNot=01340.000, last consulted on 29th March 2024), Austin 1973, 198, Pordomingo 2013, 217-219.

⁶⁶ See Pordomingo 2013, 218, who also collects previous scholars' opinions.

⁶⁷ See more recently Fassino 1999.

⁶⁸ Guidelines for the identification of these materials are proposed e.g. by Pernigotti 2007 and Piccione in CPF 2.3.

⁶⁹ Pordomingo 2013, 31.

⁷⁰ <https://www.trismegistos.org/text/59939>.

⁷¹ See Piccione in CPF 2.3 pp. 19, 427.

⁷² In *Synes. De insomn.* p. 404a.

⁷³ P.Cair. Zen. 56226 = Criatore 184 = GNOM 19. Pernigotti in CPF 2.3 p. 141, commenting on this excerpt, rightly notes the exceptionality of the recurrence of a mythological character (i.e. Prometheus) in the gnostic tradition, usually reluctant to recall the myth: «Anche se non è dato sapere quanto del testo a noi noto fosse presente nel papiro è comunque interessante notare come la figura di Prometeo godesse di una discreta fortuna nella tradizione gnomologica, di solito restia a richiamarsi al mito: i casi noti traggono origine da versi comici che facevano riferimento al ruolo decisivo svolto dal titano come *medium* fra mondo divino ed umano e come responsabile dell'esistenza della donna, obiettivo *par excellence* della polemica moralistica». See e.g. P.LugdBat. XXV 16 (= Criatore 305).

⁷⁴ See Criatore 1996, 216-217 #184. On the likely circulation of Phi-

preserves only the first line of the fragment by Philemon, followed by a blank space⁷⁵.

As regards the Strasbourg papyrus, the text is severely damaged and therefore the editors made massive use of Stobaeus to supplement it (particularly in lines 6-9, 11, where sometimes just a few letters survive)⁷⁶. Where a comparison is possible, the differences are of little or no relevance⁷⁷. Snell (1937, 90) distinguished after line 11 the shadow of a *paragraphos* no longer distinctly visible, indicating the conclusion of one text before the beginning of the next. Since line 11 corresponds to the end of the pericope also quoted by Stobaeus, it can be assumed that the fragment was circulating, due to its philosophical or gnomic nature, in the portion of the text that we read now as early as antiquity⁷⁸.

lemon in school exercises see also the previous example (§2.3.). For the possibility that this text circulated also on ostraca, again of school provenance, see Funghi 2003, 7-8 and fn. 16 (= adesp. com. fr. 1047-1048).

⁷⁵ However, Pernigotti in CPF 2.3 p. 142 is cautious about the actual original extent of the citation: «[...] il modo in cui è occupato lo spazio del foglio di pap. impone qualche riflessione: ciò che si legge mostra che chi ha vergato il testo è andato a capo a metà del primo trimetro, ma se il frammento fosse riportato nella sua interezza dovremmo aspettarci che, seguendo lo stesso criterio, ciò che sappiamo mancare seguendo il confronto con Stobaeo fosse riportato subito sotto, secondo la medesima mise en page. Delle due l'una: o si è cambiato criterio, si è proseguito sul secondo rigo e ciò che è riportato è perso in lacuna a destra, oppure è stato riportato solo il primo rigo».

⁷⁶ See now Pordomingo 2013, 219.

⁷⁷ The discrepancies listed in the apparatus regarding the elisions and the aspirations of vowels are not relevant for the transmitted text: the use of elision as well as the use of aspiration are strictly linked to and depending on the scribe. So while in line 1 the papyrus seems to show more refinement, in line 3 both the papyrus and Stobaeus show inconsistencies (the former does not elide, and the latter does not aspirate). In line 3 they present two variants in word order: the papyrus has φουσιν μίαν, while Stobaeus (and consequently Nicephorus) has the normalized form μίαν φύσιν. Both variants are metrically equipollent. Philemon's editors print the papyrus version out of a spirit of variation from what we read in line 8, which again has μίαν φύσιν. In line 5 there is another inversion, on the one hand πάντες εἰσίν (of Stob. M^d A Mac. and the papyrus), on the other εἰσίν πάντες (of Stob. Br and consequently Nicephorus), again a metrically equivalent normalization. In lines 9-11 the papyrus is too ragged to provide a term of comparison.

