

**Zeitschrift:** Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

**Band:** 53 (1996)

**Heft:** 2

**Artikel:** THIAEAAHN

**Autor:** Parsons, Peter

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-41333>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 15.01.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝ

By Peter Parsons, Oxford

This paper discusses a papyrological curiosity, first published more than seventy years ago, which continues to pose intractable questions: what sort of text can it be? what sort of person can it describe? I have tried to present the questions more fully than earlier editors; but I have failed to find answers more convincing than theirs. I hope only that Thomas Gelzer, a scholar equally φιλέλλην and εὐπροσήγορος, will enjoy the problem and advance the solution.

## *The papyrus*

The famous Tragic Songs papyrus in Strasbourg (P. Strasbourg WG 304–307) consists of a group of fragments recovered by Ibscher from mummy cartonnage. The roll carries writing on both sides, but by different hands. After a first and partial publication by Crönert<sup>1</sup>, further sections of the verso were published by Knox<sup>2</sup>; later, Bruno Snell<sup>3</sup> and Naphthali Lewis<sup>4</sup> examined the fragments more systematically. Most recently, Donald Mastronarde has re-edited WG 307 recto, which contains extracts from Euripides, *Phoenissae*, and confirmed the correct alignment of the smaller fragments which compose it<sup>5</sup>.

The Recto contains an anthology of Euripidean lyric (Pack<sup>2</sup> 426), and tragic iambics generally ascribed to Astydamas, *Hector* (P<sup>2</sup> 170; *TrGF* I 60 F2a). The Verso carries miscellaneous extracts in verse, chiefly iambic or choliambic:

WG 304: Tragedy? *TrGF* II Adesp. 697–698 (P<sup>2</sup> 1735).

WG 306 col. ii: Philemon fr. 93 KA; *Paean to Eurus*, *PMG* 858 (P<sup>2</sup> 1592).

WG 307: (a) col. i 1–29 choliambics first published by Knox and attributed by him to *Phoenix* (P<sup>2</sup> 1349); *paragraphos* below

(b) col. i 30–ii 3 iambics first published by Crönert (P<sup>2</sup> 1698), republished by Colin Austin, *CGFPR* no. 300(a), now PCG Adesp. 1036; *paragraphos* and blank line below

\* I am grateful to Peter Brown, Simon Hornblower, Arnd Kerkhecker and Richard Rutherford for advice and bibliography; and especially to Dirk Obbink for illuminating discussion.

1 *NGG* 1922, 17–22 (recto), 31–32 (verso).

2 *Herodes, Cercidas and the Greek Choliambic Poets* (Loeb, 1929) 254ff. (reprinted in J. Rusten/ I. C. Cunningham/A. D. Knox, *Theophrastus, Herodas, Cercidas and the Choliambic Poets*, Loeb, 1993, 469ff.).

3 *Euripides Alexandros* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 5, 1937) 69ff.

4 *Etudes de Papyrologie* 3 (1936) 52–75.

5 *ZPE* 38 (1980) 1ff.

(c) col. ii 5–, c. 19 much broken lines (P<sup>2</sup> 1592), 5–10 published by Knox (of which 6–8 = Eur., *Or.* 9, 10, 6), 11–16 (on a separate fragment) published by Snell, the whole re-edited by Mastronarde, *ZPE* 38 (1980) 38–42<sup>6</sup>; below 10 a wider line-space may serve to introduce a new extract, which may or may not continue in (d)

(d) col. ii foot, ten lines (24–33) first published by Knox (P<sup>2</sup> 1592), republished by Colin Austin, *CGFPR* no. 300(b), now PCG Adesp. 1060. Apparently *paragraphos* below the last line.

The script of the Recto was originally assigned by Crönert to the later Ptolemaic period. Lewis dated it to the mid-third century BC, Schubart to the borders of the second and first century<sup>7</sup>; more recently, Turner has argued for a date about 250 BC<sup>8</sup>, Cavallo for a date in the first half of the second century<sup>9</sup>. The hand of the Verso was assigned by Crönert to the same period as the recto; by Lewis to the second century BC, by Bell and Lobel to the mid-third century<sup>10</sup>.

