

THE COMPLETE TITLE OF A WORK OF HERMIPPUS (FGRHIST 1026 39,40)*

1. Introduction – the two versions of the title and the “state of the art”

For the past 150 years or so, it has been a vexed question among scholars as to how to reconstruct the exact and complete title of a work by Hermippus of Smyrna which Philodemus refers to twice in his *Σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων*, in the book about the Academics and in the one about the Stoics.¹ The full title must have read “On Those Who Converted from Philosophy to <...> and the Exercise of Power”.² Apart from the two excerpts given by Philodemus only a passage in Athenaeus can surely be assigned to this work of Hermippus.³ It is almost certain that Philodemus had direct access to that treatise and did not quote him from other sources.⁴ Unlike the *Index Stoicorum* (PHerc. 1018), the *Index Academicorum* (PHerc. 1691/1021) seems to preserve a more extended and probably correct version of the title with an additional first element (noun). In the most recent editions, the two passages mentioning the title of Hermippus’ work read as follows:

Phld. *Index Acad.* col. 11, 3–7 (Verhasselt 2015)⁵

ληνέως [των . . . υ] Χαίρωνος, ἐπει-
 δήπερ οὐδὲν (ἐμ)ποδῶν ἐσ-
 τι, παραθετέον ἂν κατεχώ-
 ρισεν Ἑρμιππος ἐν τῷ Πε-
 5 ρὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας εἰς
 ἀριστείας καὶ δυναστεί-
 7 α]ς με[θ]εστηκότων · vac. Χαί-

it follows the account on Chaeron

6 τυραννίδ]ας Bücheler (1869) ἀρ]ισ[τείας Mekler
 (1902) ἀρ]ιστ[ε]ί]ας Gaiser (1988) ἀρ]ιστ[ε]ί]ας Dorandi
 (1991) ἀριστείας Verhasselt (2015) 7 paragraphum
 Verhasselt legit

Phld. *Index Stoic.* col. 16, 1–10 (Dorandi 1994)⁶

σαμένωι πρὸς εὐφη-
 μίαν Ἑρ]μίππωι γρά-
 φεται ἐν] τῷ Περὶ τῶν
 5 ἀ[πὸ φιλ]οσοφίας εἰς δυ-
 να[στεί]ας με[τ]αστάν-
 τω[ν], τόν τε [βί]ον τοῦ
]οδε Ζήνω-
 vos μὲν μα]θητῆς ὄν
]του βα
 10] .ει

ca. 25 lineae deperditae fine col. 15 ante l. 1 οὐ διηγη]σα-
 μένωι vel χαρι]σαμένωι Comparetti 2–6 Comparetti
 7 Dorandi : [[Περσά]ιου ὡς] ὅδε Comparetti : Φιλωνίδου].
 ὁ δὲ Bücheler 8 Comparetti

* This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and innovation programme (Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 703798 – AcadHist). This article only reflects the author’s view. I would like to thank Graziano Ranocchia for his comments.

¹ Phld. *Ind. Acad.* col. 11,4–7 and Phld. *Ind. Stoic.* col. 16,3–6. For the title and content of this work, see the thorough discussion in J. Bollansée, *Hermippus of Smyrna and His Biographical Writings. A Reappraisal*, Leuven, 1999, pp. 72–80 (= Bollansée 1999a) and the remarks in J. Bollansée, Felix Jacoby. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker continued. Part four. Biography and Antiquarian Literature. IV A 3. Hermippus of Smyrna*, Leiden, 1999, pp. 355–362 (frg. 39+40a,b) (= Bollansée 1999b).

² Translation in Bollansée 1999a and Bollansée 1999b.

³ FGRHist 39+40a,b. For the possibility that some other fragments might belong to this work see Bollansée 1999a, pp. 79–81.

⁴ Bollansée 1999a, p. 107.

