

Reeve 1971, p. 514, amusingly noted that hiatus-spotting had been an unfashionable field of study for nearly a century, even then. An additional half century has not brought it renewed popularity. Nonetheless, a working knowledge of it is necessary when editing Herculaneum papyri, since Philodemus, particularly, is commonly said to avoid it. What exactly hiatus in prose is will be the topic of the first part of this study, and Philodemus' practice will be detailed and compared with other prose authors in the second. The third part will consist of an investigation of the practices of other Epicurean authors, and, in the fourth, I will examine several cases of texts of unknown or disputed authorship. The presence or absence of hiatus probably cannot, on its own, as a rule, prove or disprove authorship, but it is a valuable datum and can help make a case.

*Keywords:* Hiatus, prose style, Epicurus, Philodemus, Epicurean authors

## §I What is Hiatus in Prose?

Hiatus, as the name implies, is the gaping emptiness between two vowels when they are pronounced out loud and distinctly.<sup>1</sup> When we say that an author «allows» hiatus, what we actually mean is that certain juxtapositions of vowels do not bother him. This informality would have been the norm in everyday speech, and so we find hiatus in informal works of all sorts, and in some formal works in which prose style is not a concern (legal documents, *e.g.*). We are accustomed to thinking of hiatus as a problem in poems, but similar aesthetic considerations also began to hold sway in prose genres. In the fourth century, avoidance of hiatus came to be a mark of artistic and carefully written prose. Plato famously permitted it less and less as his career progressed, and Isocrates was

My thanks go to David Armstrong, Richard Janko, Francesca Longo Auricchio, and especially Jürgen Hammerstaedt for their comments and criticisms, which have gone a long way towards improving this paper. I conducted much of the research on this topic in 2013 and 2014, when I was supported by a *borsa di studio* from the Centro Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Ercolanesi 'Marcello Gigante'. Throughout this work, please understand provisos like «if the reading of the papyrus is correct», «if the supplements are correct», and «if the author who quotes the fragment is reliable» whenever they seem appropriate. Writing these statements out in every instance could well have doubled the length of the paper.

Bibliographical Abbreviations: BENSELER 1841 = G.E. BENSELER, *De Hiatu in Scriptoribus Graecis* (Freiburg 1841); CAPASSO 1988 = M. CAPASSO, *Carneisco, Il secondo libro del Filista*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da M. GIGANTE, vol. 10 (Napoli 1988); CIRILLO 2008 = I. CIRILLO, *Lo iato nelle opere filodemee di storiografia e biografia filosofica*, Thesis in Filologia, Letterature e

Civiltà del Mondo Antico at the Università di Napoli 'Federico II' (Napoli 2008); CRÖNERT 1906 = W. CRÖNERT, *Kolotes und Menedemus*, Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, vol. 6 (1906); ESSLER 2011 = H. ESSLER, *Glückselig und unsterblich: Epikureische Theologie bei Cicero und Philodem*, Schwabe Epicurea, vol. 2 (Basel 2011); GIGANTE 1983 = M. GIGANTE, *Ricerche Filodemee* (Napoli 1983<sup>2</sup>); INDELLI-TSOUNA-MCKIRAHAN = G. INDELLI-V. TSOUNA-MCKIRAHAN, *[Philodemus], [On Choices and Avoidances]*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da M. GIGANTE, vol. 15 (Napoli 1995); LONGO AURICCHIO 1977 = F. LONGO AURICCHIO, Φιλοδήμου περὶ βητορικῆς *libri primus et secundus*, Ricerche sui papiri ercolanesi, vol. 3 (Napoli 1977); LONGO AURICCHIO 1988 = EAD., *Ermaco, Frammenti*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da M. GIGANTE, vol. 6 (Napoli 1988); REEVE 1971 = M.D. REEVE, *Hiatus in the Greek Novelists*, *«CQ»* 21/1971, pp. 514-539; RADT 1980 = S. RADT, *Noch einmal Aischylos, Niobe Fr. 162 N.<sup>2</sup> (278 M.)*, *«ZPE»* 38/1980,

