

CHRYSANTHOS S. CHRYSANTHOU

P. OXY. LXXI 4808: *Bios*, CHARACTER, AND LITERARY CRITICISM

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 193 (2015) 25–38

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

P. OXY. LXXI 4808: *Bios*, CHARACTER, AND LITERARY CRITICISM¹

Introduction

This paper discusses the literary genre of the unknown prose text published in volume LXXI of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* by A. G. Beresford, P. J. Parsons, and M. P. Pobjoy. The text is divided by the scribe into three separate sections. The first section (col.i.1–17), marked with a blank line-end at col.i.17, is subdivided into three parts, each dealing with a different historian of Alexander the Great: Onesicritus (1–2), Chares (2–9), and Cleitarchus (9–17). The second section (col.i.18–col.ii.20) deals with Hieronymus, a historian of Alexander’s *diadochoi*, while the third section (col.ii.21–35), introduced by a forked *paragraphos* with ἔκθεσις at col.ii.20–21, focuses on Polybius. The reference to Polybius provides a *terminus post quem* for the composition of the text: it is plausible to think that Polybius published the first fifteen books of his *Histories* by 147 BC, and completed the whole work in his lifetime, so before the end of the second century BC; the details on the papyrus about Polybius’ ‘eye-witness’ and possibly ‘Scipio’ suggest that the writer had an eye to the completed work, not just the earlier version.² Taking also into account that the papyrus is dated to the late first century or the early second century AD,³ the text must have been written at some point in the late Hellenistic or early Roman period.

Discussing the possible genre of the work, the editors suggest that it could be a catalogue of historians with summary comments, a person’s short notes on Hellenistic historiography or even a handbook.⁴ They also propose that it could be related either to a chrestomathy of a similar type to P. Oxy. X 1241, which includes a list of Alexandrian librarians, or to an ‘elementary guide to Greek literature in general, a list of classic works with summary judgments’ of the sort that Quintilian had constructed in his *Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.46ff.⁵

In discussing the nature and literary genre of this work, I present and analyse the biographical information about, and the author’s evaluative comments on, the Hellenistic historians.⁶ What kind of biographical information does the author choose to include? How does biographical material coexist and function with judgements on historical writing? Could we identify anything especially indicative about this sort and level of detail of characterisation and moralising? Keeping all these questions in mind, I then explore what kind of work is preserved on the papyrus. What might the position of this work be in terms of the literary tradition?

1. Biographical Information and Literary Criticism

i. Onesicritus, Chares, Cleitarchus

The text begins with a section on Onesicritus, Chares and Cleitarchus. The surviving lines do not preserve the name of Onesicritus, though the editors infer that the note on him began in the preceding column, wherein other historians might also have been included.⁷ The most extensive part, as the papyrus now

¹ I gladly acknowledge the sponsorship of the State Scholarships Foundation (IKY). ‘This article was completed during my postgraduate study which was funded by the Act “Bursary Program SSF (State Scholarships Foundation) with Individualized Assessment Process, academic year 2012–2013” from funds of the Operational Programme “Education and Lifelong Learning” of the European Social Fund (ESF) and the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) 2007–2013’.

² See [Lucianus] *Macr.* 22 placing Polybius’ death in around 120 BC; cf. Walbank (1972) 20–22. Note also that Walbank (1979) 735, based on 39.5.4–6, suggests that there was a posthumous edition of Polybius’ history.

³ Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 27.

⁴ *Ibid.* 28.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Let it be clarified that my purpose is not to reconsider its historical acuity, but rather to examine the nature of the information.

⁷ Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 33.

stands, is devoted to Cleitarchus and it is particularly rich in biographical details. The editors restore col.i.9–17 as follows:

col.i
 10 Κλείταρχος δὲ κομπω-
 δῶς] μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν ἰς-
 τορίαν γέγραφεν, ἄμεμ-
 πτο]ς δ' ἐξτὶν τὴν διάθε[σι]ν·
 . . .] νε[. . .] δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κ[
 . . .] γε[ι[. . .] καθά φησιν Φ[ί-
 15 λιπ]πο[ς] καὶ διδάσκαλος [. . .]
 . . .] τοῦ [Φ]ιλοπάτορος τ[. . .]
 . . .]αι [. . .] vac.

The editors' suggestion that the ἐπὶ τοῦ κ[α]ταλ[ο]γε[ῖ]ου] seems palaeographically plausible for lines 13–14,⁸ is reinforced by documentary papyri of the late third century BC,⁹ which confirm that the καταλογεῖον had already been established as an administrative office during the kingship of Ptolemy IV (221–204 BC).¹⁰ Therefore, Cleitarchus could have held this leading position and at the same time been the teacher of Ptolemy IV, as our text suggests. However, the papyrus further complicates the discussion of Cleitarchus' dating by revealing that Cleitarchus had lived and worked in Egypt and more precisely in Alexandria from the late fourth century onwards,¹¹ dying at some point after he had become the instructor of Ptolemy IV.¹² If it is here conveying reliable information, the text marks a contrast to those scholars who accept that Cleitarchus was an eye-witness of Alexander's campaign and who thus date his lifetime much earlier than the papyrus suggests.¹³

Alongside the biographical material, the author evinces several judgements on the way in which Cleitarchus composed his historical work. First of all, a close connection between Cleitarchus' *History of Alex-*

⁸ *Ibid.* 34. See also Landucci-Prandi (2013) 84. I am thankful to Prof. Luisa Prandi for correspondence and for sending me a copy of the *RFIC* issue. Prandi claims that 'l'ipotesi che alle ll. 13/14 vi sia menzione di un *katalogeion* appare troppo congetturale per essere seguita. Infatti, sebbene alla fine della l. 13 vi sia parte di una lettera interpretabile come κ ε nella l. 14, dopo l'inizio perduto, la foto d'archivio mostri che prima della rottura del frammento si leggeva bene la sequenza] γε [. la traccia di lettera che si coglie prima di γ non sembra compatibile con la curva di una lettera tonda come ο, mentre la lettera dopo ε potrebbe leggersi ι ma potrebbe anche essere il primo tratto di ν.' Personally, I have no difficulty to consider this small trace of ink before γ as part of an ο. In fact, the black and white archival photo shows just one speck, which could be part of any letter.

⁹ BGU VI 1211, 8 (Decree by Ptolemy IV on the Egyptian cult of Dionysus; 215–205 BC): Ἀριστόβουλον εἰς τὸ καταλογεῖον [ἄ]φ' ἡ[ς]; P. Tebt III.1 770, 13 (Petition of Asclepiades to the King Ptolemy IV; 210 BC): [- ca.10 - ἐπὶ Ἀπο]λλών[των] τοῦ] καταλογεῖου.

¹⁰ On the καταλογεῖον in Alexandria see Taubenschlag (1955) 321; 484 n.30; 533; Wolff (1970) 65; 75 n.45b; 79–82 and (1978) 28; 249–250 n.127.

¹¹ For further evidence on Cleitarchus' presence in Alexandria see Fraser (1972) 496 and 717 n.3; Prandi (1996) 66–68.

¹² Beresford-Parsons-Pobjoy (2007) 34 assert that his death should be placed after 234 BC, if Philopator was born around 244.