⁵ G. Verhasselt, *Hermippus on Chaeron of Pellene* (Phld., *Acad. Hist.*, PHerc. 1021 coll. 10,40–12,4 and PHerc. 164, frg. 22 and 24): edition and discussion, in: *CErc* 45 (2015), pp. 33–48.

⁶ T. Dorandi, *Filodemo: Storia dei filosofi: La stoà da Zenone a Panezio* (PHerc. 1018), Leiden, 1994.

The editio princeps of the *Index Academicorum*⁷ has been provided by Bücheler (1869), who relied exclusively on the *Collectio altera*.⁸ The German scholar, who was looking for an accusative ending in $\alpha\varsigma$ and fitting the context or, more accurately, the supposed content of the work, suggested $\tau\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$. This supplement was rejected by Mekler (1902), who printed $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ which Praechter (1902) in his review of Mekler could not make much sense of.⁹ Subsequently, many scholars preferred Bücheler's supplement, obviously regarding it as more likely in a context where the "exercise of power" is mentioned and a kind of straying from the philosophical path might be implied.¹⁰ Bollansée adopts neither Bücheler's nor Mekler's reading in his monograph (1999) and in his edition of Hermippus (1999), although Mekler's conjecture ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$) was printed in an improved version by Gaiser and Dorandi in their own editions ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$). Bollansée regards the papyrological basis as being too uncertain and especially has a problem with the positive notion of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ which he regards as incompatible with the critical tendency he assumes for the work. He is careful and does not offer an alternative supplement, conservatively translating the title as "On Those Who Converted from Philosophy to <...> and the Exercise of Power". Most recently Verhasselt (2015), who was the first to exploit the Multispectral images (MSI) for this passage, offers the transcription $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, which practically means that there cannot be any serious doubt about the first element of the title anymore.¹¹ Indeed, he claims in the abstract that the re-examination of the papyrus "has also shown the correct title of Hermippus' work *On Those Who Converted from Philosophy to Excellence and the Exercise of Power*".¹² No doubt, the confirmation of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ would have some serious consequences on the supposed content and tenor of Hermippus' work.

2. Another re-examination (PHerc. 1021, col. 11,6) – $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, not $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$

Is *Excellence* ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$) really the correct noun in the title of the work and has the question been settled for good? I am currently preparing a new comprehensive edition of Philodemus' *Index Academicorum*. For this purpose, I have also reread the "Hermippean-title-passage" in the original papyrus and re-evaluated the MSI, which reach beyond the light a human eye can detect. By combining autopsy and the MSI, I have read and reconstructed a title different from all previous editors.

⁷ The latest comprehensive edition of Philodemus' History of the Academy (*Index Academicorum* or *Historia Academicorum*) is the one by T. Dorandi, *Filodemo. Storia dei filosofi. Platone e l'Accademia* (PHerc. 1021 e 164). Edizione, traduzione e commento, Naples, 1991. Prior editions were provided by F. Bücheler, *Academicorum philosophorum index Herculensis*, Greifswald, 1869; S. Mekler, *Academicorum philosophorum index Herculensis*, Berlin, 1902. The edition by K. Gaiser, *Philodemos Academica*, Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt, 1988 includes only the first part of the book. PHerc. 1021/1691 represent an opistograph and Philodemus' working draft, whereas PHerc. 164 preserves some scanty remains of the final version (cf. K. Fleischer, *Die Lokalisierung der Verso-Kolumnen von PHerc. 1021 (Philodem, Index Academicorum)*, in: ZPE 204 (2017), pp. 27–39, here: p. 27).

⁸ The text in the *collectio altera* is more or less the same as the one to be found in the Neapolitan disegni of the papyrus.

⁹ K. Praechter, Review of Mekler (1902), in: GGA 164 (1902), pp. 953–972, here: p. 971: "... scheint mir $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ keinen brauchbaren Sinn zu geben."