⁷⁸ Prominent among the few other fragments of Philemon cited on pa-

3. Gnostic collections

Not on papyrus, but from Byzantine and post-Byzantine florilegia (14th-16th cent.)⁷⁹, two more examples of material shared by Stobaeus and the anthological tradition stand out. The two cases differ from the ones on papyri in that we can say with a higher degree of certainty that they drew from Stobaeus' *Anthology* more likely than sharing common sources. This is surely the case for the second example.

3.1. Philem. fr. 166 ap. Stob. 4, 22b, 42 and ms. *Par. Graec.* 1630, f. 189v.

Philemon fr. 166 consists of a single liner about marriage, the most widespread topic in gnostic collections:

τὸν †μόνον ὄντα καὶ κακὴ τύχη τρέφει

τὸν μόνον Stob. : καὶ μόνον *Par. Graec.* 1630, 189v. : τὸν δὲ μόνον Gesner : τὸν ἄγαμον Hense

«Even bad luck supports a man † who's single»⁸⁰.

The fragment is quoted by Stobaeus in the section ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαθὸν τὸ γαμεῖν, «that is not good to marry», and in a gnostic collection printed in the *Anecdota Graeca* vol. 1 by Boissonade and preserved by the manuscript *Par. Graec.* 1630, f. 189v, (14th cent.)⁸¹. The fragment is attributed to Hesiod, as the six quotations which precede it, all introduced by τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Although the first four are Hesiodic quotations, the last two are a fragment by Euripides (fr. 701 Kn., also transmitted as MS 463 Jäkel = Pernigotti, and twice in Stobaeus) and a line from Philemon. Stobaeus also has the fragment as one liner. The two texts differ in the incipit: Stobaeus reads τὸν μόνον, while the byzantine florilegium has καὶ μόνον. Both of them are corrupted

papyrus that are not matched in Stobaeus are frr. 91, 128, and 129, all three of which are attested by P.Harr. 170 (= CFP 2.3 pp. 180-186, GNOM 27), a gnomology of comic texts dated to the 2nd century CE. In the first case, the fragment is introduced with the title (Χήρα[ι], «The widow»).

⁷⁹ On which see above fn. 8. See moreover Piccione 2004.

⁸⁰ Transl. D. Konstan in Rusten 2011, 624.

⁸¹ For a list of contents see Omont II (1888) 109-112. See also Tziatzi-Papagianni 1994, 68-73 and Pernigotti 2008, 75.

for the metre, since in each one a syllable is missing. Modern editors have tentatively tried to supply it (see the apparatus above), but it is ultimately impossible to emend it with certainty.

3.2. Philem. fr. 97 ap. Stob. 3, 9, 21 and *Corpus Parisinus* 597 Elter = 44 [1191] Searby

My last example is Philemon, fr. 97, eight lines quoted by Stobaeus in the third Book (3, 9, 21) in a section «on justice» (περὶ δικαιοσύνης), following another fragment by Philemon (fr. 60)⁸².

ἀνὴρ δίκαιός ἐστιν οὐχ ὁ μὴ ἀδικῶν,
 ἀλλ' ὅστις ἀδικεῖν δυνάμενος μὴ βούλεται·
 οὐδ' ὃς τὰ μικρὰ λαμβάνειν ἀπέσχετο,
 ἀλλ' ὃς τὰ μεγάλα καρτερεῖ μὴ λαμβάνων,
 ἔχειν δυνάμενος καὶ κρατεῖν ἀζημίως· (5)
 οὐδ' ὅς γε ταῦτα πάντα διατηρεῖ μόνον,
 ἀλλ' ὅστις ἄδολον γνησίαν τ' ἔχων φύσιν
 εἶναι δίκαιος κοῦ δοκεῖν εἶναι θέλει

