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NOTES ON PHILODEMUS, ON ANGER

Fr. 17 app. 15–17

15 καὶ ΔΟΥΜ[— — —]
ΕΙΔΕ[— — —]
ΛΕΥϹ[— — —]

At the end of line 15, I read λ. Perhaps then a contrast was drawn between a slave or slaves and a king (17 βαϲιλεύϲ, supplied by R. Philippson, RhM 71 (1916) 437). But it is not easy to take matters any further.  

3.6–7
tὸ μὲν ἀ[γ–] νοο[μένα] τελεόϲ  

The supplement at the end of line 6 is ruled out by the faulty line division: γ cannot be separated from ν in this combination. νοο is clearly legible in N and it begins at the left-hand margin, but it is in a second hand and written over something else. The original shows νο, with room for a narrow letter at the beginning of the line; O has more of this ν, correctly placed, and lacking only the very top. We may then print ἀ[γ–]νοο[μένα]: the second o given by the second hand of N is probably no more than a conjecture.

3.18–25
tοῦτ[ο] γὰ[ρ] δὴ προϲ-
τι[θ]ε[κ]υ[ν] [κό[μ]υ][μετρ]-
20 ω[c] τῶν φιλ[οϲ]φον οἱ
δὴ γεν[αιο] καὶ τοὺς τρό-
[πο]υς, δ[ι’] ὄν ἢκιςϲα
τοὺς ὑργ[ῖλοϲ] πάθεϲιν
περιπίπτ[ο]υς, ὑπο-
25 γράφουϲιν.

1 Lemmata are drawn from the edition of G. Indelli, Filodemo: L’ira (1988), and his numbering is used throughout. I also refer to the editions of L. Spengel (Philol. Suppl. 2 (1863) 498–525), T. Gomperz (Philodemi Epicurei de ira liber (1864)), and K. Wilke (Philodemi de ira liber (1914)). References are to columns except where specified. The sources for the text are the papyrus (P. Herc. 182) and the Oxford (O; for digital images, see http://www.herculaneum.ox.ac.uk) and Naples (N) disegni. I have used photographs of all three. To save space, I do not discuss passages in which I am inclined to revive neglected proposals found in earlier editions (e.g. 21.17–20 ο[ὐ] μο[ν] (Gomperz) …, Φ[ο]λο[ν] (Spengel)), nor a few places where my readings match those of M. McOsker, who plans to publish a revised text and translation in collaboration with D. Armstrong. The following abbreviations may be noted:

Cröner  W. Cröner, Kolotes and Menedemos (1906).
Jensen  C. Jensen, Ein neuer Brief Epikurs (1933).

2 I briefly record here a few other points in the fragments:
1.9 Perhaps λοπροτ[ι]ς: the final letter appears to have a crossbar. (E. Dürr, CERC 18 (1988) 215, states that frr. 1 and 2 are in a different hand, but see Giuliani 136 n. 19.)
3.31–2 οὐτοϲ: a participle in agreement with the following τοῦ μὴ κτλ.?
13.14 ἂ παρῆται. It is not clear which sense of παρῆται is to be assumed.

3 See in general Janko 75–6.

4 Wilke reports ‘μενο’ N l. at the end of 6, but the surface is damaged, and there are no clear traces to the right of α, which O shows as the last letter of the fragment.
Concerning the structure, Wilke comments (on line 19) ‘κἂμι μετρίωϲ sc. ὀργιϲθείη’, but the ellipse is a harsh one, as Indelli says in his note: the verb to be understood is not present in the context. μετρίωϲ was supplied by Gomperz; Wilke places ω outside the bracket, but the small high trace at the beginning of the line does not point to any letter in particular, and in fact ωϲ is clearly too long for the space. Then in the previous line, where Wilke reads and supplies [κα]ί, O has space for two or three letters followed by ὁ. The draughtsman shows no doubt about the decipherment, and while the papyrus is now damaged, the surviving traces are compatible with what he draws. (In N too, an α was drawn after the gap, but this and the next letter, now largely obscured, were made into a large μ by the corrector:5 cf. above on 6–7.) We may then safely supply καί here, with Gomperz, though the κ will not fill the gap by itself. Finally, in line 21, Gomperz was evidently wrong to take γενναῖϲ to be the first word of the line, but there is no reason to supply δῆ (Crönert 90 n. 440) in particular at the start. Taking these points into account, I propose the following text:

\[\text{τοῦτο[ό] γῶ[ό] μ[]} \prod \text{προς-} \]
\[\text{τιθέαϲιν [ο[ί] κ[α]ί μ[έτρι-} \]
\[\text{ό[ι] τ[ῶν φ[ιλ][φ]όφων, ο[ί} \]
\[\text{δὲ} γενν[ά]ο[ι] κτλ.} \]

‘For even the middling among philosophers add this, while the noble (sc. among philosophers) also sketch the traits by means of which we should least fall victim to irascible passions.’ For the expression, cf. Oec. 27.31–3 ο[ι καὶ χο[π]α[π]κυκότεροι τ[ῶν φ][]λο[κ]φο[ι]ν.