## HIATUS IN EPICUREAN AUTHORS

MICHAEL MCOSKER

pp. 47-58; SMITH 1993 = M.F. SMITH, *Diogenes of Oenoanda, The Epicurean Inscription*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da M. GIGANTE, Suppl. 1 (Napoli 1993); SMITH 2003 = ID., *Supplement to Diogenes of Oenoanda, The Epicurean Inscription*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi fondata da M. GIGANTE e diretta da G. ARRIGHETTI e F. LONGO AURICCHIO, Suppl. 3 (Napoli 2003); STRATHMANN 1893 = G. STRATHMANN, *De hiatus fuga quam invenimus apud Philodemum Epicureum*, Jahresbericht Nr. 16 über das Real-Progymnasium der Stadt Viersen für das Schuljahr 1891-1892 (Viersen 1893); SUDHAUS 1906 = S. SUDHAUS, *Eine erhaltene Abhandlung des Metrodor, «Hermes»* 41/1906, pp. 45-58; WEST 1982 = M.L. WEST, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982).

<sup>1</sup> The foundational work is BENSELER 1841. REEVE 1971 is a model of clarity and sanity, and contains an extremely useful bibliography divided by author on p. 514 n. 2. On the various ancient and modern terms for the phenomena discussed here, see W.S. ALLEN, *Vox Graeca* (Cambridge 1974<sup>2</sup>), pp. 90-96.

<sup>2</sup> For hiatus in the Attic orators as a stylistic choice with consequences for our interpretation of the text, see L. PEARSON, *Hiatus and Its Effect in the Attic Speech-Writers* «TAPA» 108/1978, pp. 131-145, reprinted in D. LATEINER-S.A. STEPHENS (edd.), *Selected Papers of Lionel Pearson* (Chico 1983), pp. 233-247. Comparison will reveal that he and I have different views about what constitutes a hiatus.

<sup>3</sup> See below, n. 23.

<sup>4</sup> At no point are adjacent vowels within a single word (e.g. ἀγλαός) under consideration in this paper. Word final vowels that result from elision of another vowel (e.g. μόρι' Ἀχαιοῖς) also do not count as objectionable hiatus.

<sup>5</sup> As BENSELER 1841, p. 5, put it, «nos contra in scriptoribus prosae orationis eos solos appellamus hiatus, ubi vocalis in fine vocabuli posita aliud verbum a vocali incipiens antecedit neque elisa est». STRATHMANN 1893, p. 5, makes the same assumption: «nemo Graecus certe pronuntiabat δὲ ἀνδρός et καὶ ἐκεῖνος, sed pronuntiabatur [sic] δ' ἀνδρός et κάκεῖνος. Quae res ita inter omnes constabat, ut eam scriptura significare vix opus esset». REEVE 1971, pp. 515 f., sets some methodological strictures: «[a]s for aphaeresis, crasis, and synizesis, it can be assumed that in Attic prose the rules are supplied by Attic comedy and tragedy, in which certain juxtapositions of vowels are also legitimate...». Reeve applies the Attic rules to his corpus, as do I here. Philodemus' practice, in fact, seems to me most closely to match Demosthenes'.

<sup>6</sup> See RADT 1980 for a discussion of elision and crasis. He relies on metrical texts, where the meter provides an external control on the orthography. For example, ἡ μορία Ἀχαιοῖς is written in *scriptio plena*, but it is still metrical and there is no hiatus: the elision (μορί' Ἀχαιοῖς) would be pronounced automatically whenever the text was read. That is to say, the actual spelling on a papyrus or in a manuscript hardly matters for the question of hiatus in certain cases - these matters were completely in the power of the scribe - but the spelling had no effect on the pronunciation. The principle is that, regardless of what appears in a given manuscript, every possible elision and crasis was pronounced. Confusion on the question of

very strict (though to slightly different degrees according to genre, see below); Demosthenes was nearly as strict.<sup>2</sup> The author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, for example, also avoids it, as do Theopompus and Ephorus; all three are said to belong to the «school» of Isocrates. Other authors did not take trouble over it: Herodotus, Thucydides, Lysias, and Chrysippus (in at least some works) all permit it. Epicurus usually does not avoid hiatus, since he is concerned with argumentative clarity instead of stylistic finish, but he avoids it in the *Ep. Men.*, which corresponds with the higher stylistic register of that work, which is both intentional and unique in the surviving corpus.<sup>3</sup>

