

Two notes on the “Vita Socratis” – Oxford disegni and PHerc. 495 frg. 2 col. II/frg. 1 O Giuliano

Some questions related to the Oxford disegni of PHerc. 495 and in particular the nature of a remarkable “mini-libretto” included among the disegni are discussed. Furthermore, fragment 1 O, which, according to the editor, is only preserved in an Oxford disegno, represents actually not a separate fragment (disegno), but is identical to frg. 2 col. II.

Amongst the Herculanean papyri there are some scanty remains of two rolls (PHerc. 495 and PHerc. 558) which supposedly come from a “Life of Socrates”, possibly including a history of his “school”.¹ The editor princeps Crönert (1902) tentatively assigned the papyri to Philodemus’ σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων and assumed that both papyri originated from the same scroll.² Subsequently, scholars rejected this view, on the grounds that the two papyri showed different hands and colours. The papyri clearly derive from different rolls, albeit not (necessarily) from two different works.³ For decades no one carried out any in-depth work on these fragments, which led Erler (1994) to state: “Eine Neuausgabe steht noch aus”.⁴ Finally, in 2001 Fabio Massimo Giuliano provided a new comprehensive edition of the “Vita Socratis” (PHerc. 495 and 558).⁵ He clarified several points of interest. In particular, he argued that PHerc. 558 which contains some chapter headings was not a second copy of the work in a strict sense, but a draft version, and that PHerc. 495 represented the final version.⁶ He compared the relationship between these two papyri to that of PHerc. 1691/1021 and PHerc. 164. The latter papyrus contains the final version, while the former includes the draft version of Philodemus’ *Index Academicorum*.⁷ Giuliano comes up with good arguments for his hypothesis, but some doubts about the exact nature of the papyri and their relationship remain.

The possibility that we might have two versions of two separate books of the σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων (*Index Academicorum* and *Vita Socratis*) leads me to tentatively suggest that the draft versions of all or at least some other books of the σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων were to be found in the library of the Villa dei Papiri along with the final versions. Regarding the hundreds of not yet unrolled papyri in the collection, a future discovery of more draft-final version pairs is possible and could provide some valuable insights into the process of writing and drafting an ancient book.

* I would like to thank Holger Essler, Graziano Ranocchia and Francesca Longo Auricchio for their advice.

¹ To be precise, PHerc. 495 has only been partially unrolled. Nowadays, there exists an almost entire not unrolled scroll labelled 495 which, however, seems to have been written by another hand and has accordingly no relation to PHerc. 495. For a discussion see I Bukreeva et al., Virtual unrolling and deciphering of Herculanean papyri by X-ray phase-contrast tomography, in: *Scientific Reports* 6, 27227 (2016).

² W. Crönert, *Herkulanische Bruchstücke einer Geschichte des Sokrates und seiner Schule*, in: *Rhm* 57 (1902), pp. 285-300, especially pp. 299. (= Wilhelm Crönert *Studi Ercolanesi* (ed. E. Livrea, Naples, 1975), pp. 135-154).

³ M. d’Amelio, *Di alcuni trattati epicurei sulla ricchezza*, Naples, 1926, p. 28 and L. Baldassarri, *Sui papiri ercolanesi 495 e 558*, in: *CErc* 6 (1976), pp. 77-80, here: p. 77,78; G. Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano. Introduzione allo studio dei materiali greci*, *CErc* 13 supplement, Naples, 1983, p. 31; T. Dorandi, *La Rassegna dei Filosofi di Filodemo*, in: *RAAN* 55 (1980), pp. 31-49, here: p. 44.

⁴ M. Erler, *Die Schule Epikurs - § 25 Philodem*, in: H. Flashar (ed.), *GGPh* 4.2, Basel, 1994, p.300,301.

⁵ F. M. Giuliano, *PHerc. 495 -PHerc. 558 (Filodemo, Stori di Socrate e della sua scuola?)* Edizione, commento, questioni compositive e attributive, in: *CErc* 31 (2001), pp. 37-79.