8.24–8
καὶ βριμώϲεωϲ καὶ δεινήϲ
8.25
ἐπιθυμίαϲ τοῦ μετέλ-
θείν καὶ ἀγονίαϲ, εἰ δυ-
νήϲεται, κεκάστερ ὁπο-
O has at the start of line 28 δἐ, ωϲ, the uncertain trace being an unusually broad letter resembling a π. N has δἐ followed by an erasure, and the ε is quite clear in the original, but little can be made out in the damaged patch that follows.6 In such a case, O, conscientiously executed when the text was better preserved, is of particular value. Its reading is most easily accounted for by supposing that the papyrus had ἀποδειÇουϲ: a damaged ξ, with its flat top, could easily be taken for the right-hand side of a broad π.7 The man’s utterances, then, will demonstrate his anguish, should he be able to take revenge: it is no longer necessary to take εἰ δυνήϲεται somewhat unnaturally with τοῦ μετέλθειν, as Bücheler had proposed (580 = 513).

9.18–19
τρόμοϲ καὶ κ[ινήϲειϲ]
τῶν με[λ]ῶν
In line 19, O has between με and ον the loop of a ρ with the upper part of its upright on the left. For μερῶν in this context, cf. e.g. Gal. Trem. Palp. 5 (51.16–17 Konstantinides = vii 594.16–17 Kühn) ἀκούϲίοϲ δὲ κινῆϲε ώϲ τε καὶ κάτω τῶν μερῶν ἐναλλαζε ν φερομένων ὑ τρόμοϲ.

11.6–9
ἀλλ[o] π[α]ντόλλων ἐπο-
κτικῶϲ σω[μ]ο[ρ]ῶν, ὅταν
μὴν πάντων[ο]ϲ [ἐ]θυραϲ ἀ-
ναλαβόϲιϲ [ἀδ]θρώπω

5 Wilke reports the original reading of N in Textkritisches 96, but only that of the second hand in his edition.

6 Wilke reports ‘δου mutatum in δη et λ., ήτι λ.’; but ε is clear, and nothing points unambiguously to λ. For another account of the traces, see Giuliano 148 n. 123.

7 I find a similar proposal, ἀποδειξουϲ, in a heavily annotated copy of Gomperz’s edition in the Ghent University Library: see http://lib.ugent.be/catalog/bkt01:000411663. The notes in this copy deserve further investigation: the supplement ἐτ[α]ῶν at 21.16, for example, is worth considering.
The text of line 8 is problematic. As J. Blomqvist, *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose* (1969) 49, observes, ‘the force of μήν is obscure’. Then πάντες is an emendation of Wilke’s. Gomperz had printed πάντες, and Wilke reports that he read πάντες in the papyrus. But there seems to be some confusion here. The trace following μήν in the original is the lower part of an upright, with the papyrus lost to the right and above. O shows no trace, but the edge of the papyrus as drawn there corresponds to the edge as seen in the original today: no further loss has occurred. N too shows a lacuna of the same extent, but it has the upright in place, and a second hand has drawn a π across the gap, with the preserved trace serving as its first upright: several such editorial supplements can be seen in the drawing. μήν πάντες must then be considered highly dubious. I should read instead μήν [ε]αντες, ‘having become enraged’. Philodemus refers to Achilles’ μήνυς at 29.23; see in general H. Frisk, *Mýνις. Zur Geschichte eines Begriffes*, *Eranos* 44 (1946) 28–40.9

12.20–22

20 κατά [τελευταῖοι]

οὐ καὶ κατασφε[ρεῖν εἰς]

λί[θον] ὁμόλαξ.

Wilke heals the asyndeton that results from his supplement at the end of line 20 by inserting (δὲ) before κατά in the next line, but the loss would be hard to account for. A likelier supplement is κατά [δὲ βαίνον, ‘little by little’. κατά βαίνον has the further advantage of being (unlike κατά τελευταῖοι) an attested Greek phrase: see the *Diccionario Griego-Español* s.v. βαίνος 2.

16.34–7

μανίας το[γ]ράφουν

35 οὐχ ὁμογν[ενή] ἕιν

καὶ συμβεβήκε [τήν] ὅρ-γήν.