Not every pair of vowels printed next to each other in an edition is a hiatus.<sup>4</sup> When we find an apparent hiatus, it may not be objectionable, or even really a hiatus. There are three possible reasons: the first is that hiatus, *stricto sensu*, does not arise, because there is no gap between two vowels. This is because the first vowel is actually, in practice, elided or joined by crasis to the following vowel, or the second vowel is prodelided. Elision happens in most cases in which the first vowel is short.<sup>5</sup> Crasis occurs in fewer cases, and usually involves καί, μή, πρό, and perhaps the article.<sup>6</sup> The second possible reason is that punctuation, whether written or felt, intervenes and there is a pause in pronunciation. In this case, hiatus does not arise either, because of the pause as the text is read out. Elision, prodelision, crasis, and punctuation are the most common obviators of apparent hiatus. The third possibility is that there is in fact a juxtaposition, but it is of a sort which does not bother the author. This gives rise to a real hiatus, but almost every author who is said to avoid hiatus admits some hiatus of this sort, which I call «permitted». The practices of several authors will be set out below. The first two possibilities are simply parts of the Greek language: it seems likely that any reader pronounced elisions automatically as he or she read, just as every text had at least notional punctuation and phrasal pauses, even if they were not marked. Therefore, the degree of strictness with which the third sort of hiatus mentioned above is permitted is the criterion for saying that an author avoids, or does not avoid, hiatus.

As a methodological note, one should either work from a substantial enough corpus or be able to show that an author is adapting word order to avoid hiatus, since it was quite possible for Greeks to write quotidian documents without hiatus. For instance, many documentary papyri do not have any instances of objectionable hiatus (as I will define it for Philodemus), but we must assume that this is accidental, perhaps due partly to their short length. Corpora like Philodemus' and Epicurus' are certainly large enough - even that of Demetrius Laco is sufficiently large - to guarantee a good sample from which to work. More fragmentary authors present various problems which will be discussed *ad hoc* below. A corpus of about 10 well preserved and well edited OCT or Teubner pages should be sufficient to generalize about the work in question; any less than this and we can only talk about the data and possible inferences.

short vowel + vowel and the various combinations that give rise to crasis is the cause of most mistaken statements about hiatus. Also attributable to scribes is the use or non-use of v-moveable and optional *sigmas*, like in

οῦτο(c). Additionally, rough breathings are irrelevant for questions of elision or crasis. Note the oddity of θ' ἀμάρτημ' written at Phld., *Lib. dic.* fr. 9 7 f. for τὸ ἀμάρτημα; this probably indicates the actual pronunciation of the phrase.

## §II The Practice of Philodemus Compared with Other Prose Authors

We will study Philodemus' practice primarily because his corpus is large and well preserved enough to do so, and because he has already been studied. The standard work on hiatus in Philodemus is Strathmann 1893, who relied on Benseler 1841. Cirillo 2008 is an update and supplement to Strathmann's work. Strathmann first discussed the usage of Isocrates, who is the strictest of classical authors, then proceeded through Demosthenes to Philodemus. He distinguished between hiatus on the one hand and elision and crasis on the other. Since elision and crasis are standard ways of avoiding hiatus, it is important to know what an author considers allowable.

Benseler 1841, pp. 6-59 (listing of data) and 59-61 (summary; Benseler's results are also summarized in Strathmann) lists out all the elisions, crases, and allowed hiatus. These can be fashioned into general rules, very similar to those found in Greek poetry.<sup>7</sup> Isocrates permits the following elisions:

ᾳ is elided at the end of words of two or more syllables, including nouns and verbs.

ε can always be elided.

ι is elided in verb endings and in ἀντί, ἐπί, and ἔτι (as well as μηκέτι and οὐκέτι).

ο is elided in ἀπό, ὑπό, and δύο; in terminations of the neuter (except τό and ὅ), and the verb endings.

υ is not elided.

Long vowels are not elided.

Additionally, Isocrates permits the following crases: κάν, κάν, κάκει, κάκεῖθεν, κάκεῖνος, κάμοι, κάμε, κάγω, and κάγαθός, (i.e. -ᾶι + α or ε) and ταῦτα, τάναγκαῖα, τάγαθά, τάρχαῖα, τάλλοτρια, τάλλα, τάληθῆ, τάναντία, θάτερα, τάκεῖνα, τάκει, τάμα, and τάμαντοῦ (i.e. -ᾶ + α or αν or ε).<sup>8</sup> καί generally is elided before a long vowel or diphthong.<sup>9</sup> Before a short vowel, I think that we must assume that it undergoes correction.