⁶ Giuliano (2001), p. 46,47.

⁷ The latest edition is provided by T. Dorandi, *Filodemo. Storia dei filosofi. Platone e l’Accademia (PHerc. 1021 e 164)*. Edizione, traduzione e commento, Naples, 1991. I am currently preparing a new comprehensive edition of the *Index Academicorum*. For the nature of PHerc. 1691/1021 as a draft and opistograph see most recently K. Fleischer, *Die Lokalisierung der Verso-Kolumnen von PHerc. 1021*, in: *ZPE* 204 (2017), pp. 27-39.

In this concise contribution I would like to discuss some questions related to the Oxford disegni of PHerc. 495 and shortly identify and discuss a blunder, the unconscious doubling of a fragment, which has slipped in Giuliano's edition. Basically, his edition represents a huge step forward in the research history of the "Vita Socratis" and he deserves credit for many innovative thoughts and the first modern edition of this papyrus.⁸

1. First, some remarks concerning the "Oxford disegni" which Giuliano exploited for his edition of PHerc. 495, are in order. From his introduction to the Oxford disegni it emerges that he has used a hand-written copy of the disegni which can be found in the folder containing the Neapolitan disegni of PHerc. 495.⁹ This hand-drawn copy is very odd and not a usual disegno. In August 1914 the National library acquired it from the bookshop owner (*libraio*) Pappacena who was based in Naples (in the so-called "Spaccanapoli" street).¹⁰ This "copy" consists of a small folded sheet representing a kind of "mini-libretto" comprising four pages in a small format. The ink has a brownish colour and all the fragments are coloured with a kind of "watercolour". Therefore, we do not have an ordinary disegno here, but a very neat and aesthetically pleasing copy the likes of which we normally do not find amongst the disegni.¹¹ The headings (numeration) of the fragments in this mini-copy probably stem from the same hand as the fragments' drawings and suggests an English origin, since the word "Fragment" is used and once a miswritten *u* is explained as "upsilon".¹² PHerc. 495 belongs to a group of thirteen papyri which were opened in Naples in late 1819 and early 1820 by the famous chemist Humphrey Davy who took drawings (disegni) of these papyri back to England.¹³ Nowadays they are stored in the Bodleian Library in Oxford where they have been collected and bound in a small book (Ms. Clar. Press. d 44).¹⁴ This book is stored separately from the bulk of the Oxford disegni unrolled by Hayter (1802-1806) and is not available online. I have recently consulted it in Oxford (November 2017).

Some copies of Davy's Oxford disegni were included in a special, fancy book (a collection of disegni) for King George IV, who had sponsored Davy's stay ("The King's Book"). This book is stored in the

⁸ Cf. F. Longo Auricchio, *Gli studi sui testi biografici negli ultimi dieci anni*, in: M. Erler/S. Schorn, *Die griechische Biographie in Hellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin, 2007, pp. 219-256, here: p.238.

⁹ Giuliano (2001), p. 38,39.

¹⁰ Pappacena's bookshop was quite famous in Naples in its day, although it was a rather modest one. For instance, Benedetto Croce liked the atmosphere of Pappacena's bookshop: D. Marra, *Croce Bibliofilo*, *Bibliotheca* (online publication), 2014 (no page number). The cover-sheet of the folder containing the disegni of PHerc. 495 gives the following information: "Il fascioletto a parte fu acquisitato dal libraio Pappacena nell' Agosto 1914 (num. d' ingr. 412326/7)."

¹¹ Also another copy of this kind was acquired from Pappacena in August 1914, depicting fragments of PHerc. 1484, a Latin papyrus also opened by Davy. I could not identify other specimens in the collection.

¹² An Italian would have used either the Latin "fragmentum" or the Italian "frammento", but hardly "Fragment". A German might have used "Fragment", but hardly the English "upsilon" instead of the German "ypsilon".