The hiatus in line 35 can be avoided by supplying instead ὁμογν[εν] with W. Crönert ap. M. Gigante, *CErc* 16 (1986) 95 = *Atakta* (1993) 41. For this idiomatic use of the neuter singular, cf. West on Hes. *Th.* 864, and *II.* 2.204 in his edition. I have placed an asterisk under the γ, since the *disegni* show a τ.

20.17–19

β] τὰ M[	śdd]

ΤΩΝ ἡ ἐπὶ μ[ικροὶς [ἐναγ-]


The papyrus is now damaged before τα, but the trace shown in O is the upper part of an oval. After τα, ν seems more probable than μ: O shows an upright with an oblique descending smoothly from its top, almost reaching the baseline at the edge, while most of the oblique is now lost in the original. ὅταν is thus a likely interpretation. After it, we may consider supplying [κατά πάνιν]τον, as at *Lib.* fr. 79.4–6 Olivieri μηδὲ εἰγερχός αὐτῷ ποιεῖν, μηδὲ κατά πάνιν. The unreasonable behaviour in question may then be manifested either ‘against everyone or over small things’.

28.16–21

καὶ φιλονικ[εῖ]ν καὶ λυπ[εῖ]ν

καὶ διαζύρειν καὶ πάνιν[πολ-]

λα ποιεῖν ἕτερα δυσχερή.

— συνανιμόμενον δὲ καὶ μι-

κανθρωπίας αἴτητον γίνε-

τα —, (ἐνιοτε) δὲ καὶ ἀδικεῖν.

8 Blomqvist finds here and in one place in Epicurus ‘cases of non-connective μήν with a function that cannot be paralleled in earlier Greek’, but μήν is no longer read in the passage of Epicurus, now *Nat.* 14 col. 41.21 (ed. G. Leone, *CErc* 14 (1984) 63). The example recognized in our passage would stand alone.

9 The example in a Ptolemaic document cited on p. 33 is now P. Dryton 31.3 (140–30 BC).
Wilke's supplement in line 21 does not account for the corruption. Perhaps the word lost was βιαζεται\textsuperscript{10} and the scribe's eye skipped forward from the first εται to the second.\textsuperscript{11} Then there is no need to take what precedes as a parenthesis.

33.40–34.4
33.40 [καὶ τῷ τε κ[ο]λ[ά]τ[ε]ιν\textsuperscript{13}
34.1 τοῖς ἴππικοῖς τούς ἵππο[ν]\textsuperscript{14}
kαὶ τοὺς γραμματικοὶ[ν] ἀμέλειας
(μέ)λει (καὶ) τοῖς ἄλλοις τεχνίταις
ἐδο[φ]κε (τοὺς) μ[ε]θητάς

The text of 34.3–4 given above assumes losses in three separate places. The letters on the left-hand side are on a sovrapposto and belong one circumference (7.6 cm) further forward, at 35.3–4,\textsuperscript{12} where ἀμέλειας and ἀπεδο[φ]κεν are supplied: we may now print ἀμέλειας and ἀπεδο[φ]κεν in that passage. Crönert (62 n. 304) had evidently recognized the sovrapposto,\textsuperscript{13} he rightly gives the text of 34.2–4 as καὶ τοῖς γραμματικοὶ[ν] καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τεχνίταις [τοὺς] μεθητάς.\textsuperscript{14} Then at the foot of col. 33, Wilke's [καὶ τῷ τε] is too short for the gap: Crönert read πρὸς τό here in the original, and [καὶ] πρὸς τό would fit. We may then give the text in the following form:

34.1 τοῖς ἴππικοῖς τούς ἵππο[ν]\textsuperscript{14}
kαὶ τοὺς γραμματικοὶ[ν] καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τεχνίταις
τοὺς μεθητάς

'and (whether anger is needed) by horsemen for punishing their horses and by teachers of letters and other experts for punishing their pupils'.

35.5–7
5 [ἐ]πήκαν
δ'[ἐν] αἰτ[ί]ιοι[ις] ποτέ\textsuperscript{15} μὲν αἱ κοινότηται