Isocrates in his pamphlets allows hiatus after the following words and in these phrases: τί, τι, ὅτι, περί, πρό, πολὺ ἄν, and ὀπότεροι ἄν.<sup>10</sup> In the forensic speeches, he allows hiatus after εἰ and ὢ, and allows «forms of the article» to form crases or stand in hiatus, as the case may be.<sup>11</sup>

Demosthenes adds the following exceptions to those allowed by Isocrates in the forensic speeches: ποῖ, and ὅπου, as well as ἐπεί and μή, which are perhaps crases, and μέντοι and καίτοι, which are probably elisions.<sup>12</sup>

Demosthenes' style probably formed most educated Greeks' idea of elegance, given how widely he was studied. Avoidance of hiatus (at least to some extent) consequently became a regular feature of literary prose, but technical philosophical treatises were not «literature» in the relevant sense.

Philodemus adds the following permitted hiatus to those allowed by Demosthenes: ὥι (i.e. qua), ὥχρι ἄν (presumably μέχρι ἄν as well), and μηδὲ ἔν (etc.).<sup>13</sup> Short -αι in verb endings (i.e. all of them except the aorist optative, but especially the third person singular middle-passive -εται) can be elided (so Strathmann 1893, p. 13). ἀμφί is elided in verse (cf. West 1982, p. 10) and so probably in prose, but I have not noticed any instances in these texts.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. WEST 1982, pp. 10-15. There are various differences between the practices of avoiding hiatus in prose and poetry, most importantly, in poetic texts hiatus is not usually excused by punctuation and some poets, like Callimachus, are strict about not eliding nouns and adjectives.

<sup>8</sup> As WEST 1982, p. 13, notes, the difference between crasis and synizesis is merely orthographical; the two do not differ in pronunciation.

<sup>9</sup> So WEST 1982, p. 10. It is difficult to tell what original pronunciations would have been, and more crases than I have listed might have been used.

<sup>10</sup> In the last case, there may have been elision in practice, given that ὥν coheres closely with the preceding word (so BENSELER 1841, p. 30), and that the final diphthong of ὀπότεροι is metrically short (though -οι and -αι as noun endings do not usually elide in the authors under consideration). Most of these cases, as well as the exceptions added by Demosthenes and Philodemus, were permitted in Homer or Attic comedy; see WEST 1982, p. 11.

<sup>11</sup> STRATHMANN 1893, p. 5, says «articuli formae»; he seems to mean that the article does not cause an objectionable hiatus before any word that follows it, which is correct, but not complete, see below on the «chain of concordant words» exception.

<sup>12</sup> See BENSELER 1841, pp. 62-162 for the data, and pp. 162-167 for the summary. Demosthenes also allows hiatus around ιοὺ ιού, which is surely an exceptional case.

<sup>13</sup> Comic scansion of μηδὲ ἔν (etc.) as three syllables guarantees that there is a hiatus, rather than an unwritten elision. The effect was probably emphatic.

From all of this data, we can extract a simple principle: nearly any short vowel, with the clear exceptions of *υ* and some instances of *ι* (e.g. dative singular of the third declension), can be elided. The list of cases available all include *καὶ* or the article followed by *α*, *αι*, *αι*, or *ε*. Offensive hiatus, then, involves primarily long vowels followed by another vowel.

Prodelision (*alias aphaeresis*) is another common feature of Greek texts. Here, an initial short vowel, almost always an *epsilon* but rarely an *alpha*, is lost after an *ᾱ*, *ᾱι*, *η*, *ηι*, *ω*, *ῳ*, or *οῳ*, with *η* and *ηι* being by far the most common.<sup>14</sup> The most commonly affected words, for our purposes, will be *ἐστι*, *ἐμός* (and other first person pronouns), *ἐπί*, *ἐκ*, *ἐν* (rarely), and *ἔτερος* (very rarely) along with the *epsilon* augment, and *ἀπό* and *ἀνά* also possibilities.<sup>15</sup> These examples indicate that the words so affected tend to be short, and the prodelided vowel is rarely essential to the word (*i.e.* enough of the rest of the word is left to make the meaning clear). However, this is not a common phenomenon, and we might doubt whether careful prose authors would have regular recourse to it.<sup>16</sup>

Now we turn to the cases of hiatus which can be excused by punctuation. Reeve 1971, pp. 516 f., developed a somewhat complicated typology of punctuation in order to classify the practices of the Greek novelists, which I reproduce here. I have removed many of his examples, but included those useful for understanding his terminology.