¹³ H. Davy, *Some Observations and Experiments on the Papyri Found in the Ruins of Herculaneum*, in: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* 111 (1821), pp. 191-208. Some fragments of PHerc. 495, all to be found in the Oxford disegni, are printed in this article (plate XIV). These 13 papyri are: PHerc. 59,97,177,241,371 (Latin),373,396 (Latin),494,495,502 (Latin),1484 (Latin),1620 (Latin),1671. See also F. Longo Auricchio, *L' esperienza napoletana di Davy*, in: A. El-Mosalamy, *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Papyrology*, Cairo, 1992, pp. 189-202.

¹⁴ Precisely: Weston Library, Oxford. See also R. Janko, *How to Read and Reconstruct a Herculaneum Papyrus*, in: B. Crostini et al., *Ars Edendi Lecture Series*, vol. IV, 2016, Stockholm, pp. 117-161, here: p.122.

Royal Library at Windsor Castle and I was recently able to obtain digital images of it.¹⁵ Giuliano purports that the Oxford disegni of PHerc. 495 were depicted by W. Gell and revised by P. Elmsey. This claim might be based on the insufficient information available to Giuliano at the time and who worked with the mini-libretto which only displays the actual text. The original disegni of PHerc. 495 in Oxford are in fact all signed by Francesco Celentano, who executed them in Naples in early 1820. P. Elmsey annotated them. W. Gell produced the above-mentioned special high quality version for the king.¹⁶

On behalf of the Oxford Philological Society photographs of all the Oxford disegni (including the Davy disegni) were distributed to some European universities in 1890. Crönert (1903) claimed that he knew of two copies of these photographic volumes located in Naples.¹⁷ The interesting question arises of when and by whom the handwritten copy (mini-libretto) of PHerc. 495 was made, and of how it ended up in the hands of the Neapolitan bookseller from whom the library acquired it in 1914. A fully satisfying answer might require advanced research, but I would like to venture a guess. The handwritten copy of PHerc. 495 is a remarkably detailed reproduction of the disegni nowadays stored in Oxford, imitating even the smallest details in an almost pedantic and photographic way. So it would not have made a big difference, if Giuliano had consulted the original Oxford disegni drawn by Celentano or an 1890-photograph of them. Furthermore, the numbering of the fragments is the same as in Ms. Clar. Press. d 44. However, there is one fragment in the original Oxford disegni which is not reproduced in the mini-libretto and has therefore not been included in Giuliano's edition.¹⁸ Since both the original papyrus and the Neapolitan disegno are still preserved, this missing fragment was luckily not really crucial for the *restitutio textus*, but some additional letters can be read in the Oxford disegno. Two further fragments of the Oxford disegni are drawn twice in Ms. Clar. Press. d 44 and the drawings are very similar, though not exactly identical.¹⁹ Only one version of every fragment is reproduced in the mini-libretto. On the other hand, there are two fragments of PHerc. 241 in the mini-libretto which are not to be found in the Oxford disegni. This proves that the libretto cannot have been based on the photographs (after 1890) and its outward appearance (paper, etc.) suggests an earlier date as well. I suppose that this "mini-libretto" was created on the basis of the original Celentano-disegni or (more precisely) of the "The King's book", possibly at the very time of the production of "The King's Book". However, the draughtsman must have used some material pertaining to PHerc. 241 that nowadays are neither to be found in the "King's Book" nor in Ms. Clar.

¹⁵ I would like to express my gratitude to Bettina Gierke, who was Curator of Books and Manuscripts at Windsor Castle at the time when I submitted my request to digitize the "King's Book", and who was providing some digital images for me in December 2017/January 2018 (images supplied by The Royal Collection Trust/© Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2018). As far as I understand, the book had never been digitized before and was accordingly not accessible to scholars (unless visiting Windsor Castle in person).

¹⁶ On the "King's book" as an apograph (yet apparently not exclusively an apograph of Ms. Clar. Press. d 44) and the Davy disegni see Janko (2014), p. 122.