¹³ Generally, a reconstruction of Cleitarchus' biography has given rise to a heated discussion among scholars. Jacoby (1921) 624–626 considers that Cleitarchus wrote around 300 BC, therefore being born c.350; he seems to think that Cleitarchus did not take part in Alexander's campaigns, although he can find no conclusive proof of it; see also Brunt (1983) 545, asserting that there is no clear evidence that Cleitarchus was on campaign with Alexander; see Welles (1963) 11 n.1, being ready to accept Cleitarchus' participation; see also Badian (1965) 5–11; cf. Badian (2003b) 421 follows Pliny *HN* 3.57 and maintains that even if Cleitarchus did not follow the expedition from the beginning, he possibly found himself in Babylon in 324–323 BC; Steele (1921) sees 351 BC as the most plausible latest assignable date for the birth of Cleitarchus and thinks that he possibly wrote after 297 BC; Zambrini (2007) 216 dates Cleitarchus' work to the decade 310–300 BC; see also Baynham (2003) 10–11 and Heckel (2008) 7–8, both situating Cleitarchus between the end of the 4th century and the beginning of the 3rd. Prandi (2012) 15–26 sides with a 'high' dating of Cleitarchus (between the end of the 4th century and the beginning of the 3rd). Hazzard (2000) 7–17 places him in the first half of the third century BC; for a complete bibliographical review of Cleitarchus' chronology see Prandi (1996) 69–71; 77–79 and Prandi (2012) 16.

ander,¹⁴ Chares' and most possibly Onesicritus' works – note the καὶ αὐτότε at col.i.10, presumably picking up on the preceding κομπω[δῶτε] (col.i.9–10) 'he too wrote grandiloquently ...' – is implied. But what does such a connection tell us about these three historians of Alexander the Great?

Although the only information we get from our text about Onesicritus is that he was a pupil of Diogenes the Cynic (col.i.1–2),¹⁵ we know from elsewhere that Onesicritus participated in the eastern conquests of Alexander the Great as a high-ranking officer in Alexander's fleet and wrote a work generally known as Πῶς Ἀλέξανδρος ἤχθη.¹⁶ Onesicritus' work was linked with Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* by Diogenes Laertius (6.84 = FGrHist 134 T1), who emphasised its encomiastic character (ὁ δὲ [*sic.* Ὀνησίκριτος ἐγκώμιον] Ἀλεξάνδρου πεποίηκε) and the inferiority of its author compared to his model (ὡς ἀπόγραφος ἐξ ἀρχετύπου δευτερεύει).¹⁷ Lucian takes Onesicritus as an example of a flatterer historian (*Hist. conscr.* 40 = FGrHist 134 T7) and Aulus Gellius (9.4.3 = FGrHist 134 T12) considers him a writer of no authority, who merely deals with incredible tales.¹⁸ Strabo, in particular, in his discussion of writers on India, makes a distinction between 'deliberate falsifiers' and 'defective reporters', including Onesicritus in the latter category (παραψελλίζοντες ἤδη, 2.1.9).¹⁹ Given the general concern of ancient critics with Onesicritus' taste for intermixing marvellous stories and falsehoods with his narrative, despite his being an eye-witness of most of what he describes, we might assume that the papyrus might have included a similar discussion of Onesicritus' literary style. Such a hypothesis can be reinforced by what we read in the following section about Chares:

col.i

Χάρης

δὲ] πρὸς τῷ καὶ αὐτότε πολ-
λ] ἀπεψεῦσθαι, πλείετα γὰρ

5

. . .] ξενικώτερον ἀφήγη-
ται], κακοηθίαν ἐμφαίνει,
οἶ]ον ἐπ' αὐτῇ φωρᾷ τοῦ
πε]ρὶ Παρμενίωνα μελαί-
νων]²⁰

Too little is known of Chares' *Histories of Alexander*, with what we do know mainly drawn from Plutarch and Athenaeus, showing Chares' interest in collecting anecdotes about the luxurious life at Alexander's court and during his campaigns, information about Persian customs and odd items of natural history.²¹ Our papyrus sheds further light on several aspects of Chares' historical narrative. Chares is presented as saying many lies (καὶ αὐτότε πολλ[λ] ἀπεψεῦσθαι) and narrating most of his story in a way depicted as ξενικώτερον. This rare comparative adverb is found in conjunction with the verb ἀφηγοῦμαι in a *scholium*

¹⁴ FGrHist 137 F1–6.

¹⁵ See also FGrHist 134 T1–3; T5a; F17b; on Onesicritus' relation with Diogenes see Pearson (1960) 84; Pédech (1984) 71–72; Brown (1949) 3–4; 24–53 with a chapter on 'Onesicritus and the Cynics'.

¹⁶ On Onesicritus' office see FGrHist 134 T1; T4; T5a; T5c; T6; F27; on Onesicritus' work see FGrHist 134 T1; T9; F27. See also Strasburger (1942) 460–467; Brown (1949) 1–23; Strasburger (1982) 177–180; Pédech (1984) 71–98 and 127–157; Heckel (2006) 183–184; Goulet-Cazé (2007) 130; Zambrini (2007) 213–214; on the ἀρχικυβέρνησις in the Hellenistic era see Hauben (1987) 569–593.

¹⁷ On the relation between *Cyropaedia* and Onesicritus' work see Brown (1949) 13–23. Pearson (1960) 90 considers more possible that Diogenes Laertius meant to compare Onesicritus' work with the *Anabasis* and not the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon.

¹⁸ Cf. Plutarch, presenting him as being ridiculed by Lysimachus for relating the fable of the Amazons' visit to Alexander (*Alex.* 46.4).

¹⁹ Cf. 15.1.28. A similar distinction between those writers who trusted false reports and those who invented their stories for entertaining their audience is also found in Diodorus Siculus' comments on the writers on Africa (3.11). On these points see Romm (1992) 95–97.

²⁰ The supplement in col.i.8–9 μελαί[νων] might fit better than the μελαί[νει.], as Prof. Hammerstaedt suggests to me.

²¹ See FGrHist 125 F1–19; on the character of Chares' work see Berve (1926) 405–406; Badian (2003a) 193; Mignogna (2000) 201; on Chares' fragments in Athenaeus with comparative remarks on those in Plutarch see Payen (2007) 191–214.

to Euripides' *Rhesus*, describing a reference by Mnaseas to Pan's genealogy.²² Mnaseas is identified there with Mnaseas from Patara in Lycia, the author of a work entitled *Periplous* or *Perihēgēseis*, which includes several books interpreting myths and marvellous stories (θαυμάσια) in a rational, euhemeristic manner.²³ The adverb ξενικώτερον, meaning that something is narrated 'in a more strange/unfamiliar/unusual way',²⁴ could thus well signify here that Chares, like Mnaseas, or even Onesicritus – note the καί at col.i.3 – wrote his history in a somewhat idiosyncratic way, suggesting also something more distinctively 'foreign', namely bringing in ideas and versions from distant and possibly non-Greek peoples.²⁵ This interpretation fits well with our assumption that the preceding section on Onesicritus might have included several judgements on the historian's deceitful and falsified narrative. This correlation of novelty (τὸ ξένον τῆς ὑποθέσεως), falsehood (ψεύσματα ποικίλα πιθανῶς τε καὶ ἐναλήθως ἐξενηνόχουμεν) and attractiveness of a work (ἐπαγωγὸν ἔσται) is also found in Lucian's *Verae Historiae* (1.2).

Chares, though, is not only presented as a liar but as a *malicious* author as well (κακοηθίαν ἐμφαίνει), a characteristic well exemplified by the hostility he notoriously (ἐπ' αὐτῇ φωρᾷ)²⁶ shows toward the circle of Parmenion (τοὺς ἰ [πε]ρὶ Παρμενίωνα μελαί[νων]) (col.i.7–9).²⁷ This last piece of information is most likely to be taken as an intimation of the content of Chares' writings.²⁸ However, one should not rule out the possibility that the hostile relationship between the historian and Parmenion's friends might have been extrapolated as biographical information from Chares' work or elsewhere, being used in the present context to suggest Chares' malignity. Chares, after all, belonged to Alexander's suite, having the role of εἰσαγγελεύς (FGrHist 125 T2), and he might have had the opportunity in some cases to have been directly acquainted with those people.