1. a. before *ἀλλά*  
b. before *ἢ*  
c. before *οὐδέ*  
d. before a second *οὐτε*  
e. before a second *εἴτε*
2. before the word before *μέν* or *δέ*
3. a. before a vocative  
b. after a vocative (*i.e.* *ὦ* does not cause hiatus with the word before, and there is a pause after a word in the vocative case)<sup>17</sup>
4. a. after an adverbial clause, *e.g.* *ἐπεὶ δ'* *ἥθη*, *ἐπηρώτα* ... (Hel. 7.24.3)  
b. after a participial phrase, *e.g.* *τὸν ὄντα ὅστις ἐστίν ὁ ξένος ἐρωτωμένη ἀγνοεῖν* *ἔλεγεν* (Hel. 10.22.2)  
c. after a parenthetical or epexegetic clause or phrase, *e.g.* *ἐν τούτῳ Χαρμίδης* (*τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ὄνομα τῷ στρατηγῷ*) *ἐπιβάλλει τῇ Λευκίππῃ τὸν ὄφθαλμόν* (Ach. Tat. 4.2.1)
5. a. before an adverbial clause or noun clause, *e.g.* *ἐαυτὴν ἀποσφάξειν ἥπείλει*, *εἰ μὴ ἀμφοτέρους ἄγοτεν* (Hel. 1.4.1.6)  
b. before a participial phrase, *e.g.* *"Ἐλληνί τινι παραδίδωσι νεανίσκωι οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς αἰχμαλώτωι γεγονότι* (Hel. 1.7.3.6)  
c. before an epexegetic phrase or clause, *e.g.* *δυοῖν θάτερον ἀνάγκη, ἢ ... ἢ ...* (Hel. 3.18.2.8), *πάντα δέ μ' εἰχεν ὁμοῦ, ἔπαινος, ἔκπληξις ...* (Ach. Tat. 1.4.5), and *ἥπειρός ἐστι μεγάλη, ἀφετήριον εἰς τὴν βασιλέως γῆν τὴν πολλήν* (Chariton 5.1.3.4)

<sup>14</sup> W.S. ALLEN, *Vox Graeca* (Cambridge 1974<sup>2</sup>), p. 96, and M. PLATNAUER, *Prodelision in Greek Drama*, «CQ» 10/1960, pp.140-144. It is not always clear, as Allen notes, if a given instance is crasis or prodelision; fortunately, the question is irrelevant to our purposes here, since the hiatus is obviated either way. Platnauer observes that, in poetry, it is a feature almost uniquely of Attic drama, and so perhaps has an origin in colloquial speech.

<sup>15</sup> *Τροίην* 'ν is written for *Τροίην* ἐν in Phld., *M. XXXIII* 11 f. in a quotation of *Od.* V 307, unless this is a scribal error.

<sup>16</sup> It is possible that hiatus before any form of *εἰμί*, including those beginning with long vowels or diphthongs, was permitted by some authors as an extension from the forms where the *epsilon* was prodelided, or that hiatus before forms of *εἰμί* was simply permitted by some authors. Indeed, comedy was freer and prodelided any form of *εἰμί* that began with an *epsilon* (*e.g.* *ἔστο* and *ἔσται*), whereas tragedy only allows prodelision of *ἐστι*, and colloquial speech could have been freer still. This does not seem to be the case to me, at least in the authors treated here, because hiatus before such forms is never the only offensive type found. Nonetheless, there are many instances of hiatus before such forms, and it may have been felt to be less offensive or to have had a special status of some sort.

<sup>17</sup> I note also that hiatus between *ὦ* and the name is permissible, if this is not an example of crasis.

- d. before a relative clause
- e. before ὥcte (and ὥc used as ὥcte) + infinitive<sup>18</sup>

6. before asyndeton

7. direct speech:

- a. before direct speech
- b. before inset ἔφη, e.g. «θάρκει» ἔφη
- c. after inset ἔφη, e.g. «còc» ἔφη «ό λόγος»
- d. before ἔφη, e.g. ἡ δὲ Μελίνη ἔφη ...
- e. after ἔφη, e.g. ἔφη ό Κνήμων

Several simple principles can be extracted from this list: conjunctions and clause boundaries, as a rule, allow hiatus. Similarly, hiatus in the novelists seems to be allowed almost anywhere a speaker would be tempted to put a comma or pause briefly in speech (*i.e.* at many phrase boundaries). Though Reeve developed his list from the texts of the novelists, the principles derived from it are a useful guide to Philodemus' practice (though he is somewhat stricter; see below).