¹⁷ W. Crönert (1903), *Die Überlieferung des Index Academicorum*, in: *Hermes* 38 (1903), pp. 357-405, here: p. 383, n. 3 and K. Fleischer, *Die Lokalisierung der Verso-Kolumnen von PHerc. 1021 (Philodem, Index Academicorum)*, in: *ZPE* 204 (2017), pp. 27-39, here: p. 28. Crönert locates the photographs in the library of the Archaeological Museum and in the National Library in Naples respectively. In any case, Giuliano did not use these photographs (there are none for PHerc. 495 in the *Officina*), whereas Crönert might have consulted them in Naples.

¹⁸ This fragment is on the same page as frg. 4 in Ms. Clar. Press. d 44 (the number four might even originally have been supposed to refer to this fragment) and corresponds to frg. 3 N (= frg. 3 Giuliano).

¹⁹ Frg. O 2 and frg. O 5.

Press d 44. “The King’s Book” was painted in gouache by Gell²⁰ and also the “mini-libretto” of PHerc. 495 has a gouache-like quality to it. Hence, it is likely that what we have here is a draft or a kind of spin-off version of Sir William Gell himself.²¹ However, how this mini-libretto finally ended up in the hands of a bookseller in Naples who sold it almost 100 years later to the Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli, must remain a mystery for the moment. Consequently, Giuliano has consulted an excellent hand-written copy of the original Oxford disegni which nonetheless skips one fragment.

2. Giuliano states that there are eleven fragments in the Oxford disegni of PHerc. 495 (three of them wrongly assigned to PHerc. 241) which all correspond to parts of the preserved papyrus. However, he claims that there is a single Oxonian fragment for which no parallel is to be found either in the original papyrus or in the Neapolitan disegni.²² He tries to explain this fact with the loss of the original fragment during the process of unrolling the papyrus - which would not be unusual at all - and prints this single Oxonian fragment separately at the end of his edition labelling it frg. 1 O. Already Crönert had noted: “Dazu kommt endlich ein Stückchen in o (*i.e. the Oxford disegno*), das weder in n (*i.e. the Neapolitan disegno*) noch in den heute erhaltenen Resten anzutreffen ist, es wird darum ein *sovraposto* gewesen sein (VII 31o).”²³ A few pages before this isolated Oxford fragment Giuliano prints another fragment given as frg. 2, col. II in his edition. I here reprint these two fragments with the corresponding apparatus as edited by Giuliano:

PHerc. 495 frg. 2 col. II (Giuliano)

PHerc. 495 Frg. 1 O (Giuliano)

]μετι[
]ν δ' έαυτ[
]ην και μη[
 φα[- -] δρᾶμα λ[
 5 ταισπα φθιν. [
]. [.]αθμα[
 πεμ[- - φιλ]οσοφεῖν. [
]σιν οδ[
]εῖναι δ[έ

 ]ν δὲ αὐ[τ
 . . .]ην καὶ μη[
 . ἄν]δρα μάλ[α
 ταῖς πλ. φθιν[
 5 . . . γ]νωμα[ις
 . . φιλ]οσοφ[
 ]μενα[

Testimonia: P (II), O (II 2-7), N (I, II 1-4, 6-8)
 2 Giuliano: νδεαυ O: βλτι N: nunc tantum εαυ P
 3 ηνκαμη O: nunc tantum νκαμη P (et N)
 4 δραμαλ O: nunc tantum αλ P (et N)
 5 ταισπα φθιν. O: fort. tantum σ (ρ?) P: vacat N
 6 αθμα P: νωμ O: λομ N
 7 πεμ[μεμ[O: vacat P: litterae fort. suppositae
]οσοφ[O:]ειν. [P (et N): coniunxit et lacunam
 implevit Giuliano
 8 spatium inter σιν et οδ P

Testimonia: O
 1 suppl. Crönert 3 ἄν]δρα suppl. Crönert
 μάλ[α Giuliano 5 sq. suppl. Crönert

²⁰ Cf. Janko (2014), p. 122. I have compared the drawings in the “King’s Book” with the mini-libretto and it seems to me that we are dealing with the same hand, namely that of Sir William Gell.