In light of the above, we can now better understand how the words καὶ αὐτός (col.i.10) denote that Cleitarchus, like the two other historians of Alexander, must be seen from a disapproving perspective, being blamed for writing κομπω[δῶς] (col.i.9–10). Our papyrus seems to reinforce the arguments of several modern critics, who tend to associate especially Cleitarchus with Onesicritus, alleging that Cleitarchus used Onesicritus' work and that Strabo's characterisation of Onesicritus as τῶν παραδόξων ἀρχικυβερνήτην (15.1.28) might be extended to Cleitarchus as well.²⁹ Yet even if Cleitarchus is indeed to be criticised for his bombastic style, his arrangement of his material (τὴν διάθε[σι]ν, col.i.12) is characterised as ἄμεμ[πτο]ς (col.i.11–12). What we can only assume from the surviving fragments is Cleitarchus' interest in geograph-

²² *Schol. Eur. Rhes.* 36, Merro 81.8 [= Cappelletto fr. 22]: Μνασέας δὲ ξενικώτερον ἀφηγεῖται τὰ περὶ Πάνα () ἢ ὅτι Κρόνου παῖς ἢ ὅτι παλαιός ἐστιν; for Merro (2008) 167 'È improbabile, dunque, che il periodo di rr. 9–11 (*sc.* ἢ ὅτι ... Αἰακίδην) facesse parte della testimonianza di Mnasea, ed è preferibile ipotizzare con Schwartz lacuna a r. 8'; Merro adds that 'è più plausibile ipotizzare con Cappelletto che questa sezione della nota sia opera di un esegeta del *Reso* ... , che può essersi servito delle genealogie riportate nello scolio stesso per spiegare l'appellativo di Pan ...'; therefore, what Mnaseas says about the genealogy of Pan is lost in the lacuna; cf. Cappelletto (2003) 217; contrast Dindorf (1863) 22–23, noting no lacuna. Another example of ξενικώτερον + ἀφηγοῦμαι is found at the *Schol. Eur. Rhes.* 916. 922 [= Mette fr.84]: [π α ρ ' Α ἰ] σ χ ὄ λ ω ι δὲ τὰ περὶ τὸν Θάμυριν καὶ [τὰς Μούσας ξενικώ]τερον ἀφήγηται; cf. FGrHist 12 F10 in corrigendis p. *32.

²³ Damschen (2006) 93; see also Cappelletto (2003) 13–33; Merro (2008) 166–167.

²⁴ See LSJ citing Arist. *Rh.* 3.1406a 14–15: ἐπεὶ δεῖ γε χρῆσθαι αὐτῷ (ἐξαλλάττει γὰρ τὸ εἰωθὸς καὶ ξενικὴν ποιεῖ τὴν λέξιν); Arist. *Poet.* 1458a 22–23: ξενικὸν δὲ λέγω γλωτταν καὶ μεταφορὰν καὶ ἐπέκτασιν καὶ πᾶν τὸ παρὰ τὸ κύριον.

²⁵ Note that the use of ξενικώτερον might additionally imply something 'alien' or 'borrowed' in it, namely that Chares, apart from telling many (πολλ[λ]) lies on his own account (καὶ αὐτός), also repeated most (πλείστα) of the lies told by others.

²⁶ Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 34 cite Poll. *Onom.* 8.69 (ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῇ φωρᾷ) and Hesych. α8484 (αὐτοφωρία: τὸ ἐπὶ αὐτῇ φωρᾷ (-φορ- bis MS, corr. H. Stephanus). See LSJ (ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῇ φωρᾷ = ἐπ' αὐτοφώρω). I prefer to translate it in the more general sense 'notoriously'/'manifestly' (see LSJ, αὐτόφωρος) rather than 'you catch him', as the editors suggest on p. 33.

²⁷ On Chares' life see FGrHist 125 T1–3; let it be emphasised that Pearson (1960) 57 brings out that 'the fragments reveal nothing of his (*sc.* Chares') opinions about any of the members of Alexander's circle'.

²⁸ Noted also by Prandi in Landucci–Prandi (2013) 83–84.

²⁹ See Prandi (1996) 161; Steele (1921) 40; Brown (1950) 142, tracing additionally the Cynic influence on both authors; on other evaluations of Cleitarchus' pompous narrative see, for example, Strabo 11.5.4 = FGrHist 137 F16; Demetr. *Eloc.* 304 = FGrHist 137 T10; [Longinus] *Subl.* 3.2 = FGrHist 137 T9. Very informative is the fact that later in 12th century AD the way of writing like Cleitarchus becomes a synonym for exaggeration (Tzetz. *Epist.* 13: σὺ δὲ κλειταρχικῶς ἡμᾶς ἐπαίνεις φάμενος πρὸς τοὺς νῦν ἀπαράμιλλον ... οὕτω πως ὑπεραίρεις καὶ σὺ τὰ ἡμέτερα).

ical, ethnographic, zoological observations and highly sensational stories,³⁰ while with reference to the structure of his work, it seems to have been arranged in about fourteen or fifteen books.³¹

In addition, there is possibly a further implication in the word διάθε[ci]γ (col.i.12), whose ambiguity might lead us to take it as ‘disposition’ in the sense of mood or moral character;³² that would suggest a contrast to Chares’ κακοηθίαν (col.i.6), meaning that although Cleitarchus wrote in the same boastful manner, as Chares did, he was, however (δ’ ἐξτίγ, col.i.12), faultless in his moral attitude to the events he describes (col.i.9–12).³³ In any case, the text in P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 is important in revealing a positive response to Cleitarchus. Such a positive evaluation of Cleitarchus seems in concord with the general esteem he enjoyed, especially in the early Roman period. Pliny, for example, refers to him as a *celebratus auctor* (HN 10. 136 = FGrHist 137 T2) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.74 = FGrHist 137 T6) includes him in his canon of historians. Cicero, moreover, cites him as a reliable historical source in his *Epistulae ad familiares* 2.10.3 (FGrHist 137 F8).

Our text, therefore, can well claim a place in that tradition, which helps us learn more about what Cleitarchus’ *History* was like and what kind of *writer* and *person* he was. It provides some significant pieces of biographical information, which not only shed light on Cleitarchus’ character in general but also explain and might be explained by the popularity of his historical work and its attractiveness to the multitude. The fact that Cleitarchus held an official position in Alexandria – possibly heading the κατάλογεῖον – and died after having become a teacher of Ptolemy Philopator might be taken as evidence of his great importance as an Alexandrian scholar in the Hellenistic period. On the other hand, having such administrative privileges Cleitarchus could easily have accessed all the literary sources and documents he needed for writing a *History of Alexander*, giving a richness of material which might help to explain how, despite not being an eye-witness of Alexander’s expeditions, he could become the most popular and admired author on Alexander in Rome between the first centuries BC and AD. Information about Cleitarchus’ public activity and judgements on his historical work can, therefore, be combined to sketch a brief portrait of Cleitarchus. In the following two sections on Hieronymus and Polybius, it will become even more evident how the relation between the historian *qua* historian and the historian *qua* man can constitute an important means by which the scribe characterises and moralises.³⁴

ii. Hieronymus of Cardia

After Cleitarchus’ section, the text contains information about the life and literary activity of Hieronymus of Cardia. We learn, first of all, that he wrote a History of the διάδοχοι of Alexander the Great (col.i.18–19: [Ἱερώνυ]μος [ὁ περὶ] διαδόχου[ci | γράψ]ας).³⁵ In what follows, the reference to Hieronymus’ role as mediator (δισπαστήν, col.i.25; cf. FGrHist 154 T3–4) and the brief exposé of his political and military careers are written in such a way that the reader is clearly meant to judge him favourably. He is primarily presented as a good *person* – [ἀν]ήρ καλὸς | [κάγαθ]ός (col.i.20–21) –³⁶ and is praised for having actively participated in everything he narrates: [. . .]ος[. . .] ἔμπρακτος [. . .] εἶ . . . καὶ γὰρ περὶ τού[των] ἔγραψεν οἷς εχ[. . .] [. . .] ἐπη]κολούθησεν (col.i.21–24).³⁷ A negative judgement on Hieronymus’ historical exposition probably follows ([. . .] πρὸς χάριν ἱστ[ορίαν συν]γράψας, col.i.27–28),³⁸ being in accord with similar

³⁰ See Tarn (1948) 43; Prandi (1996) 161–162; Zambrini (2007) 216.