In general, it is worth noting that a single word can be involved in more than one type of hiatus: for instance, ὅτι could be preceded by hiatus, which is obviated by the pause at clause boundary, and followed by one which is permitted, since ὅτι never elides.<sup>19</sup>

To Strathmann's list, I have one important addition: hiatus is allowed between all members of a certain type of phrase. He had observed that hiatus between an article and its noun was permitted, but this is not sufficient.<sup>20</sup> In fact, hiatus is permitted between all words in a self contained nominal phrase and in fact between all consecutive words when they agree, or closely cohere, grammatically. I call this the «chain of concordant words exception». I have chosen this particular name because the words all stand together, usually in a connected phrase, in a regular word-order for Greek prose with some kind of grammatical concord (either simply agreement or governance within a complex phrase) as well. It is the addition of the grammatical concord which differentiates this exception from a normally phrased sentence.

There are two main categories that fall into this exception: the first is the regular noun-phrase, with expansions, such as τῶι ἀγαθῶι ἀνδρί, where the two hiatus are permitted. The second is when the words are in the regular prose word order and are closely grammatically connected. Real instances are found at *Po.* V, col. X 19 f.: τ]οῦ [εῦ] ποιεῖν and το]ῦ ἀγαθοῦ | ποιητοῦ; *Oec.* col. XXVI 39 f. το[ῦ] ἀπὸ κτής[ε]ως<sup>21</sup> (with πλούτου understood), and *Lib. Dic.* fr. 32.5: ώc ἄλλοι [αῖ]φνίδιοι. There are more dubious cases at *Ira* col. XXV 1-3: κάνθρωπο[ι] ἀφυεῖ...γενόμενοι (if restored correctly), *Oec.* col. VII 10 f.: π[ρὸc τῷ] ἀνεκτὰ φαίνεθαι (if restored correctly), and *Po.* V, col. XXVIII 31-33: τὸ...φύceι ὑπάρχει (unless this should be attributed to the opponent). An example of the second exception is *Lib. Dic.* fr. 87 l.7 f.: ⟨v⟩έου ⟨v⟩περη[φά]νου] ὕντοc (if correctly restored), which is not an article-attributive-noun phrase. Many other cases will be discussed throughout the rest of this paper.

<sup>18</sup> Reeve does not mention ὥcte + indicative, but it is difficult to believe that hiatus before ὥcte would be impermissible.

<sup>19</sup> Any instance of ώθ' is to be understood as ώτε (or ώτέ) therefore.

<sup>20</sup> STRATHMANN 1893, p. 5, mentioned above at n. 11, seems only to have accounted for the hiatus after the article.

<sup>21</sup> Jensen (followed by Tsouna) printed το[ῦ γ'] but this is not necessary, and I doubt that the spacing on the papyrus allows it.

<sup>22</sup> The case is less clear with paraphrases, several examples of which will be discussed below in §III and §IV.4.

<sup>23</sup> Epicurus' practice in the *Ep. Men.* is hardly distinguishable from Philodemus', except that he allows hiatus after μηκέτι and οὐκέτι (or, probably better, he elides them; presumably the same is true for ἔτι): cf. §§122 and 125 (for Epicurus' letters, I have used von der Muehll's Teubner edition). Two troublesome cases remain: βλάβαι τάτιαι† §124 (variously emended) and χυλοὶ ἵνην §130 (*n.b.* χυλοὶ γάρ) Diels on account of the hiatus). I counted seventeen hiatus in the first ten pages of the *Ep. Hdt.*: τῶι βίωι ἐποίησα §37, δεῖ εἰληφέναι §37, ἡι εἰς ἀπειρον (if rightly restored) §37, ἀπειροι εἰς εἰς §42, κόσμοι ἀπειροι εἰς εἰς §45, ἀτομοι ἀπειροι οὖσαι §45, τύποι ὁμοιοσχήμονες §46, ἀντικομή ὁμοίωμα §46, ἀπειροι οὐκ §47, συγχεομένη ὑπάρχει §48, περιέχοντι δέξειαι §48, μεταξύ ήμῶν §49, μορφή ἔστιν §50, προσδοξαζομένωι ἀεί ἔστιν §50. Additionally, I would put commas between χρόνοι ὅθεν and between τόπου ἔσται, both in §47. Some of these can be considered permitted because they are in chains of concordant nouns or if the exception before forms of εἰμί is accepted (see n. 16), but enough clear cases of hiatus remain that we can say that Epicurus did not avoid it in this work. The phrase οἱ ἡκίστα ταῦτης δεόμενοι in §130 is also worth noting. In the first one hundred columns of the *On Nature* II, as edited in G. LEONE, *Epicuro, Sulla natura libro II*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi fondata da M. GIGANTE e diretta da G. ARIGHETTI e F. LONGO AURICCHIO, vol. 18 (Napoli 2012), I noticed the following certain or likely cases: ἄπειροι ἡιαν col. I 10, ἐγεννήθην οὖν col. IV 1, πεπειρασμέναι [εἰς]εἰς col. VIII 8 f., ἥπαι οὐχι col. XXXVI 7, κατατίθηται εἰς col. XXXVIII 7 f., ιαί οὐ[οι-] col. XXXIX 5, πανταχῆται a[ col. LII 12 f., ]ιαί οι[ col. LIX 3, β]άθη a[ col. LXXXVII 11, ]ιαί ἀλλ[ col. XC 9, and τρόποι [εἰς col. XCVIII 23.