Palaeographic datings always need a pinch of salt, especially when comparative material is relatively scarce<sup>11</sup>. But to my eye too Crönert's original dating looks unduly late. I should opt for c. 250–150 BC as a reasonable assessment; and I see no reason why Verso and Recto should not be contemporary.

That sets a lower limit for the composition of the iambics now to be discussed.

6 Line 11, read as χ]ρυσοπτε[, appears as *TrGF* II Adesp. 699. But the reading is uncertain, see Mastronarde l.c. 41.

7 His opinion is recorded by Snell 69.

8 *Scrittura e Civiltà* 4 (1980) 29; *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*<sup>2</sup> (London 1987) no. 30.

9 *Libri Scritture Scribi a Ercolano* (Naples 1983) 52.

10 See Knox 253.

11 There are no objective indications of date, other than the use of accommodation at word-end (note 8 *avtoy*); see on this E. Mayser/H. Schmoll, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* I 1<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1970) 203–206, from which it emerges that such accommodation appears rarely in documents after the 3rd century BC, but survives longer in literary texts. Since our papyrus comes from cartonnage, we could ask whether the same mummy or group of mummies produced any dated documents. I am most grateful to Professor Jean Gascou for information. He reports that, strictly speaking, nothing can be known, since the archives of the 'Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft in Strassburg', which acquired the papyri originally, have not survived. On the other hand, "les verres 304–307 semblent former un lot avec les nos WG 278–303", all Ptolemaic documents from cartonnage. Of these documents, eight belong to the archive of Harmachis (PStrasb II 93–95, 111, 113, VI 562–563, SB XIV 11649); W. Clarysse has dated them securely to 215/4 BC, see *Ancient Society* 7 (1976) 185–207. Another group, from the same cartonnage, published as PStrasb II 103–105, 107–108, VII 622, has been dated most recently to 210 BC, see W. Clarysse/E. Lanciers, *Ancient Society* 20 (1989) 127–132.

*Text*

PStrasb. WG 307 verso i 30–ii 3 = C. Austin, *CGFPR* 300 (a), with bibliography

(col. i)      ἀγαπᾶτε τῷτογ πάγτες ὃς ἔχει τάγανὰ  
                   ἄπαντ' ἐν αὐτῷ· χρηστός, εὐγενής, ἀπλοῦς,  
                   φιλοβασιλεύς, ἀνδρεῖος, ἐμ πίστει μέγας,  
                   σώφρων, φιλέλλην, πραῦς, εὐπροσήγορος,  
                   5    τὰ πανοῦργα μισῶν, τὴν [δ' ἀ]λήθειαν σέβων,  
 (col. ii)      ἐπιστα...[  
                   τιμᾶν ψεο...[  
                   αὐτὸγ κυβε[ρν]

Lectional signs: none. I have checked the readings on a photograph which Dr Austin was kind enough to lend me.

Line 5 ends a column, lines 6–8 begin another; Knox and Maas (quoted by Snell) had suggested that 6–8 followed directly on 5, and Mastronarde has confirmed this reconstruction of the papyrus. In col. ii the writing looks larger, the line-space wider; and the beginnings are inset in relation to the lines which follow, even though these are or may be iambic trimeters too. We might therefore take them to be a heading or the like; Knox assumed them to be a separate text, “three pseudo-Epicharmic verses”. On the other hand, there is a paragraphos below line 8, apparently no paragraphos below line 5: that suggests continuity, and the content equally could continue the enumeration of virtues.

1 ἀγαπᾶτε ... πάγτες. Indicative or imperative? For the former compare [Andoc.], *Alc.* 32 τοῦτον μὲν ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ύμετέρων χρημάτων ταῦτα κατεργασάμενον; Dem. 40.8 ύμεῖς ἄπαντες τοὺς ύμετέρους παῖδας ἀγαπᾶτε. To whom is this addressed? If our extract comes from comedy, it might address the company on stage, or the audience, as in the final πάντες ἐπικροτήσατε and its variations (Antiph. fr. 34 KA; Men., *Misum.* 464 S, *Sam.* 734 S), or mankind in general, so far as they can be distinguished from the audience (Apollod. Car. fr. 5.1 KA). If it comes from an independent poem, it might address an imagined audience; but moral precepts seem normally to admonish the reader, and therefore in the second person singular.