³¹ See Steele (1921) 43; Pearson (1960) 213; Prandi (1996) 72.

³² Cf. Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 34.

³³ Cf. Dion. Hal. *Pomp.* 3.15.3–4: ζητοῦμεν, τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ συγγραφέως διάθεσιν, ἣ κέχρηται πρὸς τὰ πράγματα περὶ ὧν γράφει.

³⁴ On ‘the style and the man’ in general see Rudd (1964) 216–231.

³⁵ Cf. FGrHist 154 T3; F6.

³⁶ See the comments of Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 35 on the reconstruction of the text.

³⁷ Underlined by me; FGrHist 154 T2.

³⁸ Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 35. The phrase πρὸς χάριν ἢ ἀπέχθειαν is so persistently contrasted with truth in historiographical criticism. On this point see Woodman (1988) 43–47 and the large number of passages cited by Avenarius (1956) 49–54.

charges of partiality against him by other ancient critics.³⁹ Such a negative verdict sits also well with the following lines, where Hieronymus is condemned for the use of speeches in historical writing, which are cited as one way in which Hieronymus falls short of other historians (col.i.29–35).⁴⁰

However, column ii provides important biographical material, which endorses the positive characterisation and evaluation of Hieronymus by indicating his active participation in public affairs:

col.ii	. . .]ετοπ[
	. . .]νεα [
	πρωταμε [
	τωι γάρ συν[c.10	Α-
5	λεξάνδρου [
	τε καὶ εἵκοσι[
	των παρε[
	λουπιτοζ[
	ταδε Αντιγ[ον		
10	τω πολλαατ[
	α .ειτα Δημη[ητρι	c.5	Αν-
	τι]γόνω τω [
	. [] . α .καμ[
	ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐνεγ[ήκοντα ἔ-		
15	ζησεν ἔτη [c.5 παράδει-		
	γμα		

Hieronymus entered the service of Antigonos Monophthalmus (9); he later followed Demetrius Poliorcetes (11), and finally Antigonos Gonatas (11–13).⁴¹ It is also possible that in line 7 there is a reference to Hieronymus' service next to Eumenes (παρ' Εὐμένει), as the editors assume.⁴² The account of Hieronymus' public career ends with a mention of the old age at which he died (14–15). Moreover, if we accept the editors' reconstruction of lines 3–5 (πρῶτα μὲν [Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, Κλει]τῶι γάρ συν[ῆν τῶι ἀδελφῶι Ἀ]λεξάνδρου),⁴³ the text seems to expand our knowledge about Hieronymus' relation to Alexander, providing extra information about Hieronymus' knowledge of Alexander and his campaigns.⁴⁴ However, an alternative restoration of the text, which would have no such suggestion, might also be possible, although the papyrus is too damaged to enable any firm assertion. We could read this as saying, for instance, [ἐπὶ τοῦ]τῶι γάρ συν[έγραψε τὰς Ἀ]λεξάνδρου π[ράξεις,⁴⁵ implying a plausible reference to Hieronymus' own work;⁴⁶ in this view, it is

³⁹ Cf. esp. FGrHist 154 F9 and F15 on a negative assessment of Hieronymus' bias towards Antigonos Gonatas; on Hieronymus' elitist approach to history see Roisman (2010) 139–148 and (2011) esp. 61–62 and 73–76.

⁴⁰ Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 35 reconstruct col.i.28–34 as follows: καὶ εἰ μὴ ἰ [πυκναῖ]ς ῥητορείαις ἦδελ[το, τάδε] μὲν γάρ ἀ[λλότρι]α ἱστορία[ς ἀλη]θοῦς ἰ [ώ]ς καὶ ὠφελίας [ὄλ]ης ἰ [έ]στι]ν, οὐδενὸς λ[ε]ί[πει]τ' ἄ]ν ἱστορικῶν.

⁴¹ Cf. FGrHist 154 T3–6; T8; F3; see Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 35–36 for more details on textual criticism; see also Jacoby (1913) 1540–1560; Brown (1947) esp. 684–696; Knoepfler (2001) 26–27; 35–40 on Hieronymus' life and career in general.

⁴² Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 35.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Hornblower (1981) 9 mentions that 'through nothing that we know of his history necessarily suggests personal knowledge of Alexander or of his campaigns'; cf. Jacoby (1913) 1540: 'Ob er sich schon zu Alexanders Lebzeiten bei Eumenes befand, ist ungewiß, aber bei der Verehrung, die H. für die Gestalt des großen Herrschers gehabt zu haben scheint, nicht unwahrscheinlich.' Most recently see Landucci–Prandi (2013) 90. Landucci seems to accept that here we have new information about Hieronymus' relation to Alexander, noting that 'sulla base di tale citazione, infatti, è ipotizzabile l'esistenza di una prima fase della carriera di Ieronimo in collegamento diretto con la vita e le gesta del sovrano macedone, fase che fino alla pubblicazione del papiro ci era totalmente ignota ...'

⁴⁵ I owe this point to Chris Pelling. Palaeographically, after υ, there are only some scanty traces of ink which could be just accidental or part of a letter -π is not impossible.

⁴⁶ So [ἐπὶ τοῦ]τῶι could possibly refer to a specific section of Hieronymus' work. Hornblower (1981) 16 comments that there must have been several digressions in Hieronymus' work, as for example on the funeral carriage of Alexander (FGrHist

not unlikely that the biographical information which follows has also been taken from Hieronymus' books, where the author included the history of his own time and possibly might have mentioned details of his own participation in the campaigns of Alexander's successors. However, no word of Hieronymus is directly attested and our papyrus is too fragmentary to enable any firm conclusion. In any case, what we should keep in mind is that the text is rich in biographical information, which contributes to the generous portrayal of Hieronymus as an active participating historian, representative of serious historical writing. The moral aspect of the text becomes particularly evident at the end of Hieronymus' section, where the historian is elevated to an *exemplum* of σωφροσύνη, to a great and serious (ζ[π]ουδαῖος) *author* and *man*:

col.ii
 15 ζησεν ἔτη [c.5 παράδει-
 γμα σωφροσύνης c.7
 ἔξ' ὧν πάντων
 νεωστῶ
 20 μος συνγραφεὺς καὶ ἀνὴρ
 ζ[π]ουδαῖος [