1 ἀδικῶν Stob. : -εῖν MS 2 μὴ SM^d Br, corp. Par. : οὐ A, MS βού-
 ληται Br, var. lect. in MS 3 ἀπέσχετο A ex. corr. : ὑπ- SM^d Br 6
 διατηρεῖ μόνον Grotius : διαθηρώμενος SM^dA Br : γρ. διατηρεῖ μόνως
 A2 in marg. : -εῖ νόμφ Buecheler ap. Hense

«The just man's not the one who does no injustice, but the one who, able to do an injustice, doesn't wish to; nor is he the one who's refrained from taking little, but the one who persists in not taking much though able to have and conquer with impunity; nor is he the one indeed who only observes all this, but the one who has a guileless and genuine nature and wishes to be just, not just seem to be»⁸³.

The sentence at lines 1-2 is also quoted by *Corpus Parisinum* 597 Elter = 44 [1191] Searby⁸⁴, the gnomological section of cod. *Par. gr.* 1168 (14th cent.) [P] that, together with *Bodl. Digby* 6 (16th cent.) [D], consists of 565 Christian quotations and more than 1100 pagan ones. The fragment is quoted in a section of the *CP* gathering extracts from

⁸² Therefore, the excerpt is introduced by the lemma τοῦ αὐτοῦ in cod. S, while MA have the lemma Φιλήμωνος.

⁸³ Transl. D. Konstan in Rusten 2011, 615.

⁸⁴ See Searby 2007 and the useful review of the book by Dorandi 2007.

the *Florilegium* of Stobæus⁸⁵. As Searby (2007, 10) points out: «Unlike the preceding section, these excerpts are arranged thematically with approximately the same headings as in the chapters of Stobæus from which they are taken». The manuscript not only reproduces some of the fragments from the *Florilegium*, but it also borrows the titles of the sections. In the present case as well, the *CP*'s section quoting the passage by Philemon is named *περὶ δικαιοσύνης*, as Stobæus' one. Nevertheless, the compiler seemed to work inconsistently; he more or less follows the chapter sequence in Stobæus but can suddenly break off and revert to earlier chapters.

The interest of the gnomological tradition in the 2 lines is also testified by the fact that they also flew into the so-called *Menandri Sententiae* (MS 37-38 Jäkel = Pernigotti). The text we read in Stobæus is overall a good one, compared to that of the *monostichon* (see the apparatus above). At line 1, MS has the infinitive *ἀδικεῖν*, whereas the participle is preferred. In line 2 the subjective negation *μή* of Stob. and the *CP* has the advantage of avoiding the hiatus *ὁ οὐ ἄ-*. In the same verse, *βούλεται* is attested in the subjunctive (*βούληται*) by Stobæus' Br and as a *varia lectio* in MS, even though there is no need for a subjunctive, since all other verbs are in the indicative.

4. Conclusions

This paper has offered an overview of the comic poet Philemon's transmission in Stobæus and the gnomic tradition. While data and statistics of Philemon's presence in the *Anthology* align with other dramatic poets' ones, the gnomic papyri offer interesting insights into Stobæus' sources and, more generally, into the circulation of gnomonic material. Although each one of the analyzed papyri is an independent product and none of the them can be identified as a direct source for Stobæus (as different textual cuts [§ 2.2.] or the presence of variants [§ 2.1.] suggest), they nonetheless testify to the circulation of the same material (§§ 2.1.-2.4.), sometimes of the same length (§ 2.4.), and to its use by the gnomonic tradition. They also hint at a presence of

⁸⁵ The one Searby classifies as C4, consisting of 214 excerpts. For the relationships between the *CP* and Stobæus see Searby 2007, 80-83.

⁸⁶ Similar considerations on Menander are in Millis 2020, 652.

Philemon in collections that are configured as school exercises (§§ 2.3., 2.4.). Overall, the text we read in Stobaeus' manuscripts is valuable, as we see in the case of variants (§ 2.1.) and morphological and syntactic care⁸⁶. While the papyri provide an insight into the sources, the gnomic anthologies (§§ 3.1., 3.2.) testify to the reception and the pre-eminent position of the *Anthology* in the following centuries.