<sup>24</sup> See J. HESSLER, *Epikur: Brief an Menoikeus: Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Schwabe Epicurea, vol. 4 (Basel 2014), pp. 40-99, for discussion of the *Ep. Men.* as protreptic, protreptic literature more generally, and the grammar, style, and rhetoric of the letter. Note also Lucretius' statement in his honeyed cup metaphor at I 926-950 = IV 1-25.

<sup>25</sup> Metrodorus' fragments are cited from A. KÖRTE, *Metrodori Epicurei Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1890) and have been checked against more recent editions.

Let us summarize Philodemus' usage in several principles and then a list of exceptional cases:

1. Short vowels (with the exception of υ and sometimes ι) elide, as do -ᾰ and -ᾰτι in some cases.
2. The following vowel combinations can result in crasis: -ᾰτι + α or ε and -ᾰ + α, αν or ε.
3. Philodemus allows the words on the following list to be followed by a hiatus: ει, ἐπει, η, και, καίτοι, μή, περί, τι, τι, ὅτι, περί, πρό, and ποῦ. Hiatus is allowed as a rule, it seems, before ὅν (cf. n. 10 above).
4. A pause resulting from punctuation, usually at a clause boundary but sometimes at a phrase boundary, allows hiatus (*i.e.* the pause means that the conjunction of the vowels does not really happen, since there is auditory space between them).
5. The «chain of concordant words» exception.
6. Quotations from other authors are not corrected to exclude hiatus, and do not count as Philodemus' usage.<sup>22</sup>

As Strathmann 1893, pp. 10, 12, etc., already observed, Philodemus tends to avoid even allowable hiatus by selection from among alternative possibilities. He uses, e.g., the forms θέλω, κεῖνος, and διότι instead of ἐθέλω, ἐκεῖνος, ὅτι to avoid hiatus before the word, and ἔνεκεν instead of ἔνεκα to avoid it after. However, his practice in this respect was not strict or consistent. It is not unreasonable to feel that this list, especially 4, provides too much freedom to the critic to determine what counts as an offensive hiatus and what is permissible or excused by a pause or punctuation. I hope that my discussions below in the following sections will satisfy these worries. In particular, the novelists seem freer with «phrase boundary» hiatus than Philodemus is.

### §III Other Epicureans

I have examined the extant fragments of the Epicurean authors down to Philodemus' lifetime, as well as Diogenes of Oenoanda. Because, in most cases, the *corpora* are small, often consist in large part of quotations, which were possibly subject to revision, and are uncertainly restored, certainty is difficult and detail is impossible. Nonetheless, I think it is worthwhile to put forward my results because some broad trends can be established. In all cases, I have used Philodemus' practice as a *kanōn*; *i.e.* Epicurus in the *Ep. Men.* is roughly as strict, Hermarchus in the lengthy extract from Porphyry is more strict, and most earlier Epicureans are less strict than Philodemus.

As mentioned above, Epicurus usually does not bother avoiding hiatus, but in the *Ep. Men.*, he does.<sup>23</sup> The *Ep. Men.* is written at a high stylistic level and served as a protreptic toward the study of Epicureanism, and for that goal, greater stylistic refinement might have been useful in attracting students.<sup>24</sup> In technical works like the *On Nature*, care for fine points of style could well have distracted from the argument or made already difficult material more difficult to understand.