²¹
²² Giuliano (2001), p. 38,39: „una copia a mano di disegni che il Davy aveva fatto eseguire a Napoli e poi portato con sé a Oxford, dove si trovano oggi custoditi fra i Clarendon Press Facsimiles della Bodleian Library. Si tratta dei cosiddetti disegni oxoniensi (O) ricavati da 3 frammenti di PHerc. 241 – svolto, anche quello, dal Davy – e da 8 del nostro papiro, precisamente i fr. 2,4,5,6,8,9,12,13, più un nono, da me contrassegnato come fr. 1 O, di cui non si ha più riscontro nei frammenti conservati né nei disegni napoletani.”

²³ Crönert (1902), p. 289.

Although the word division, a mistaken extra line and some layer mixing in frg. 2 col. II are confusing and distracting at first, already a quick glance at the two fragments and especially at the apparatus of frg. 2 col. II made it obvious that Giuliano had used the same Oxford disegno twice, transcribed it differently, “doubled” it and postulated an additional fragment. In the first case (frg. 2 col. II) he used the disegno correctly to restore a still (partly) preserved fragment of the papyrus.²⁴ In the second case (frg. 1 O) he used the same Oxford disegno again, postulating an otherwise lost fragment. In what follows, the “doubling” of the fragment, the divergent transcriptions of the same text and some related implications shall be discussed and put into perspective.

Giuliano gets the “lining” in frg. 2 col. II wrong and mixes up different layers (sovra- and sottoposto). A fresh look at the MSI as well as the original shows that he combined original, Neapolitan and Oxford disegni from different layers and inserted another extra line 6 which is part of another layer. All the subsequent lines of the fragment mostly consist of different layers. The margin of the original Oxford disegno as well as the “mini-libretto” reproduce quite closely the still preserved margin of the papyrus. It seems that the Oxford disegno was a *sovrapposto* which subsequently crumbled away and revealed a new layer.

I identified the doublet by chance, when reading through the edition and wondering how Giuliano could be so sure about δρᾶμα and entirely exclude ἄν]δρα μάλ[in frg. 2 col. II, a division which I could read a few pages later in frg. 1 O. The word δρᾶμα had already been suggested by Bassi 1916.²⁵ A closer look at the surrounding lines soon revealed that we are dealing with a doublet here and that the separate frg. 1 O is in fact more or less identical to frg. 2 col. II. Giuliano transcribed δρᾶμα in frg. 2 col. II, l. 4 and commented: “Della col. II si segnala l. 4 δρᾶμα, che credo di poter ricavare con una certa sicurezza dalla lezione δραμαλ di O, perservata oggi in P solo nelle ultime due lettere.”²⁶ This statement is remarkable given that just a few pages later in his edition he adopts for this very string of letters δραμαλ Crönert’s ἄν]δρα and adds μάλ[α as his own supplement. So exactly the same sequence of letters, which with a certain degree of probability had been reconstructed to δρᾶμα, turned into ἄν]δρα μάλ[α a few pages later and without any further comment. To be sure, the word δρᾶμα suggested by Giuliano and Bassi is perfectly possible,²⁷ but Giuliano unwittingly proves within his own edition that it is far from being certain a reconstruction and that another word division is equally arguable.

Giuliano might be partly excused for presenting the Oxford disegno twice. Unfortunately, Crönert, who actually admits to have worked on this piece in quite a rush,²⁸ missed the textual overlap between this Oxford fragment and the original papyrus (frg. 2 col. II). This was clearly due to the fact that at the time (1902) the papyrus (the *sovrapposto*) had already suffered further damage and it

²⁴ Several surviving letters in the original leave no doubt about the assignment of the disegno to the original fragment.

²⁵ Giuliano does not refer to Bassi’s earlier suggestion. D. Bassi, *Notizie di papiri ercolanesi inediti*, in: *RFIC* 44 (1916), pp. 481-484, here: p. 484.