iii. Polybius

The last section of the text is concerned with Polybius' political and military careers as one of the leading men of the Achaean League.⁴⁷ As said on the papyrus, Polybius was involved in a τάγμα and participated in affairs,⁴⁸ most likely following Scipio in his expeditions: αὐτος ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι γέγονε καὶ ἐν Κικιπῶνι | συνεστράτευσε, col.ii.23–25). Again, biographical information is used to draw out several aspects of the character of the historian. Polybius' military and civil careers become revealing of Polybius' love for truth and his great practical knowledge. The text primarily stresses Polybius' autopsy (ἀυτόπτης τῶν πλεῖστων ἐγένητο, col.ii.25–27) and active involvement in historical events. It is not impossible that the author of our text might have extracted the biographical details and statements about Polybius' writing from Polybius' *Histories* themselves. Polybius does make a reference to his role as commander of the cavalry of the Achaean League (28.6.9) and includes many instances of his own military and political activity.⁴⁹ He also lays particular emphasis on the significance of first-hand knowledge in writing history,⁵⁰ maintaining that a man lacking personal inquiry and political and military experience can never become a historian (12.25g.1).⁵¹ Our text is therefore aligned with Polybius' statements in his *Histories* and illustrates again how Polybius' first-hand experience (notice πολειτικοῖς, col.ii.31) endowed him with versatile knowledge and the capacity to write truthfully:

col.ii
 25 συνεστράτευσε καὶ αυτό-
 πτης τῶν πλεῖστων ἐγένε-
 ντο καὶ φιλαλήθως συν-

154 F2), on the Dead Sea (FGrHist 154 F5) etc. Moreover, on p. 89 she argues that 'it is *a priori* unlikely that Hieronymus burdened his introduction with irrelevant details about Alexander. Brief allusions to Alexander's lifetime were often necessary.' Cf. Panichi (2001) 156–157; 164–166 on Hieronymus' 'alternative' versions of Alexander's march to Asia, as attested by Appian; on Hieronymus book, in general, see Hornblower (1981) 76–106.

⁴⁷ See Von Fritz (1954) 3–30 for Polybius' life and political background.

⁴⁸ Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 36 suggest the following reconstruction of col.ii.21–22: either τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἱππικῆς οὐ τάγματι[ος] or τῶν ἐκ τοῦ βουλευτικῆς οὐ τάγματι[ος].

⁴⁹ See for example 6.11a.2; 24.6.3; 28.3.7–8; 28.13.6; 31.23.7–9; 35.5. On this point see McGing (2010) 84–86; Walbank (1972) 71–74.

⁵⁰ See 3.4.13; 20.12.8. Note that Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 36 point out that in lines 25–26 our author seems to quote Polybius' words at 3.4.13. On Polybius' assumptions on the writing of history see especially Sacks (1981).

⁵¹ Cf. 12.25d.1; 12.27.6.

γέγραφε· πολυμ[αθέτε-
 ρος δὲ καὶ ἐν [
 30 ρος καὶ μάλιε[τα ἐν τοῖς
 πολεμικοῖς κ[
 πολυμαθεῖς δ[
 .[.]μημοναῖ [c. 9 ic-
 το[ρί]αν περι· ε[
 35 ἀλλὰ καὶ περι· [52

To sum up, in all the sections analysed above we can clearly see how the author includes biographical material – probably in some cases originally found in or deduced from the same works of the historians or elsewhere – in order to sketch the character of the historians and highlight their virtues and vices in composing historical works.⁵³ Within such a framework our author is ready to pass his own judgements on the historians and at the same time prompt analogous reactions from his readers. It is indeed true that an unequal number of biographical details is given for each historian. We read, for example, that Onesicritus was a pupil of Diogenes the Cynic, but we learn nothing explicit about Chares' life, although strong evaluative comments on the lying and malicious aspects of his narrative are sufficient to illuminate several aspects of his ἦθος (cf. *κακοηθία*, col.i.6). However, more information is given about Cleitarchus' public life, indicating several aspects of his persona as a public figure and historian. Finally, in the last two surviving sections, we see the author portraying Hieronymus as an example of prudence, both a great man and writer, and Polybius as an active public individual, a historian of true and versatile learning. Hieronymus and Polybius constitute, in fact, two authors who in many respects invite comparison with each other. This is something the author acknowledges by placing the one after the other, also giving in both cases references to their military and political activities that serve to provide the reader with portraits of two serious and 'pragmatic' historians. The author of our text seems to suggest his opposition to the falsified, malicious, bombastic and dramatic style of historical writing; he sets forth his preference for a truthful and impartial historical narrative, written by an experienced and actively participating historian.⁵⁴ P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 does imply a sort of a theory of historical writing; however, in order to accomplish this, the author builds up the portraits of some historians by closely interrelating their βίος, moral disposition and the way of their writing.

2. What kind of work was P. Oxy. LXXI 4808?

At this point, I turn my attention to an examination of the literary genre of the work preserved in P. Oxy. LXXI 4808, taking into account all the observations made above. As mentioned already in the introduction, the editors put forward many alternatives when discussing the nature of this work, being more inclined to accept that it constitutes a simple catalogue, something more than a simple list of historians, with summary comments. They also relate the text to the chrestomathy of P. Oxy. X 1241 and to Quintilian's reading list for orators.

P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 does indeed have some affinities with such texts, but at the same time there are important differences. The second column of P. Oxy. X 1241 begins with an account of the Alexandrian librarians, who are presented in chronological order and by name with almost no information on their career or any judgement passed on them. Only at lines 2–5 are we informed that Apollonius Rhodius was the tutor of Ptolemy I. Therefore, P. Oxy. X 1241 appears to be different from P. Oxy. LXXI 4808, where

⁵² Underlined by me. See Luppe (2007) 40 for a possible restoration of lines 31–34: κ[αὶ πᾶν τὸ] | πολυμαθεῖς δ[ιαφαίνε]τε[ρα] μὴ μόνον ἐῖς τὴν ἰστορίαν, translating as 'und die gesamte Gelehrsamkeit scheint durch nicht nur auf die Geschichtsschreibung'.

⁵³ Cf. Vannicelli (2013) 101–102 noting too the interconnection between the biographical information that are chosen to be cited on the papyrus and the historians' writing.

⁵⁴ See also Moggi (2013) 63–64 making a similar point and relating our text to Lucian's conception of historical writing in the *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit*; cf. Landucci-Prandi (2013) 94–95.

well. Plutarch's *On the Malice of Herodotus* provides an illuminating parallel with our argument. Plutarch accuses Herodotus of maliciousness (κακοθήτεια)⁶² – remember P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 col.i.6: κακοθήτῳ ἐμφαίνεται –, deceit and insincerity in his historical writing. He relates Herodotus' defective narrative to Herodotus' love for barbarians (857A: φιλοβάρβαρος), and often resorts to biographical details to back up his criticism. Plutarch says, for example, that Herodotus' unfavourable presentation of the Thebans might be related to Herodotus' unsuccessful attempt at asking the Thebans for money, whose magistrates, according to Aristophanes the Boeotian, prevented Herodotus from meeting and discussing with their young men (864D). Moreover, Plutarch explains Herodotus' introduction of Callias in the story by Herodotus' wish to flatter Hipponicus, one of the wealthiest men of his time (863B). He additionally refers to Herodotus' attachment to the Halicarnassians in order to disqualify Herodotus' strong criticism of the Greeks who medized (868A).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus follows a similar practice in his essay *On Thucydides*. Dionysius considers that Thucydides was different from earlier historians because he excluded from his narrative all those stories that seem incredible and highly ridiculous (*Thuc.* 6.3–5; 7.3).⁶³ He explains this aspect of Thucydides' work by laying especial emphasis on Thucydides' first-hand experience (ἐξ ἐμπειρίας) in some of the historical events he narrates as well as his research about those events in which he could not participate because he was in exile. With reference to Thucydides' presentation of the Melian Dialogue, in particular, Dionysius stresses that Thucydides neither took part in the discussion nor was present at the meeting nor even heard about it from any of the Athenian or Melian spokesmen. During that time, Dionysius tells us, Thucydides was in exile (*Thuc.* 41.3). It is because of his exile, as Dionysius thinks, that Thucydides held a grudge against his city and accordingly gave such a slanderous account of the Melian Dialogue (*Thuc.* 41.7–8).