Jensen (58 n. 2) proposed to read and supply here Ἦκαν δ'[ἐν] αἰτίᾳ[ις] ποτέ\textsuperscript{16} μὲν αἱ κοινότηται, with ποτέ\textsuperscript{16} μὲν corresponding to πολλάκις δὲ at line 22. According to his interpretation, the passage is concerned with Epicurus in particular: 'die Gründe genannt werden, die ihn als jähzornig erscheinen ließen'. But Gomperz's Ἦκαν cannot have stood alone at the end of line 5: as Wilke reports, the papyrus has further traces before the η, transcribed by him as "'. Wilke himself, adopting a suggestion made to him by Mewaldt, prints [ἐ]πήκαν, with the underlining used to indicate an uncertain letter (p. 2). But the traces point rather to εἴκαν I δ’ ἀ[ν]. (For the second letter of line 6, we depend entirely on N, but there is no particular reason to reject its evidence here.) In the rest of line 6, Wilke prints οἱ πο[ραδεδο]μέναι. πο is clear and unambiguous in both disegni. The supplement, however, is too short. I suggest οἱ πο[ραδεδε]μέναι. The sense is then 'the indicated qualities would be'. There is nothing here specific to Epicurus. Rather, Philodemus is referring back to 34.27–9 τὰς κοινότητας ... I δ’ ἀς ὀργίλοι φαινόνται. He now proceeds to list those qualities. The list continues in the lower part of the column: cf. Indelli on 35.17ff.

\textsuperscript{10} Gomperz's προ[δε]ται would explain the corruption equally well, but after what precedes, we do not expect a personal subject.


\textsuperscript{13} For Crönert's pioneering work on sovrapposti and sottoposti, see M. L. Nardelli, Ripristino topografico di sovrapposti e sottoposti in alcuni papiri ercolanensi, CErC 3 (1973) 104–11.

\textsuperscript{14} Gomperz had printed (τοὺς) μεθητάς at the start of line 4, while C. G. Cobet, Mnem. 6 (1878) 380, had supplied καὶ at the end of line 2, conjecturing ποτὲ at the start of line 3.
καὶ πρὶν ἐνθυμηθήναι,

ἐπίπτωϲ[ι]ν in line 26 is read and supplied by A. Angeli in Indelli’s edition, but it seems much too long. Both disegni have ἐπίπτωϲ, and Wilke appears to be correct in reporting that the papyrus has the same. Jensen (58 n. 2) proposed ἐπὶ ποιῶν: o was clearly not written on the line, but may have been added above and lost. The sense, however, is unconvincing: ‘in the case of things of a certain kind’ would be curiously vague. A likelier solution is obtained by changing the accent so as to give an indirect question: ἐπὶ π(ο)ιῶν. A good man may castigate even before he has completely pondered the circumstances of the misdeed.

48.38–49.4

περὶ τε γὰρ τοῦ μεθυκῆ-  

48.40 ἀποφαίνονται τοὺς πε-  

49.1 τοῖς καὶ τοὺς χαρακτι-κορούσιν: ἐὰν τὴν ἔπικουρον κ(ε)ριθήθαι  

In 48.38–49.2, I understand (following Bücheler 593 = 528) ‘for concerning the claim that the wise man too will get drunk, if they declare that Epicurus and his circle have used the claim that even the elegant will get drunk, they are talking nonsense, while if they declare that they themselves (have used that claim):’ cf. CErC 39 (2009) 101 with n. 55. As for what follows, Indelli (129) translates ‘è evidente che da questi ragionamenti in modo assurdo tragono conclusioni riguardo al sapiente’. This is the best that can be done with the text as it stands, but the Greek is not easily so understood if the subject of the infinitive (ἀτόπωϲ) is not expressed; and φανερῶν (Wilke) so placed would naturally be taken with ἀτόπωϲ, to the detriment of the sense. I should supply in line 3 not φανερῶν but φανερῶν τῆς ἐπικουροῦντος,

49.40–50.2

49.40 τοῖς προςτηκαμένων τῆς ἐπικου-  

50.1 τῶι ὁργῇ ἐπακολοθεῖν,  

In 49.40, we need τοῖς to fill the space between τοῖς προςτηκαμένων τωι and τὴν ὁργήν. Then the hiatus (νοτι ὁ-) is removed and the construction is clarified: the premiss introduced by τοῖς προςτηκαμένων τωι now has the expected article.

W. B. Henry, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London

w_b_henry@yahoo.co.uk

15 Wilke, Textkritisches 109, had considered φαμέν, but this is too short, and we expect a verb in the third person plural, parallel to φλικαρῶν (1–2).

16 Delattre 78 states that φανερῶν seems to be confirmed by traces (not further described) ‘qui se devinent sur le papyrus φανερῶν’, but there do not appear to be any traces preserved in the relevant place.

17 ἀδυνατεῖν is of course parallel to ἐπακολοθεῖν in the previous line; it is not clear why Delattre 85 asserts that ‘un infinitif ici ne peut aucunement se construire ni se justifier’. The original is damaged, but O and N both show a complete v at the end of the word; there are no grounds for doubt. For the argument of the passage, see E. Asmis in J. Fish and K. R. Sanders (ed.), Epicurus and the Epicurean Tradition (2011) 154–5.

18 Cf. e.g. Janko 77.