²⁶ Giuliano (2001), p. 52.

²⁷ There might be a possible reference to Aristophanes, *nubes* (669-680) in frg. 4, vgl. Giuliano (2001), pp. 52,53. In *PHerc.* 558, frg. 7,1 we have the restoration of a name of a comedian, although its identification is very speculative.

²⁸ Crönert (1902), p. 285: “...doch nicht Buchstabe für Buchstabe, denn dafür fehlte die Zeit.”

would have taken some time to match this disegno to a part of the papyrus. Accordingly, Crönert was indirectly responsible for the fact that Giuliano firmly believed that there existed an Oxford fragment that had been lost in the original. However, it is still hard to understand how he could use the same fragment to reconstruct frg. 2 col. II, only to treat it a few pages later as an independent fragment, claiming that it was only preserved in an Oxford disegno. Giuliano made use of the “mini-libretto” from the Officina, but this reproduces the original disegno preserved in Oxford quite accurately and does not double anything.²⁹ Crönert obviously exploited the photographs but, as noted above, this does not make any difference. The German scholar transcribed some parts of the disegno differently, divided some words differently and Giuliano practically copies his transcription for frg. 1 O, although here and there Crönert’s version is hardly in accordance with the traces of the Oxford disegno which Giuliano describes correctly in the apparatus of frg. 2 col. II.³⁰ Interestingly, Giuliano follows Crönert closely in transcribing]ν δὲ αὐ[τ for frg. 1 O, but suggests]ν δ’ ἔαυ[τ in frg. 2 col. II which is more likely indeed (see below). I guess that Giuliano worked on both fragments with some time in between, got confused and therefore mistakenly doubled the fragment. His arbitrary word division, combined with the other circumstances mentioned above, has probably prevented him and other scholars from realizing the identity of the two fragments, which is to say the fact that they are actually one and the same fragment. Among other things, we may learn from this doublet how careful and conservative we should be concerning the word division in smaller fragments, which is obviously what caused the blunder.

I do not want to restrict myself to the *pars destruens*. I may suggest that frg. 1 O Giuliano should simply be eliminated and forgotten about. It might be “merged” with frg. 2 col. II Giuliano. The first line of Giuliano’s frg. 2 col. II could belong to the fragment, but most or all other letters are part of a different layer and might either be listed as a separate fragment or just ignored. Therefore, a new (“merged”) frg. 2 col. II would be quite similar to the Oxford disegno (frg. 1 O). As I have stated above, it is difficult to come up with useful suggestions for such small fragments. However, it is unlikely that ν δὲ αὐ[τ as printed by Crönert is the correct word division. Assuming a Philodemian authorship, such a hiatus ought to have been avoided and there is no evidence of any scribal practice of *scriptio plena* in the other fragments of this papyrus.³¹ Hence, I favour Giuliano’s ν δ’ ἔαυ[τ. Furthermore, in line 3 I prefer ἄν]δρα μάλ[.³² It is likely that some letters of the disegno in line 4 do not represent the original correctly. The word ἔαυ[τ might refer to Socrates and μη (negation/negative pronoun) could go together with ἄν]δρ, e.g. “no man (was more... than Socrates)” or “Socrates did not (or: no)... man”, but many other reconstructions can be envisioned. A philosophical statement of whatever kind associated with the life of Socrates is likely, while the division δρᾶμα remains possible.

Kilian Fleischer, CNR-ILISEI (Neapel/Rom)

²⁹ Giuliano (2001), p. 39, n. 16.

³⁰ However, the μ[εμ[O in line 7 seems to be a mistake caused by the Neapolitan disegno which might have been reproduced here in a different way. The Oxford disegno does not have any letters here.

³¹ For hiatus in the Herculanean papyri see recently M. McOsker, *Hiatus in Epicurean Authors*, in: *CErc* 47 (2017), pp. 145-162.

³² There is no reason why μά[λα should be in the text. μᾶλλον and μάλιστα are equally possible. There are many other examples of this kind of rather arbitrary supplements in the edition.