It is this process of ancient historiographical literary criticism, synthesising biographical information, comments on the historians' moral disposition as well as on their literary qualities and/or failings, which the author of our texts follows. As has been shown, biographical details about Hieronymus and Polybius and judgements on their writing are interrelated, suggesting respectively Hieronymus as a παράδειγμα σωφροσύνης (col.ii.15–16), a great and serious man and author (col.i.20–21; col.ii.19–20), and Polybius as an active participant in affairs and a historian of great and real knowledge (col.ii.25–32). Remember also the sections on Chares (col.i.2–9) and Cleitarchus (col.i.9–17). We argued that Chares' characterisation as malicious (col.i.6) was based on the hostility he shows toward the circle of Permenion (col.i.7–9). This last information could be either an intimation of the content of Chares' writings or biographical information, which the scribe found in or extrapolated from Chares' work or elsewhere, and used in order to suggest Chares' maliciousness. Similarly, the details about Cleitarchus' official position in Alexandria – possibly leading the καταλογεῖον and being a teacher of Ptolemy Philopator – might have been either found in or deduced from Cleitarchus' work or elsewhere. Such a popular and admirable scholar *had* or *might have had* such administrative privileges, which allowed him, although not being an eye-witness of Alexander's campaigns, to write a *History of Alexander*. Whether all these information are historically accurate or not, it might not be the primary concern of the author of our text, who following a practice similar to that of Plutarch or Dionysius, is mainly interested to bring together and associate the historians' life with their character and literary output.

⁶² See, for example, *De Herod. malig.* 854E–F; 855A; 861A; 861D; 867C. Different opinions have been expressed about the possible character and 'genre' of this essay. It has been stated that it might be an 'argumentative work' (Bowen (1992) 12), a 'kind of scholarly *controversia*' (Russell (1973) 60), or an example of 'judicial rhetoric' (Hershbell (1993) 158–159 following Seavey's suggestion). See also Pearson (1965) 6 arguing that 'The *De Malignitate* is an ethical essay, not an attempt at historical criticism or a political pamphlet in defence of the Boeotians'. Marincola (1994) 192–193, whose view I share, considers that the treatise is both ethical and historiographical and argues that it is not right to separate ethical and historiographical criticism. For a similar line of thinking see Pelling (2007) 162 citing also in n. 60 Homeyer (1967) 183 who speaks of 'eine Typologie in der historiographischen Kritik'.

⁶³ I cite according to the Les Belles Lettres-edition by Germaine Aujac (1991).

Although P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 was written in the later first century or the early second century AD, its content and format reflect the distinct tendency of Hellenistic scholars to group poets, philosophers and men generally of the same profession in the same book,⁶⁴ but it also demonstrates the propensity to produce important treatises in the form of lists/catalogues.⁶⁵ One might recall the Callimachean *Pinakes*, which included biographical details along with the names and works of various authors, as we learn from other sources,⁶⁶ or the ancient *Pinakes* from Tauromenion, which give a quick overview of Greek literature, offering bio-bibliographical information about Greek authors.⁶⁷ Moreover, P. Haun. I 6 has been shown to be a list, more precisely a *Pinax* with biographical summaries of the Ptolemies, illustrating how biographical enquiries alone or along with other literary concerns had a primary place in the typological interests of Hellenistic erudition.⁶⁸

In light of all the above observations, we can assume that our text was composed under the influence of Hellenistic scholarship. It constitutes a list,⁶⁹ arranged in at least three distinct sections, which follow a kind of chronological order (three historians of Alexander the Great, a historian of his διάδοχοι and a historian of his ἐπίγονοι),⁷⁰ and was written following the model of works of historiographical criticism like Dionysius' and Plutarch's.

Such a work could have had a significant function within an educational context. Biographical information is often included in works of rhetoric and literary and textual criticism for instructive purposes.⁷¹ Assuming that P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 constitutes a list, it could also have a more 'practical' aspect and, in this respect, could perhaps have been used at schools during lessons on historiography.⁷² This is, for example,

⁶⁴ See for example Hermippus, who wrote biographies of legislators, sages, philosophers and rhetoricians (FHG III, 36–51 fr. 1–73). See also P. Oxy. XI 1367 which preserves a biographical epitome of the treatise of Hermippus 'On Legislators' written by Heraclides Lembus; cf. Satyrus' βίοι, where he includes biographical sub-divisions on poets, philosophers, statesmen etc. (FHG III, 160–164 fr. 1–19). Neanthes of Cyzicus in his περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν contains biographies of great men as well (FHG III, 4–5 fr. 8–16), preparing the ground for the later Suetonius' *De viris illustribus*; cf. Duris of Samos who wrote a biographical work on the tragic poets (particularly on Sophocles and Euripides, FHG II, 486 fr. 70); see also the Miscellaneous Biographies in P. Oxy. XV 1800, where an interest in characterisation and moralising of the figures is evident. Sappho (fr. 1.i, ii) is presented at lines 17–18 ὡς ἀτακτος οὐ[σ]α τον τροπον. Thucydides (fr. 2.ii, 70) is characterised as δυνατος δε εν λογοις, while Aeschines (fr. 3.ii, 48–49) appears as ευφυης | δ εν λογοις γενομενος. I give the text as it appears in its original edition by Grenfell–Hunt (1922).

⁶⁵ See for example P. Tebt. III.1 695, a work on tragedians in the sort of a list. Hunt–Smyly (1933) 22 mention that the list gives 'besides the names of the poets, their birthplaces and the number of the tragedies which they composed'. Moreover, the second column shows that the tragedians are separated from each other with ἔκθεσις; something that occurs in the second column of P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 too. On the different types of catalogues on papyri see Van Rossum–Steenbeek (1998) 119–163 with further bibliography for all types of lists/catalogues cited on p. 119 nn. 1–4. On lists of books and authors see Otranto (2000).

⁶⁶ See, for example, Diog. Laert. 8.86. On biographical information in the *Pinakes* of Callimachus see especially fr. 430; 432; 438; 448, Pfeiffer (1949). On the *Pinakes* of Callimachus see Schmidt (1922); Stuart (1928) 165; Pfeiffer (1968) 127; Gallo (1968) 23; Witty (1973) and (1958) 132.

⁶⁷ See also Landucci–Prandi (2013) 95 for a brief comparison of the *Pinakes* from Tauromenion to our papyrus. On the *Pinakes* from Tauromenion see also Manganaro (1974) 389–409; on library catalogues, in general, see Burzachechi (1963) 75–96 and (1984) 307–338. I think that we could also relate P. Oxy. LXXI 4809 with such sort of bio-bibliographical works. The writer gives an account of Alexander's ἐπίγονοι, possibly included the διάδοχοι, and expresses an intention to deal with the kings of Pergamum. The emphasis rests on the monarchs' literary production and its authenticity.

⁶⁸ Gallo (1975) 56–75; on this papyrus see Segre (1942/43) 269–280; Momigliano–Fraser (1950) 107–118.

⁶⁹ See Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 28, not excluding the possibility of a catalogue/list; cf. Esposito (2010) 286 commenting on P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 that 'the unsophisticated style and the type of information provided point to a list of notes'.

⁷⁰ See Beresford–Parsons–Pobjoy (2007) 28.