τῷτογ ... ὃς ... ἐν αὐτῷ Knox: ταῦτα ... ὅσ' ἔχει. τάγανὰ / ἄπαντ' ἐν αὐτῷ Crönert (punctuated so rather than after τάγανά). I adopt τῷτογ, hesitantly, on the balance of the palaeographic evidence. It is true that the second and fifth letters (which are not damaged, but cursively written) look more like alpha than omicron, since they have an oblique axis sloping upwards from left to right. On the other hand, ταῦτα does not explain the ink just before πάντες; even allowing for a leftward extension of the horizontal of pi, there remains more than the finial of alpha, and those traces fit very well the characteristic high-stepping nu. ταῦταγ, i.e. ταῦτ' ἄν, would be ideal, but I do not see how to accommodate it (ἀγαπῶτε cannot be read). If the scribe did intend τοῦτον, he

must have drawn the right-hand side of his omicrons from below, and slanted them to ligature with the next letter; there are parallels for this in other informal hands of the period, but no good clear parallel in the immediate context (admittedly, much damaged).

τάγανά = “good qualities”. LSJ quotes Isoc. 8.32 τοῖς γὰρ ἀγαθοῖς οἵς ἔχομεν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, τούτοις κτώμενα καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὠφελείας; Xen., *Eq.* 1.2 ἵππου πολεμιστηρίου οὐδὲν ἀν διφελος εἴη, οὐδ' εἰ τάλλα πάντα ἀγαθὰ ἔχοι, κακόπους δ' εἴη.

2ff. Some of the virtues are too unspecific to prove anything. For χρηστός and εὐγενής see E. C. Welskopf, *Soziale Typenbegriffe im alten Griechenland* (Berlin 1968), a collection of texts; on these and ἀνδρεῖος and σώφρων, K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality* (Oxford 1974).

εὐγενής of course extends from good birth to good character (Dover 93–95). τὸν δίκαιον ..., ἀνδρα ἀπλοῦν καὶ γενναῖον Pl., *Resp.* 361B.

3 φιλοβασιλεύς. The word occurs only rarely. (1) Alexander declared Craterus to be φιλοβασιλεύς, but Hephaestion φιλαλέξανδρος: the anecdote appears in Diod. Sic. 17.114.2; Plut., *Alex.* 47.10, *Mor.* 181D<sup>12</sup>; (2) the Macedonians are said always to have been φιλοβασιλεῖς, but after the defeat of Perseus they gave up (Plut., *Aem.* 24.1); (3) the rebellious citizens of Tiberias showed themselves μήτε φιλορώμαιοι μήτε φιλοβασιλεῖς, says Josephus in his own defence (*Vit.* 345.3); (4) Eustathius commonly calls Nestor “king-loving”, because he took Agamemnon’s side. Thus the word generally indicates loyalty to the monarchic principle. I have not found it in inscriptions; but its successors φιλόκαισαρ and φιλοσέβαστος frequently do appear there as self-descriptions. Some scholars have argued that these epithets indicate a particular rank in society, i.e. presuppose the formal grant of the title *amicus Caesaris*. If that were so, we could consider whether φιλοβασιλεύς implies that the person described belonged to the φίλοι τοῦ βασιλέως: a status attested for various hellenistic courts<sup>13</sup>, and thought by most to derive from the Macedonian ἔταῖροι. That would of course strengthen the impression that we are dealing with a senior figure of the (Ptolemaic?) court. But there are clear arguments against taking the Roman terms to represent a formal rank, see D. Braund, *Rome and the Friendly King* (London 1984) 107; and as regards φιλοβασιλεύς, the literary sources give no such hint.