¹⁰ H. Diels/W. Schubart, *Didymos. Kommentar zu Demosthenes (Papyrus 9780)*, Berlin, 1904, p. XXXVIII; n. 2; S. Heibges, *Hermippos* (6), in: RE 8.1 (1913), pp. 848–852, here: 852–853; F. Wehrli, *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*, Basel, 1974, p. 95. See Bollansée 1999b, p. 73, n. 163 for the reception of Wehrli's adoption.

¹¹ Verhasselt 2015, p. 36 (edition) and p. 40: "My re-examination of the papyrus has in fact confirmed the reading $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$: the original shows a triangular letter (α), a trace of loop at maximum height (ρ), an upright (ι), a left-hand arc (σ), an upright with a horizontal crossbar (τ), remains of epsilon, a trace of an upright at line level (ϵ), and finally $\alpha\sigma$."

¹² Verhasselt 2015, p. 33.

Figure 1. Phld. *Ind. Acad.* (PHerc. 1021), col. 11,1-7Figure 2. Phld. *Ind. Acad.* (PHerc. 1021), col. 11,6 (first half of line) – στρατηγίας καὶ

Let us focus our attention on the MSI¹³ of the papyrus and begin with the end of the word in question, from which we shall proceed to its beginning. The $\alpha\sigma$ before $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is clearly readable. Immediately before these letters we can see parts of a vertical at the bottom of the line and maybe tiny ink traces at the top. The traces are compatible with ι , or even strongly suggest this letter, which is often very closely followed by α or δ .¹⁴ Now we come to a crucial letter. At first glance we may imagine an ϵ here, which has been transcribed as a certain letter by Verhasselt (2015). However, what looks like the middle-bar of an ϵ is actually not ink, but a hole in the papyrus which can only be recognised by autopsy, not in the images above, which are very misleading in this case. The ink above this hole at the top of the line could belong to a horizontal, maybe (almost) touching the top of the supposed ι . Before these traces we can see a tiny dot at the bottom. The traces allow for γ , a letter which is often rather broad and touches top of following letters. Its vertical occasionally slants to the right. Again, before this possible γ we have an elliptic hole in the papyrus. At its bottom are the remains of two feet perfectly compatible with η or π . The letter η seems more likely to me. I might only refer to the tiny η at the beginning of line 2 (figure 1). The traces before the elliptic hole hint at τ . Its right horizontal is normally rather short and its vertical often slants to the right.¹⁵ Preceding this letter we have a descending and slightly faded oblique stroke which suggests either α or λ . However, note that the “traces” at the top in the MSI stem, at least partly, from a hole in the papyrus, while the traces at

¹³ The multispectral images (MSI) of PHerc. 1021 (Biblioteca Nazionale «Vittorio Emanuele III», Naples) are reproduced by courtesy of the Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo (© Biblioteca Nazionale, Napoli – Brigham Young University, Provo, USA); all rights are reserved.

¹⁴ Cf. $\iota\delta$ in the same line or $\iota\alpha$ in line 5 (figure 1).

¹⁵ Cf. the τ at the beginning of line 3. The τ does not always have a loop at the bottom. In our case there might have been a loop or not.

bottom are compatible with the left part of an α . One may especially compare it with the α a few letters later in the line or with the first α in line 3.