⁷¹ See, for example, the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius, where Aulus often brings into his work biographical details about himself and others. On himself see his discussion on *superesse* at 1.22.6 or his comments at the aspirate *h* at 2.3.5; on others see 2.13.1–3 (Sempronius Asellio); 2.18 (Phaedo of Elis); cf. 15.20 (Euripides). Cf. the *Controversiae* of the elder Seneca, e.g. *Contr. i, praef.* 13–24 (Porcius Latro); ii, *praef.* 1–5 (Fabianus).

⁷² See Nicolai (1992) for more information on historiography and its place into the ancient educational system; cf. Legras (1997) 586–600. On the use of our text see Moggi (2013) 61, claiming that 'POxy LXXI 4808 transmits either a private text written by a learned reader or, more likely, a fragment from a handbook composed for schools and for the pursuit of more advanced learning'; Landucci–Prandi (2013) 96 express the possibility of its use at schools as well; cf. Geraci (2013) 98: 'Per

the case with Heraclides Lembus' epitome of the treatise of Hermippus 'On Legislators' in P. Oxy. XI 1367 and the biographical *Pinax* of Ptolemies in P. Haun. I 6.⁷³ P. Oxy. LXXI 4808, therefore, might preserve the individual notes of a teacher or be a sort of a handbook, designed to provide useful knowledge necessary for a certain level of education.⁷⁴ We should not exclude the possibility, though, that it might have been written for private use, perhaps for the working purposes of a scholar, who certainly knew very well the texts of the historians.⁷⁵

Bibliography

- Arrighetti, G. (ed.) (1964), *Satiro: Vita di Euripide*, Studi Classici e Orientali 13 (Pisa).
- Avenarius, G. (1956), *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim).
- Badian, E. (1965), The Date of Clitarchus, *PACA* 8: 5–11.
- (2003a), Chares, in H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. New Pauly*, Vol. 3 (Leiden–Boston): 193.
- (2003b), Cleitarchus, in H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. New Pauly*, Vol. 3 (Leiden–Boston): 420–421.
- Baynham, E. (2003), The Ancient Evidence for Alexander the Great, in J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great* (Leiden–Boston): 3–29.
- Beresford, A. G. – Parsons, P. J. – Pobjoy, M. P. (eds.) (2007), 4808. On Hellenistic Historians, in R. Hatzilambrou – P. J. Parsons – J. Chapa (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 71 (Oxford): 27–36.
- Berve, H. (1926), *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, Vol. 1: *Darstellung* (Munich).
- Bowen, A. (1992), *Plutarch: The Malice of Herodotus (de Malignitate Herodoti)* (Warminster).
- Brown, T. S. (1947), Hieronymus of Cardia, *AHR* 53: 684–696.
- (1949), *Onesicritus: A Study in Hellenistic Historiography* (Berkeley–Los Angeles).
- (1950), Clitarchus, *AJPh* 71.2: 134–155.
- Brunt, P. A. (ed.) (1983), *Arrian: Anabasis of Alexander*, Vol. 2: *Books V–VII: Indica* (Cambridge, MA.–London).
- Burzachechi, M. (1963), Ricerche epigrafiche sulle antiche biblioteche del mondo greco, *RAL* 18: 75–96.
- (1984), Ricerche epigrafiche sulle antiche biblioteche del mondo greco, *RAL* 39: 307–338.
- Cappelletto, P. (ed.) (2003), *I frammenti di Mnasea: Introduzione, testo e commento* (Milan).
- Criboire, R. (1996), *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Greco-Roman Egypt* (Atlanta).
- (2001), *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton).
- Damschen, G. (2006), Mnaseas, in H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. New Pauly*, Vol. 9 (Leiden–Boston): 93.
- Dindorf, G. (ed.) (1863), *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis tragoedias. Ex codicibus aucta et emendate* (Oxford).
- Duff, T. (1999), *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford).
- Esposito, E. (2010), *P.OXY. LXXI, CR* 60.1: 285–288.
- Fox, M. (1993), History and Rhetoric in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *JRS* 83: 31–47.
- (2001), Dionysius, Lucian, and the Prejudice against Rhetoric in History, *JRS* 91: 76–93.
- Fraser, P. M. (1972), *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 Vols. (Oxford).

quanto concerne la natura del testo sono convinto che non si tratti di una vera e propria opera letteraria in senso stretto, ma di una sorta di 'dispensa' ad uso o di un docente o dei suoi allievi o di entrambi.'

⁷³ See Gallo (1975) 27–31; 74.

⁷⁴ The question whether P. Oxy. LXXI 4808 preserves a kind of 'school text' is of great interest and importance and I intend to revisit it in a separate paper. The identification of school texts involves the close examination of various criteria, such as the layout, the content and the handwriting of the text. On school texts in papyri see Criboire (1996) and (2001); Morgan (1998); Guéraud–Jouguet (1938).

⁷⁵ I am deeply grateful to Prof. Chris Pelling for being always willing to read, and give valuable comments on, my work. I owe a special debt to Prof. John Marincola, Prof. Timothy Duff and Dr. Egidia Occhipinti for their useful suggestions on this paper. I would also like to express my gratitude to Prof. Tim Whitmarsh, Dr. Dirk Obbink, Dr. Katerina Mikellidou for their helpful remarks on an earlier draft of this paper, and to Dr. Daniela Colomo and Dr. James Brusuelas for their important help at several moments during my research at the Papyrology Rooms, Sackler Library, Oxford. Moreover, I would like to thank the editor of the *ZPE*, Prof. Jürgen Hammerstaedt, for his expert advice and all his valuable help. Last but not least, this article is just a small token of my gratitude to Prof. Amphilochos Papatomas not only for his comments on this paper, but most importantly for his inspiring teaching and useful advice all the years of my studies.