ἀνδρεῖος means “acting like a man”; it may extend to moral courage as well as physical (e.g. Men., *Sam.* 64), and within physical activities to (say) athletes as well as soldiers (Anaxipp. fr. 3.4 KA).

12 This presumably goes back to a hellenistic source; whether to one of the early historians of Alexander, we cannot say. Inscriptions attest similar loyalty titles directed to Roman Emperors (φιλογερμανικός, φιλοκλαύδιος); see Braund, l.c. 105, who traces them back to the time of Mark Antony.

13 H. Kortenbeutel, *RE* 20 (1941) 95–103. L. Mooren, *The aulic titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Brussels 1975); *La hierarchie de cour ptolémaïque* (Louvain 1977).

ἐμ πίστει μέγας. Presumably “very trustworthy” rather than “great in the office entrusted to him”. τὴν παρακέλευσιν ... ἐν πίστει διασώζειν Xen., *Cyr.* 1.6.19; ἡ φιλία ἐν πίστει καὶ βεβαιότητι Arist., *Mag. Mor.* 1208<sup>b</sup>24; κακίων ἐν πίστει Plut., *Publ.* 19.3 (cf. *Mor.* 250D).

4 φιλέλλην. For a survey of usage, see J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et Impérialisme* (Rome 1988) 497–526; to his list (498 n. 9) a few more examples can now be added from *TLG*. The word covers a wide range: it is possible to distinguish political from cultural philhellenism, although in many cases the one implies, or manifests itself in, the other (S. Hornblower, *Mausolus*, Oxford 1982, 295ff.). In outline, the word is applied (1) to non-Greeks either (a) by Greeks, as an interested compliment, or (b) by the non-Greeks themselves, as a gesture; (2) much more rarely, by Greeks to Greeks.

(1) (a) In the nature of things, we hear mostly about monarchs and grandees, whose pro-Greek leanings had important practical consequences. The paradigm is Amasis, who gave the Greeks a city (Naucratis) and religious sites: Herodotus 2.178. Isocrates applies the word to Philip II, in anticipation of his work for Greeks against Persians (5.122); Xenophon to the more benevolent of two Egyptian kings (*Ages.* 2.31). It was applied retrospectively to Alexander I of Macedon, for services unspecified<sup>14</sup>, and to Perseus under Roman threat (App., *Mac.* 11.4.12); to Psammetichus, who gave his sons a Greek education (Diod. Sic. 1.67.9), and Hieron I of Syracuse, who honoured Greek culture (Ael., *VH* 9.1), and the Jewish king Aristobulus I (Joseph., *AJ* 13.318). Similarly, in the novel, of Persian royalty and their eunuchs (Chariton 6.7.5; Heliod. 7.11.7 etc). Whole peoples may be philhellene, in practical benevolence or religious or cultural community (cf. Pl., *Resp.* 470E): the Celts according to Ephorus (*FGrH* 70 F 131); the Salaminians under Evagoras, who took Greek wives and enjoyed Greek goods and practices (Isoc. 9.50); the Galatians, who even came to write their contracts in Greek (Strab. 4.1.5). The kinglike grandees of the Roman Republic follow in the same line: both Antony (Plut., *Ant.* 23.2) and Cassius (App., *BCiv.* 4.67.284); Cicero claimed his real, and well-publicised, philhellenism as a good augury for his brother’s governorship of Asia (*Att.* 1.15.1). Nero granted independence and freedom from taxes to the province of Achaia, and the people of Akraiphia duly honoured him: εἰς καὶ μόνος τῶν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος αὐτοκράτωρ μέγιστος φιλέλλην γενόμενος (*Syll.* II<sup>3</sup> 814.40). The unknown emperor of [Aristides] 35.20 earns the epithet by restoring respect for Greek *paideia* after a time of neglect.