At this point, some general remarks concerning the hand and the size of the letters are in order. PHerc. 1691/1021 was written – or, better, drafted¹⁶ – by an extremely irregular hand. The size of the letters varies considerably, within the same line as well as within the same position in different lines. Remarkably, in some passages of the papyrus the letters at the beginning of the lines are smaller than the letters later on in the line. Compare for instance the δ at the beginning of line 3 with the $\delta(\omega\nu)$ at the end of the same line. The second δ , though occurring much later in the line, is almost double the size of the first. In our line 7 the original papyrus (even under the microscope) reveals basically less than the MSI, which allow us to tell the ink apart from the similarly coloured and dark background (of course, possible breaks or holes in the papyrus have to be taken into account). We would expect more or less two letters before the possible α in line 7. In comparison to the first line, our line may start a bit further to the left (Maas' law). The ink at the bottom and at the top is compatible with ρ , considering the ρ in line 3. Before these meagre traces we have part of a horizontal at the top with ink below. One may consider a small τ touching with its right horizontal (almost) the right part of the ρ .¹⁷ What looks like ink at the beginning of the line on the MSI (like a rising oblique stroke followed by ink in the middle section) is a break (hole) in the papyrus. The first letter may have started right after this hole or around the hole. Traces of ink in the original cannot be excluded, but nor can they be verified with certainty. There are many examples of very small σ in the papyrus: consider, for instance, the σ of $\alpha\sigma$ just a few letters later in the same line and other very small σ at the beginning of several lines.¹⁸ It should be noted that σ and τ are sometimes merged at the top, so that the upper part of the σ is continued by the horizontal of the τ .¹⁹ The space before the supposed α equals approximately $\delta\eta$ (line 2) or $\rho\sigma$ (line 4) in the lines above.²⁰ Since σ and ρ are rather small letters and σ and τ might have been connected, the transcription $\sigma\tau\rho$ is arguable. The space might be short, but not necessarily too short for these three letters which are not ruled out by the traces. What I have read under the microscope or with the naked eye does not go against the evidence of the MSI. To keep it short, my transcription of the beginning of the line is $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. Some letters are only conservatively dotted and independently judged uncertain, but the accumulated evidence (“string of traces”) of what one can see in the MSI (and in the original) supports this transcription and even makes it likely. Furthermore, I cannot see how the traces in the MSI can be brought into accord with $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. Finally, one should also state that Greek words logically fitting the context and ending in $\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (the ι is rather certain) are restricted in some respect and not compatible with the traces in the papyrus, at least the words I have taken into consideration. It is interesting how the conjecture $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ developed from $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ to $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ and then to $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. Each editor seems to have ambitiously sought to read more than his predecessor and was apparently convinced that this word was the only possible supplement in this context and that it must have been written in the papyrus.²¹ The concerns of other scholars were ignored. Fortunately, in Bollansée's time (1999) the reading of the word $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ was still uncertain enough ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$) that the scholar could question it. With the

¹⁶ Cf. note 7.

¹⁷ τ often touches the subsequent letter. For the small right part of the horizontal, see for instance the τ in line 3. There are many other, even more extreme, examples of a τ with a short right part in the papyrus. Also some very small τ at the beginning or rather early on in the line can be found (among the many examples see for instance col. 7,9; col. 12,6; col. 19,12).

¹⁸ Cf. col. 12,9; col. 18,11–12.

¹⁹ One may compare the $\sigma\tau\rho$ at the beginning of line 36 in the same columns. However, here the letters are obviously broader.

²⁰ One may mentally shift the letters down, taking into account Maas' law.

²¹ For this problematic tendency in editions of Herculanean papyri, see D. Blank, *The Life of Antiochus of Ascalon in Philodemus' History of the Academy and a Tale of Two Letters*, in: ZPE 162 (2007), pp. 87–93, esp. p. 93: “Re-editions of Herculanean texts have the tendency to intervene in their predecessors' work only when the text seems unsatisfactory, leaving it alone when its grammar and sense seem smooth ... New readings of such passages in the papyrus, often made with new means ... were taken to confirm the texts: the editor was not questioning the text, which seemed unobjectionable on the printed page, and the microscope was used to remove dots – no one wants to have seen less than one's predecessors, except where the papyrus has suffered in the interim.”

transcription ἀριστείας he would most probably have felt compelled to accept the word as part of the title which would not only have led to the recording of a wrong title for a Hermippean work in the *Jacoby*, but, more relevantly, would have pushed him (and other scholars) to draw a (completely) different assessment of the character of this work. I must admit that a natural psychological tendency to trust the authority of (several) previous editors, the “fake-ε” as well as the poor status of conservation of the papyrus led me to believe for a certain time that ἀριστείας was the correct word, but its (slightly) unexpected connotation in this context and the traces in the papyrus eventually caused me to have second thoughts.