- Gallo, I. (ed.) (1968), *Una nuova biografia di Pindaro (P. Oxy. 2438): Introduzione, testo critico e commentario* (Salerno).
- (1975), *Frammenti biografici da papiri*, Vol. 1: *La biografia politica* (Rome).
- Geraci, G. (2013), Dibattito, in *Un nuovo catalogo di storici ellenistici (P Oxy LXXI 4808). Tavola rotonda, Roma, Istituto italiano per la storia antica, 10 giugno 2011, RFIC* 141: 98–99.
- Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. (2007), Onesicritus, in H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. New Pauly*, Vol. 10 (Leiden–Boston): 130.
- Grenfell, B. P. – Hunt, A. S. (eds.) (1922), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 15 (London).
- Guéraud, O. – Jouguet, P. (ed.) (1938), *Un livre d'écolier du IIIe siècle avant J.-C.* (Cairo).
- Guerra, A. T. (1994), L'opera filodemea *Su Epicuro (PHerc. 1232, 1289 β)*, *CErc* 24: 5–54.
- Hauben, H. (1987), Onesicritus and the Hellenistic *Archikybernesis*, in W. Will – J. Heinrichs (eds.), *Zu Alexander d. Gr. Festschrift G. Wirth zum 60. Geburtstag am 9.12.86* (Amsterdam): 569–593.
- Hazard, R. A. (2000), *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda* (Toronto).
- Heckel, W. (2006), *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great: Prosopography of Alexander's Empire* (Oxford).
- (2008), *The Conquests of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge).
- Hershbell, J. (1993), Plutarch and Herodotus: The Beetle in the Rose, *RhM* 136: 143–163.
- Homeyer, H. (1967), Zu Plutarchs De Malignitate Herodoti, *Klio* 49: 181–187.
- Hornblower, J. (1981), *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford).
- Hunt, A. S. (ed.) (1912), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 9 (London).
- Hunt, A. S. – Smyly, J. G. (eds.) (1933), *The Tebtunis Papyri*, Vol. 3.1 (London).
- Jacoby, F. (1913), Hieronymos, in G. Wissowa – W. Kroll (eds.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 8.2 (Stuttgart): 1540–1560.
- (1921), Kleitarchos, in G. Wissowa – W. Kroll (eds.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 11.1 (Stuttgart): 622–654.
- Knöbl, R. (2008), *Biographical Representations of Euripides: Some Examples of their Development from Classical Antiquity to Byzantium*, Durham theses, Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/2190/>.
- Knoepfler, D. (2001), Trois historiens hellénistiques: Douris de Samos, Hiéronymos de Cardia, Philochore d' Athènes, in J. Leclant – F. Chamoux (eds.), *Histoire et historiographie dans l'antiquité: Actes du 11e Colloque de la Villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer les 13 and 14 Octobre 2000* (Paris): 25–44.
- Landucci, F. – Prandi, L. (2013), P Oxy LXXI 4808: Contenuto e Problemi, in *Un nuovo catalogo di storici ellenistici (P Oxy LXXI 4808). Tavola rotonda, Roma, Istituto italiano per la storia antica, 10 giugno 2011, RFIC* 141: 79–97.
- Lefkowitz, M. (2012), *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London).
- Legras, B. (1997), L'enseignement de l'histoire dans les écoles grecques d'Égypte (IIIème siècle av. n.è.–VIème siècle de n.è.), in B. Kramer – W. Luppe – H. Maehler – G. Poethke, *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses: Berlin, 13.–19.8.1995* (Stuttgart): 586–600.
- Luppe, W. (2007), Würdigung des Polybios in P. Oxy. 4808, *ZPE* 163: 40.
- Manganaro, G. (1974), Una biblioteca storica del ginnasio di Tauromenion e il P. Oxy. 1241, *PP* 29: 389–409.
- Marincola, J. (1994), *Plutarch's Refutation of Herodotus*, *AncW* 25.2: 191–203.
- McGing, B. (2010), *Polybius' Histories* (Oxford).
- Merro, G. (ed.) (2008), *Gli scolii al Reso euripideo*, Orione. Testi e Studi di Letteratura Greca 2 (Messina).
- Mignogna, E. (2000), Odati e Zariadre: Carete di Mitilene (ap. Athen. 13, 575 = FGGrHist 125 F5), in A. Stramaglia (ed.), *Ἔπος, Antiche trame greche d'Amore* (Bari): 201–208.
- Moggi, M. (2013), Introduzione, in *Un nuovo catalogo di storici ellenistici (P Oxy LXXI 4808). Tavola rotonda, Roma, Istituto italiano per la storia antica, 10 giugno 2011, RFIC* 141: 61–66.
- Momigliano, A. – Fraser, P. (1950), A New Date for the Battle of Andros? A Discussion, *CQ* 44.3/4: 107–118.
- Morgan, T. (1998), *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge).
- Nicolai, R. (1992), *La storiografia nell'educazione antica* (Pisa).
- Otranto, R. (2000), *Antiche liste di libri su papiro*, *Sussidi Eruditi* 49 (Rome).
- Panichi, S. (2001), Ieronimo di Cardia, Alessandro e gli Antigonidi, *Studi Ellenistici* 13: 155–166.
- Payen, P. (2007), Les fragments de Charès de Mytilène chez Athénée, in D. Lenfant (ed.), *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (16–18 Juin 2005)* (Paris): 191–214.
- Pearson, L. (1960), *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, *Philological Monographs* XX (New York).
- (1965), Introduction, in L. Pearson – F. H. Sandbach, *Plutarch's Moralia in Fifteen Volumes*, Vol. 11 (Massachusetts–London): 2–7.
- Pédech, P. (1984), *Historiens compagnons d'Alexandre. Callisthène – Onésicrite – Néarque – Ptolémée – Aristobule* (Paris).

- Pelling, C. (2007), De Malignitate Plutarchi: Plutarch, Herodotus, and the Persian Wars, in E. Bridges – E. Hall – P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford): 145–164.
- Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949), *Callimachus*, Vol. 1 (Oxford).
- (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford).
- Prandi, L. (1996), *Fortuna e realtà dell'opera di Clitarco*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 104 (Stuttgart).
- (2012), New Evidence for the Dating of Cleitarchus (*POxy LXXI. 4808*)?, *Histos* 6: 15–26.
- Roisman, J. (2010), Hieronymus of Cardia: Causation and Bias from Alexander to his Successors, in E. Carney – D. Ogden (eds.), *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives* (Oxford): 135–148.
- Roisman, J. (2011), The Silver Shields, Eumenes, and their Historian, in A. Erskine – L. Llewellyn-Jones (eds.), *Creating a Hellenistic World* (Swansea): 61–82.
- Romm, J. S. (1992), *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction* (Princeton).
- Rudd, T. (1964), The Style and the Man, *Phoenix* 18.3: 216–231.
- Russell, D. A. (1973), *Plutarch* (London).
- Sacks, K. (1981), *Polybius on the Writing of History* (Berkeley).
- Schmidt, F. (1922), *Die Pinakes des Kallimachos* (Berlin).
- Schorn, S. (ed.) (2004), *Satyros aus Kallatis: Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel).
- Segre, M. (1942/43), Una genealogia dei Tolemei e le “*Imagines Maiorum*” dei Romani, *RPAA* 19: 269–280.
- Steele, R. B. (1921), Clitarchus, *AJPh* 42.1: 40–57.
- Strasburger, H. (1942), Onesikritos, in W. Kroll – K. Mittelhaus (eds.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 18 (Stuttgart): 460–467.
- (1982), Onesikritos, in W. Schmitthenner – R. Zopf (eds.), *Studien zur Alten Geschichte I* (Hildesheim): 177–180.
- Stuart, D. R. (1928), *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography* (Berkeley).
- Tarn, W. (1948), *Alexander the Great*, Vol. 2: *Sources and Studies* (Cambridge).
- Taubenschlag, R. (1955), *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri 332 B.C.–640 A.D* (Warszawa).
- Vannicelli, P. (2013), Dibattito, in *Un nuovo catalogo di storici ellenistici (P Oxy LXXI 4808). Tavola rotonda, Roma, Istituto italiano per la storia antica, 10 giugno 2011*, *RFIC* 141: 101–102.
- Van Rossum – Steenbeek, M. (1998), *Greek Readers' Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri*, *Mnemosyne Supplementum* 175 (Leiden–New York–Köln).
- Von Fritz, K. (1954), *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity: a Critical Analysis of Polybius' Political Ideas* (New York).
- Walbank, F. W. (1972), *Polybius* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London).
- (1979), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Vol. 3: *Commentary on Books XIX–XL* (Oxford).
- Welles, C. B. (ed.) (1963), *Diodorus of Sicily in Twelve Volumes*, Vol. 8: *Books XVI. 66–95 and XVII* (Cambridge, MA.–London).
- Witty, F. J. (1958), The Pinakes of Callimachus, *Library Quarterly* 28.1/4: 132–136.
- (1973), The Other Pinakes and Reference Works of Callimachus, *Library Quarterly* 43.3: 237–244.
- Wolff, H. J. (1970), *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer* (Munich).
- (1978), *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemäer und des Prinzipats*, Vol. 2: *Organisation und Kontrolle des privaten Rechtsverkehrs*, *Rechtsgeschichte des Altertums* 5.2 (Munich).
- Woodman, A. J. (1988), *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (London–Sydney).
- Zambrini, A. (2007), The Historians of Alexander the Great, in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford): 210–220.