14 First, it seems, in Harpokration. See N. G. L. Hammond/G. T. Griffith, *History of Macedonia* II (Oxford 1979) 101 and n. 3 (“If he was given the name ‘Philhellene’, it was due to his warnings to the Greeks rather than any damage he did to Persia during Xerxes’ invasion”); E. Badian, “Greeks and Macedonians”, *Studies in the history of Art* 10 (1982) 35. Alexander and his friends will have wanted to put the best possible gloss on his behaviour. On the other hand, would he have settled for ‘philhellene’ when he claimed to be a Hellene himself (Hdt. 5.22)?

(1) (b) The later hellenistic era produces evidence of monarchs who themselves adopted Philhellen as a title: thus more than one king of Parthia, Antiochus I of Commagene and the rest<sup>15</sup>. Prudence might recommend a gesture to the rising as well as the declining power (or to power as well as to culture): Strabo notes that Rhodes maintained its independence by being on good terms with τῶν βασιλέων τοῖς φιλορωμαίοις τε καὶ φιλέλλησιν (14.2.5). Antiochus I took the double title, which survived, at least in the remoteness of the Kingdom of Bosporus, as late as the third century AD<sup>16</sup>. Diplomacy explained that the Romans punish kings who plot against the Greeks; kings who maintain their friendship with the Romans, those common benefactors, always produce an incidental benefit for the Greeks<sup>17</sup>.

(2) καλὸν Ἐλληνα ὄντα φιλέλληνα εἶναι (Xen., *Ages.* 7.4). Thus the Athenians stood up for Greek interests in general (Isoc. 4.96, 12.241); so do the Corinthians in Favorinus fr. 95.17 B ([Dio Chrys.], *Or.* 20.17 von Arnim). Hippocrates was a patriot, and declined an invitation to the Persian court (Soranus, *Vit. Hipp.* 8.1). Above all, Homer was a patriot: ἀεὶ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής (Schol. bT on *Il.* 10.14–16)<sup>18</sup>.

πραῦς: the older form (see KB I 532f; Braswell on Pind., *Pyth.* 4.136), which reappears in Xenophon and hellenistic prose. Attic drama has πρᾶος; for New Comedy both papyri and MSS transmit -ο- (Men., *Fab. Inc.* 41, CGFPR 256.24; Men., *Cith.* fr. 1.4, fr. 608, Philem. fr. 82.8 KA) – but -υ- in a papyrus of the *Monostichoi* (VII 4 J).

εὐπροσήγορος is attested first in Euripides, then at Isoc. 1.20; the quality is praised in the *Monostichoi* (260, 265, 654).

5 i.e. μισοπόνηρος (see Welskopf 1207) καὶ φιλαληνής. For the second phrase cf. σέβων ἀλήθειάν τε καὶ πίστιν, Philo, *Spec. leg.* 4.33.2.

6 ἐπισταμ...[, rather than επιστατ...[, to judge from the photograph. If this does continue the description, we could think of ἐπιστάμενος followed by infinitives of which one (τιμᾶν) survives in 7. That seems satisfactory in sense, if a little awkward in metre. Plut., *Marc.* 21.7 τὰ καλὰ ... τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὐκ ἐπιστάμενος τιμᾶν.

7 τιμᾶν ὑεού[ς] rather than ὑεόγ, to judge from the photograph.

8 αὐτὸγ or αὐτὸγ κυβερνᾶν or the like? If so, what was the meaning? (i) With αὐτόν, we could consider two possibilities. (a) The moralising context might suggest a subject like ‘reason’: ‘Epicharmus’ 23 B 57.1 DK ὁ λόγος

15 Evidence in J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique* (Paris/Rome 1988) 499f.

16 *Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani* 54, decree of Amastris in honour of King Rhescuporis.

17 *Syll. II*<sup>3</sup> 630 (decree of the Amphiktyons in honour of Eumenes II, 182 BC) 8–10, 17–18.

18 The material is listed in H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem VI* (Berlin 1983) 520, and discussed by M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden 1963) I 474ff. See further Kakridis, *Homer Revisited* (Lund 1971) 54ff.; Richardson, *CQ* 30 (1980) 273f. Richardson notes that this theme “seldom appears in the A scholia. In its more extreme form, therefore, it does not seem to derive from the Alexandrian scholars”.