Virginia Mastellari

Bibliography

- Austin 1973 = C. Austin, *Comicorum graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 1973.
- Bartoletti 1966 = V. Bartoletti, *Frammenti di un florilegio gnomologico in un papiro fiorentino*, in *Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (Milano 2-8 settembre 1965)*, Milano 1966, 1-14.
- Bartoletti et al. 2008 = V. Bartoletti et al., *Papiri greci e latini*, volume 15 (nrr. 1453–1547), Firenze 2008.
- Bastianini 2003 = G. Bastianini, *Testi gnomici di ambito scolastico*, in *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, I, a cura di M. S. Funghi, Firenze 2003, 167-175.
- Bruzzese 2011 = L. Bruzzese, *Studi su Filemone comico*, Lecce 2011.
- Conca 1973 = F. Conca, *Ricerche sulle gnomai in Filemone*, «Acme» 26.2, 1973, 129-166.
- CPF 2.2 = *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini*. Parte II.2: *Sentenze di Autori Noti e «Chreiai»*, Firenze 2015.
- CPF 2.3 = *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini*. Parte II.3: *Gnomica*, Firenze 2017.
- Cribiore 1996 = R. Cribiore, *Writing, teachers, and students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta 1996.
- Cribiore 2001 = R. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the mind. Greek education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton-Oxford 2001.
- Dorandi 2007 = T. Dorandi, review of Searby 2007, «Elenchos» 28.2, 2007, 482-486.
- Dorandi 2023 = T. Dorandi, *Stobeana. Tradizione manoscritta e storia del testo dei primi due libri dell'Antologia di Giovanni Stobeo*, Baden Baden 2023.
- Fassino 1999 = M. Fassino, *Revisione di P. Stras. W.G. 304–307: Nuovi frammenti dalla Medea e di un'altra tragedia di Euripide*, «ZPE» 127, 1999, 1-46.
- Funghi 2003 = M. S. Funghi, *Tipologie delle raccolte papiracee dei Mo-*

- nostici: vecchie e nuove testimonianze*, in *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, I, a cura di M. S. Funghi, Firenze 2003, 3-20.
- Gignac 1981 = F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*, Vol. II: Morphology, Milano 1981.
- LDAB = Leuven Database of Ancient Books, Leuven (<https://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/>)
- Kassel – Austin 1989 = R. Kassel – C. Austin, *Poetae comici graeci VII*, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 1989.
- Mayser 1906 = E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, Leipzig 1906.
- Millis 2020 = B. W. Millis, *Fragments of Menander in Stobaeus*, in *Fragmentation in ancient Greek drama*, edited by A. A. Lamari – F. Montanari – A. Novokhatko, Berlin-Boston 2020, 647-661.
- Morgan 1998 = T. Morgan, *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman world*, Cambridge 1998.
- Morgan 2007 = T. Morgan, *Popular morality in the early Roman empire*, Cambridge 2007.
- Nervegna 2013 = S. Nervegna, *Menander in antiquity. The contexts of reception*, Cambridge 2013.
- Nesselrath 2010 = H.-G. Nesselrath, *Comic fragments: Transmission and textual criticism*, in *Brill's companion to the study of Greek comedy*, edited by G. W. Dobrov, Leiden-Boston 2010, 423-453.
- Nesselrath 2014 = H.-G. Nesselrath, *Later Greek comedy in later antiquity*, in *The Oxford handbook of Greek and Roman comedy*, edited by M. Fontaine – A. C. Scafuro, Oxford 2014, 667-679.
- Odorico 2004 = P. Odorico, *Gli gnomologi greci sacro-profani. Una presentazione*, in *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, II, a cura di M. S. Funghi, Firenze 2004, 61-96.
- Omont 1888 = H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres bibliothèques de Paris et des départements*, 2e partie, Paris 1888.
- Orth 2015 = C. Orth, *Nikochares - Xenophon: Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (FrC 9.3), Heidelberg 2015.
- Orth forthcoming = C. Orth, *Comic quotations in Stobaeus*, in *Treasuries of literature: anthologies, lexica, scholia and the indirect tradition of classical texts in the Greek world*, edited by F. Favi – V. Mastellari, Berlin-Boston forthcoming.
- Pernigotti 2007 = C. Pernigotti, *Antologie gnomologiche su papiro: materiali per una nuova analisi del problema*, in *Akten des 23. Internationalen Papyrologen-Kongresses*, hrsg. von B. Palme, Wien 2007, 535-539.
- Pernigotti 2008 = C. Pernigotti, *Menandri Sententiae*, Firenze 2008.
- Perusino 1978 = F. Perusino, *Un frammento di Filemone in un papiro fiorentino*, «QUCC» 27, 1978, 155-159.