3. Military commands and the Stoic Persaeus

Consequently, the title of Hermippus’ work, as reported by Philodemus in his *Index Academicorum*, should read Περί τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας εἰς ἰστρατηγίας καὶ δυναστείας με[θ]εστηκότων *On Those Who Converted from Philosophy to Military Commands and the Exercise of Power*, or maybe *On Those Who Converted from Philosophy to the Exercise of Military Command and of Power*. The connection between the words ἰστρατηγίας and δυναστείας in the title of such a work seems very plausible, since both terms describe the exercising of non-philosophical actions: the former clearly military or strategic actions, the latter actions associated with politics and power in general. Bollansée (1999) deserves much credit for having left the questions of the complete title open and having been sceptical about both suggestions, τυραννίδας and ἀριστείας. He wrote: “Accordingly, a negative term, or at the most another neutral one (...) would seem to be more in place in the lacuna than a complimentary one. Having said that, I will readily admit that I am not able to come up with a valid counter-suggestion: nevertheless, I deem it preferable to leave the gap in the title open – an awkward and uneasy decision, but one made in due recognition of the fact that we do not have all the answers to the problems raised by our ancient sources.”²² His awkward decision has now turned out to have been a prudent one and my new reading ἰστρατηγίας might provide the sought for neutral term, which is more in place than the positive ἀριστείας. The new reading is, as it were, a compromise between the negative τυραννίδας and the positive ἀριστείας and does not hint at a particular bias of the work. Nonetheless, I am inclined to share the view held by Bollansée and several other scholars that the basic tenor of the work was not very favourable to the philosophers mentioned, inasmuch as a kind of degeneration from philosophy might have been described. However, as Verhasselt (2015) rightly pointed out, we have to keep in mind that only two fragments (Persaeus and Chaeron) of the work survive and it cannot be entirely excluded that there were other neutral or even positive examples in Hermippus’ book of philosophers who turned to politics or military commands.²³

Is there any evidence that ἰστρατηγίας was an important aspect of this very work of Hermippus and that the term was even a necessary supplement to δυναστεία? For sure, Chaeron of Pellene is likely to have taken on military roles while establishing himself as the tyrant of Pellene with the help of Corragus’ soldiers and maltreating the local citizens.²⁴ However, he seems to have been primarily remembered as a tyrant and cruel ruler, not a general, even if he may have been personally involved in some military or strategic tasks. An altogether different case is that of the Stoic Persaeus of Citium,²⁵ the only other philosopher Hermippus has certainly dealt with in this work. After studying with Zeno of Citium Persaeus was sent to the court of Antigonus Gonatas by the Stoic scholarch (276 BC), where he became the teacher of the king’s son Halcy-

²² Bollansée 1999b, p. 75. However, Bollansée might be criticised in some respect for his use of the speculative and often clearly wrong edition of Gaiser for the Chaeron passage. Dorandi’s edition is for the most part much more careful and also based on a sound papyrological analysis that takes into account of the design.

²³ Cf. Bollansée 1999b, p. 74,75. Verhasselt 2015, p. 40. His statement remains valid regardless of the fact that it seems to have been inspired by the old reading.

²⁴ Phld. *Ind. Acad.* col. 11,33–12,2 and col. 12,37–40.