ἀνδρώπους κυβερνᾷ (cf. Chrysipp. *SVF* III 390 p. 95.10–12); Men. fr. 417.4 τύχη κυβερνᾷ πάντα. (b) At Ar., *Equ.* 544f. κυβερνᾶν αὐτὸν ἔαυτῷ means “command one’s own ship” (for which you need an apprenticeship as an ordinary sailor). This is a memorable passage (Sulla quoted it over the head of the younger Marius, Appian, *BCiv.* 1.94), and the phrase might be in point here: a leader of long experience. (ii) With αὐτὸν, the point might be *imperare sibi maximum imperium est* (Sen., *Ep.* 113.30). The metaphor seems natural, though the closest verbal parallel I can find comes from high poetry: *Bacchyl.* 17.21–23 ὅστον οὐκέτι τεῦν ἔσω κυβερνᾶις φρενῶν ψυμ[όν] (see further J. Péron, *Les images maritimes de Pindare*, Paris 1974, 139). Philosophers naturally include self-command among the virtues: αὐτὸς ἔαυτὸν κρατεῖν τε καὶ νικᾶν, Ant. Soph. 87 B 58 DK; αὐτὸν ἔαυτοῦ ἄρχειν, Pl., *Grg.* 491D etc.

### Style, genre, content

We have here seven lines without a context. They are iambic trimeters, and plainly comic rather than tragic; they describe a paragon of all the virtues. Editors have glossed the facts in different ways. Crönert and Körte<sup>19</sup> thought of a play, and a high-ranking officer or official; Crönert thought of Athens (at a time of Macedonian alliance) or Alexandria, Körte opted for Alexandria, since an Attic writer would hardly use φιλέλλην and φιλοβασιλεύς as terms of praise. Platnauer agreed in recognising a piece of Alexandrian comedy<sup>20</sup>. Page agreed in seeing an officer at the Alexandrian court, but thought the piece probably not drama, in spite of its tragic models<sup>21</sup>.

Some basic qualifications need to be made. We cannot be sure that the catalogue describes an individual rather than a type; or that ἀνδρεῖος suggests a soldier, and φιλέλλην points to a barbarian; or that lines which mention a monarch must have been written in or for a monarchy, Egyptian or otherwise.

The questions of genre and matter are clearly related. The clues are these:

(i) The anthology. These lines keep company in the anthology with more than one genre. Moral choliambs precede; what follows quotes Euripides, then comes a scene of comic cookery<sup>22</sup>.

(ii) Metre. These are iambic trimeters, composed not later than c. 200 BC. Metric shows that, if they come from drama, they come from comedy, not tragedy. If they do not come from drama, what other genres would accommo-

19 *APF* 7 (1924) 257.

20 J. U. Powell, *New Readings in Greek Literature, Third Series* (Oxford 1933) 178.

21 D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri: Poetry* (Loeb 1942) no. 111.

22 A feast is suggested by 5 τρίποδες (cf. Men., *DySc.* 916, fr. 216). 7 διακονουν.. suits such a scene (Men., *Sam.* 441, *DySc.* 206, 219, 490, fr. 238.2; *CGFPR* 244.164). For 10 τὰ πάτρια ... τῆς τέχνης cf. perhaps Anaxipp. fr. 1.21–22 KA, where the young cook looks forward to leaving συγγράμματα ... καὶνὰ τῆς τέχνης; certainly cooks commonly boast of their τέχνη, Men., *DySc.* 646 etc. Anthologists liked cooks: the Guéraud-Jouguet schoolbook (about contemporary with our papyrus) includes two such pieces.

date them at this date? In the early hellenistic age, Machon used comic trimeters for his *Chreiai*, Apollodorus for his *Chronica* (and his successors for other kinds of digestible didactic); but nothing there looks like this. Philosophers of more than one school seem to have used the medium – perhaps Crantor and Zeno (SH 345–346, 852), certainly Crates (SH 362–367) and Cleanthes (frr. 2–3, 5–10 Powell); most of the fragments consist of direct injunction, but at least the moral context might provide a home for our lines. As for straight encomium, imperial poets will use trimeters for that too, but they are much later<sup>23</sup>.