- Piccione 1994a = R. M. Piccione, *Sulle citazioni euripidee in Stobeeo e sulla struttura dell'Anthologion*, «RFIC» 122, 1994, 188-216.
- Piccione 1994b = R. M. Piccione, *Sulle fonti e le metodologie compilative di Stobeeo*, «Eikasmós» 5, 1994, 281-317.
- Piccione 1999 = R. M. Piccione, *Caratterizzazione di lemmi nell'Anthologion di Giovanni Stobeeo. Questioni di metodo*, «RFIC» 127, 1999, 139-175.
- Piccione 2003a = R. M. Piccione, *Le raccolte di Stobeeo e Orione: fonti, modelli, architetture*, in *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, I, a cura di M. S. Funghi, Firenze 2003, 241-261.
- Piccione 2003b = R. M. Piccione, *Scegliere, raccogliere e ordinare. La letteratura di raccolta e la trasmissione del sapere*, in *Bisanzio tra storia e letteratura*, a cura di E. V. Maltese, Brescia 2003, 44-63.
- Piccione 2004 = R. M. Piccione, *Forme di trasmissione della letteratura di raccolta*, in *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, II, a cura di M. S. Funghi, Firenze 2004, 403-441.
- Piccione 2010 = R. M. Piccione, *Materiali, scelte tematiche e criteri di ordinamento nell'Anthologion di Giovanni Stobeeo*, in *Condensing texts – Condensed texts*, edited by M. Horster – C. Reitz, Stuttgart 2010, 619-647.
- Piccione 2017 = R. M. Piccione, *Sentenze, antologie gnomiche e gnomologi*, in CPF 2.3, 3-24.
- Piccione 2019 = R. M. Piccione, *Stobaeus, John*, in *The encyclopedia of Greek comedy*, edited by A. H. Sommerstein, Hoboken 2019, 906.
- Pordomingo 2013 = F. Pordomingo, *Antologías de época helenística en papiro*, Firenze 2013.
- Rusten 2011 = J. Rusten (edited by), *The birth of comedy: texts, documents, and art from Athenian comic competitions*, 486-280, Baltimore 2011.
- Searby 2007 = D. M. Searby, *The Corpus Parisinum: A critical edition of the Greek text with commentary and English translation. (A medieval anthology of Greek texts from the pre-Socratics to the Church Fathers, 600 B.C.-700 A.-D.)*, Lewiston-Queenston-Lampeter 2007.
- Searby 2011 = D. M. Searby, *The intertitles in Stobaeus: condensing a culture*, in *Thinking through excerpts: studies on Stobaeus*, edited by G. Reydam-Schils, Turnhout 2011, 23-70.
- Snell 1937 = B. Snell, *Euripides Alexandros und andere Straßburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischen Dichter*, Berlin 1937.
- Taormina – Piccione 2010 = D. P. Taormina – R. M. Piccione, *Giamblico. I frammenti dalle Epistole. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*, Napoli 2010.
- Tziatzi-Papagianni 1994 = M. Tziatzi-Papagianni, *Die Sprüche der Sieben Weisen. Zwei byzantinische Sammlungen. Einleitung, Text, Testimonien und Kommentar*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994.

Wachsmuth – Hense 1884-1912 = *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologiae libri duo priores*, I-II, ed. C. Wachsmuth, Berolini 1884; *Libri duo posteriores*, III-V, ed. O. Hense, Berolini 1894 (III), 1909 (IV), 1912 (V).