²⁵ For the fragments of Persaius see H. von Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* (1), Leipzig, 1905, pp. 96–102; R. Nickel, *Stoa und die Stoiker* (1), Düsseldorf, 2008, pp. 54–66 (1.3 Persaios). For a general overview, see P. Steinmetz, *Persaios auf Kition*, in: H. Flashar, *GGPh* 4.2, Basel, 1994, pp. 555–557 and J.-B. Gourinat, *Persaios de Kition*, in: R. Goulet, *DPha* (5/1), Paris, 2012, pp. 234–243.

oneus and a counsellor to the king. Philodemus remarks that he lived the life of a courtier, not of a philosopher ([σ]ὺν Ἀντιγόνῳ καὶ [ῥ]ῆμα περιπλανᾶσθαι τὸ[ν] ἀυλικὸν οὐ τὸν φιλό[σ]οφον ἢ(ι)ρημένον βίον).²⁶ This might be at least an indirect criticism of his career development. At Antigonus' court Persaeus certainly had some influence on Antigonus and could theoretically have been associated with δυναστεία. But no political engagement in the strict sense is attested, unless one wishes to count as such Persaeus' (anecdotal) plea to Antigonus not to re-establish the democracy in Eretria – an action for which Menedemus hated and bashed him.²⁷ Yet, Persaeus is particularly remembered with his failure as a general (στρατηγός) during the battle of Acro-Corinth.²⁸ Antigonus entrusted the philosopher with military command over the citadel of Corinth (mid 240s). Our sources report that in his role as a general Persaeus badly failed to defend the stronghold against the troops of Aratus of Sicyon (243). Pausanias and a source which Philodemus quotes tell us that the Stoic died bravely fighting in battle, whereas three other sources, Hermippus (Athenaeus), Polyaeus and Plutarch,²⁹ report that Persaeus fled to Cenchreae.³⁰ Plutarch writes about Persaeus' experience as a general (στρατηγός): ὕστερον δὲ λέγεται σχολάζων πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα μόνον αὐτῷ δοκεῖν στρατηγὸν εἶναι τὸν σοφόν “ἀλλὰ νῆ θεοῦς” φάναι “τοῦτο μάλιστα κάμοι ποτε τῶν Ζήνωνος ἤρεσκε δογμάτων· νῦν δὲ μεταβάλλομαι, νουθετηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σικυωνίου νεανίου”. Athenaeus referring to Hermippus' report states “... ὃς περὶ ταῦτα τὴν διάνοιαν ἀεὶ στρέφων πιστευθεὶς, ὡς φησιν Ἑρμιππος, ὑπ' Ἀντιγόνου τὸν Ἀκροκόρινθον κωθωνιζόμενος ἐξέπεσεν καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς Κορίνθου, καταστρατηγηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σικυωνίου Ἀράτου, ὁ πρότερον ἐν τοῖς διαλόγοις πρὸς Ζήνωνα διαμιλλώμενος ὡς ὁ σοφὸς πάντως ἂν εἶη καὶ στρατηγὸς ἀγαθός, μόνον τοῦτο διὰ τῶν ἔργων διαβεβαιωσάμενος ὁ καλὸς τοῦ Ζήνωνος οἰκετιεύς. Regardless of whether Persaeus survived the battle by fleeing or died a hero's death,³¹ ancient sources remember him not least as a philosopher, who held a military command (στρατηγία) and failed in his duty. So the first term of my newly reconstructed title of Hermippus' work fits nicely with the biography of Persaeus, who can be fairly said to have converted from philosophy to the exercise of military command. Ironically, the *Index Stoicorum* skips this first element of the title, which might have been especially characteristic of Hermippus' account on Persaeus. Philodemus probably wrote the different books of his *Σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων* over a longer period of time and may have skipped the first element in the *Index Stoicorum* since he had simply forgotten the complete title or, more likely, regarded the abridged version as sufficient to indicate to his readers what work he was referring to.