(iii) Style. The catalogue of virtues shows careful composition. 3 and 4 end with a longer word or word-group; then in 5 the string expands into participial phrases; then (if 6–8 do depend on ἐπιστάμενος) another participle leads into a string of infinitives for the coda. Some commonplaces are dignified by expansion: 5 paraphrases μισοπόνηρος καὶ φιλαληθῆς. The virtues are conventional enough, but the combination may be designedly paradoxical: elsewhere μισοπόνηρία stands in contrast with πραότης (Philo, *De vita Mosis* 2.279, Plut., *Tim.* 3.5).

(iv) Catalogues. The virtues form an asyndetic string. Asyndeton by itself of course is not indicative. It may mark equally comic patter (Antiphan. fr. 88 KA, Ar., *Vesp.* 675–677, Eubulus fr. 74 KA; Herodas 1.27) or breathless rhetoric (Pl., *Symp.* 197DE, *Phdr.* 253DE) or the shorthand of a practical manual (Xen., *Cyn.* 2.5, 6.15, 10.1). If we limit ourselves to personal description, we find similar passages in tragedy (earlier editors cited especially the character of Capaneus at Eur., *Supp.* 867–871, ... ἀψευδὲς ἥθος, εὐπροσήγορον στόμα, ἄκρατον οὐδὲν οὐτ' ἐς οἰκέτας ἔχων οὐτ' ἐς πολίτας; cf. *Or.* 918–922), and also in epitaphs<sup>24</sup> like CEG 67 (Attica, c. 500?) [σό]φρον, εὐ[χσύν]ετος, χσε[νικό]ς, πι[νυ]τός<sup>25</sup>, τὰ κάλ' [ειδό]ς<sup>26</sup>. O. Skutsch added a striking parallel from epic. Ennius thus describes the trusted friend of the consul (Cn.) Servilius Geminus (a self-portrait, according to Aelius Stilo): ... *doctus, fidelis, / suavis homo, iucundus, suo contentus, beatus, / scitus, secunda loquens in tempore, commodus, verbum / paucum, multa tenens antiqua, sepulta vetustas / quae facit ...* (*Ann.* 279–283 S).

(v) Virtues. Our hero has all the virtues: he is a gentleman (2); loyal and trusted (3); civilised and affable (4) and yet of high principle (5); devout and self-controlled (7–8?). That is relatively rare, and certainly easier to predicate

23 M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 183.

24 R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana 1962) 290–299.

25 πι[σσ]τός Crönert; but, as Hansen notes, the supplement is supported by CEG 69.2.

26 Compare the physical descriptions of the Ptolemaic documentary papyri (thus L. Mitteis/ U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* II ii (Leipzig 1912) no. 252.4 μέσος μελίχρως τετανός ἀναφάλακρος μακροπόσωπος εὐθύριν). See A. Caldara, *L'indicazione dei connotati nei documenti papiracei* (Milan 1924); G. Hübsch, *Die Personalangaben als Identifizierungsvermerke im Recht der gräko-ägyptischen Papyri* (Berlin 1968).

of the mythical or the dead. Thus Argos could boast Αγαμεμνον τὸν οὐ μίαν οὐδὲ δύο σχόντα μόνον ἀρετὰς ἀλλὰ πάσας, ὅσας ἂν ἔχοι τις εἰπεῖν (Isoc. 12.72, quoted by Maas); πᾶσαν ἡέχοντ' ἀρετέν, says the epitaph of Alcimachus (*CEG* I 69, c. 500 BC?). Our hero, however, is presented in the present. It may be that he is indeed accidentally perfect; it may of course be that irony comes into it. But Dirk Obbink points out to me another interesting possibility. The Stoic sage is perfect by profession: πάντα ποιεῖν τὸν σοφὸν <κατὰ> πάσας τὰς ἀρετὰς (*SVF* III fr. 557); τοῖς μὲν σπουδαίοις πάντα τάγανδα ύπάρχειν (fr. 589). The wise man will be σώφρων, εὐγενῆς, ἀπλοῦς, ἀνδρεῖος and πρᾶος<sup>27</sup>; and reason is his helmsman (*SVF* III fr. 390).

If we pursue this line, we may want again to look for a context in moral rather than dramatic literature. As it happens, the closest parallel I have found to our catalogue comes from Cleanthes (fr. 3 P, *SVF* I 557):

τάγανδον ἐρωτᾶς μ' οἶον ἔστ'; ἄκουε δή·  
τεταγμένον, δίκαιον, ὄσιον, εὐσεβές,  
κρατοῦν ἔαυτοῦ, χρήσιμον, καλὸν, δέον,  
αὐστηρόν, αὐθέκαστον, αἰεὶ συμφέρον, κτλ.

One can imagine a context in which the Good Man is described as breathlessly as the Good itself.

However, this solution confronts two difficulties. First, moral iambics normally address a singular reader; we should need some special pleading to accommodate ἀγαπᾶτε. Second, φιλέλλην and φιλοβασιλεύς may seem too specific, and the other virtues too unspecific, to pinpoint a directly philosophical context<sup>28</sup>.

Reluctantly, then, I return to the traditional view. These lines describe an individual (real or fictional); therefore we are dealing with comedy. This individual serves a king, yet possesses all the virtues recognised by Greeks and even by Greek philosophers. He qualifies as φιλέλλην: either a non-Greek, acting in the Greek interest; or a Greek acting (against local loyalties) in the general Greek interest; not necessarily of high rank, provided he has the opportunity to harm or benefit. If the former, we could consider an Egyptian, or a Persian (famous for the love of truth, compare line 5); but clearly a Macedonian comes most easily to mind, φιλοβασιλεύς like Craterus and the subjects of Perseus<sup>29</sup>.

27 For example, *SVF* I fr. 216; III frr. 594, 630, 255.

28 Not that loyalty is inconsistent with the character of the wise man: Dr. Obbink points to *SVF* III fr. 691, καν αὐτὸς βασιλεύειν μὴ δύνηται, συμβιώσεται βασιλεῖ καὶ στρατεύσεται μετὰ βασιλέως.

29 Macedonians appear rarely in comedy. Strattis wrote Μακεδόνες ἡ Παυσανίας; Meineke guessed that this Pausanias is the lover of Agathon, and the first title refers to their stay at the court of Archelaus. A Macedonian ruler figures in the fishy fantasia of Ephippus fr. 5 (see most recently H.-G. Nesselrath, *Die attische Mittlere Komödie*, Berlin/New York 1990, 218–

What sort of character in what sort of comedy? O. Skutsch constructed a hellenistic *topos*, the portrait of the king's confidant: the serious version adapted by Ennius, a parodic version given to Terence's Thraso (*Eun.* 401ff.) – and derived perhaps from his Menandrian source<sup>30</sup>. That would give a context for ironic encomium. But the construct is vulnerable<sup>31</sup>; two texts do not make a *topos*. Quite another context could be imagined, without the irony: the good Greek mercenary, loyal both to his foreign king and to his fellow Greeks. It was not only Thraso who had royal connections. A more sympathetic soldier, Thrasonides in Menander's *Misoumenos* (fr. 5 S), may have served in Cyprus “under one of the kings”.

221), but only among other barbarians of the mediterranean fringe. The speaker of Machon fr. 1 notes the gastronomic contribution made by the Macedonians “to us Athenians”. Since Machon produced his comedies at Alexandria, not at Athens (Athen. XIV 664A), he would come closest to the world of Macedonian officers at kingly courts.

30 O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (London 1968) 92–94; summarised in *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford 1985) 450f. I owe this and the following reference to Mr. P. G. McC. Brown.

31 S. Goldberg, *Epic in Republican Rome* (New York 1995) 121–123.