4. Some final remarks on the complete title

I now wish to conclude with some remarks about the exact title. Have we finally settled the question of the complete and correct title? This indeed seems to be the case, but the supposed syntax of the passage in the *Index Stoicorum* is rather irritating and will be discussed shortly. The probable δὲ in line 7 makes the connection and function of the isolated τε in line 6 problematic. Although the presence of some additional information after the title – introduced by τε shortly before a new phrase with δὲ – is possible, its position would be slightly strange. One could also think of a long, complex clause, within which the Hermippus reference is embedded and where the τε connects the last element to a section before the insertion, but this would not be very natural or elegant. Consequently, I thought of a connection of the accusative τὸν βίον τοῦ with the title of Hermippus' work. Philodemus may have added an explanation to the title or even somehow remembered a further subtitle of Hermippus' work. Since the repetition of the preposition εἰς does not seem

²⁶ Phld. *Ind. Stoic.* col. 13,4–7.

²⁷ D.L. 2,143–144 = SVF I 460 = Nickel 60.

²⁸ For this aspect of his life see in particular J. Bollansée, *Persaios of Kition, or the Failure of the Wise Man as the Ideal General*, in: L. Mooren, *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic World*, Leuven, 2000, pp. 15–28.

²⁹ Plutarch obviously relies on the “eye-witness” Aratus and mentions other anonymous sources supporting his version.

³⁰ Paus. II,8,3 and VII,8,4 = SVF I 442; Phld. *Ind. Stoic.* col. 15,1–11 = SVF I 445 = Nickel 63; Plut. *Arat* 18+23 = SVF I 443 = Nickel 61; Polyaeus *strateg.* VI 5 = SVF I 444 = Nickel 62; Athen. 4, 162c–e = SVF I 452 = FGHist 1026 40a.

³¹ Bollansée 2000, pp. 20,21 makes a strong point that the account of Persaeus' flight, which may be traced back to Aratus, is probably the more reliable version.

absolutely necessary to me, one could understand the passage in the sense: “written by Hermippus in his work *“On Those Who Converted from Philosophy to the Exercise of Power (“) and accordingly to a life of <...> (”)”*. The part “and accordingly to a life of<...>” might be a comment by Philodemus concerning Persaeus’ later non-philosophical life.³² The word defining “life” could be something like πράγματος (practical engagement) or another abstractum, an infinitive, a person (στρατηγός does not seem probable) or a personal name.³³ Bollansée has argued that, without discussing philosophical issues profoundly, the work should be viewed in the context of the relation between politics and philosophy in general and to some extent as reflecting the ongoing debate about βίος πρακτικός and βίος θεωρητικός.³⁴ Philodemus may have alluded to a general tendency of the work or to an aspect he wanted to emphasize here. The position behind the participle does not really favour the assumption that it was a genuine subtitle of Hermippus’ work. A loose addition by Philodemus is more likely, if these words have a connection with the Hermippean work at all. I do not want to insist on a relation of whatever kind between these words and the title, but judging from the (supposed) structure of the sentence(s), it seems at least possible that Philodemus commented or extended here the title of the work in his own words. Assuming such a connection to the title, one cannot entirely exclude a reference to a real subtitle, but this option seems less likely to me.

Hence, I may end this contribution with the newly reconstructed and probably genuine and complete title of Hermippus’ work (FGrHist 39,40):

Περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας εἰς στρατηγίας καὶ δυναστείας μεθεστηκότων³⁵

On Those Who Converted from Philosophy to the Exercise of Military Command and of Power.

Kilian Fleischer, CNR-ILIESI (Rom/Neapel)
Kilian.fleischer@iliesi.cnr.it

³² Cf. Phld. *Ind. Stoic.* col. 13,4–7 (cited above in the main text).

³³ There seems to be the right part of a horizontal at the top of the line at the beginning of col. 15,7. Later we have traces which are difficult to tell apart. I am not entirely sure whether we have ο (as in the disegno) or σ before δε in line 7. The column may need a proper reedition.

³⁴ Bollansée 1999a, p. 75.

³⁵ Since the title preserved in the *Index Academicorum* is (more) complete, the perfect participle (μεθεστηκότων) is more likely to have occurred in the original title than the aorist participle of the *Index Stoicorum* (μεταστάντων).