Metrodorus, as far as can be seen from the extant fragments, may avoid hiatus, but I do not think that he does.<sup>25</sup>

This is an important datum, which becomes relevant below, in §IV.4. I noticed the following in Koerte's edition:<sup>26</sup>

31 Koerte (Plut. *Adv. Col.* 1127 B): Κόλωνι ἐπιθυμίας<sup>27</sup>

42 Koerte (Plut. *Contra Ep. Beat.* 1098 C): Ἐπικούρου ὄρθως<sup>28</sup>

48 Koerte (VS 48): κόμπου οὐδὲ<sup>29</sup>

49 Koerte (VS 49): ἄλληι οὐδεμιᾷ and εὐ ήμῖν

This is not a very large sample, especially given that three of the five could conceivably be excused, and slurring might excuse εὐ ήμῖν. The evidence is probably sufficient for a weak verdict, that Metrodorus at least in some works admitted hiatus.

Idomeneus' philosophical works do not survive, but there are some fragments of his historical works. For completeness, I include a brief report. We do find several hiatus: at *FGrH* 338 F 1 (Σ Arist. *Vesp.* 947), we find Αθηναῖοι αὐτοῦ and αὐτοῦ ή οὐσία ἔδημεύθη (but the scholium may not reflect Idomeneus' original wording) and at *FGrH* 338 F 14a (Ath. XIII, 590 c-d, cf. [Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 849 D for the story), we find ὄctει εἰχεν. Hardly any *verbatim* fragments remain, but if I had to guess, I would guess that he admitted hiatus.

The one lengthy fragment of Hermarchus, that preserved by Porphy. *Abst.* I.7-12 (= pp. 46-52 Bouffartigue = fr. 34 in Longo Auricchio 1988), gives us our only real evidence for his style; the other fragments are really *testimonia* or reports (the *verbatim* fr. 23 f. do not show any hiatus, but they are short *dicta*). What is truly remarkable about this fragment is the extent to which the author avoids hiatus.<sup>30</sup> Even elision is rare. After the introductory sentence, we find only the following list of crases and elisions: καί + vowel VII 2, X 1, and XII 2; ἄλλα IX 1 and XII 3; δέ X 4 and XI 4; διά X 4; ἐπί VII 4; κατά XI 3; μετά XI 1; μήτε VIII 3; ούτε VIII 1; and παρά IX 3. Additionally, we find γίγνοιτ' ἀν at col. XI 3 and λυμαίνοιτ' ἀν at col. XI 4 (both normal elisions of short vowels). Note that νόμοι, ἐπί at col. XII 1 is excused by punctuation. All this is to say, that the practice of the author of this fragment is in line with, possibly stricter than, Isocrates'. It does not seem to match Porphyry's regular practice either. In the portion of the *De Abstinentia* which precedes the excerpt from Hermarchus, I noted the following hiatus: ἄλλοι ἐπί; φαίη ὅχλος (§1), πολλῶι ἰχυρότερα; ὀλίγοι ὀντειρήκασιν (§3), and ήδη εἰρήκαμεν (§6). This suggests that Porphyry did not avoid hiatus, and that the αὐτηρός style, including strict avoidance of hiatus, found in the Hermarchus fragment really is his own.

There are reasons to believe that this is not Hermarchus' regular practice.<sup>31</sup> In fr. 36 Longo Auricchio, we find a summary, intermixed with quotations, of Hermarchus' letter to Theophides. In one of the *verbatim* sections (*n.b.* φησιν col. XLV 29 which introduces the quotation), we find the apparent hiatus ἐ[ξ]ουσία ἐ[ξ]τί (col. XLVI 1), which is actually a case of prodelision. The hiatus at fr. 44 Longo Auricchio 1988 (= *PHerc.* 1675, col. XI 9) αἴτια ἐ[ξ]τί is another prodelision, and is perhaps to be attributed to quotation or close paraphrase of Hermarchus. That the reading should be αἴτια rather than αἴτια is guaranteed by the feminine relative which immediately follows. It is unlikely that Hermarchus wrote everything in the high style of the excerpt found in Porphyry, but our evidence is not very good.<sup>32</sup> Actual private letters (as opposed to encyclical letters or epistolary treatises) were probably, as a rule, more informally written than treatises.

<sup>26</sup> Frr. 9, 27, and 44 show hiatus in Koerte, but re-editions have eliminated them. Note that, in fr. 27 KOERTE (= *Phld. Rh.* II, *PHerc.* 1672, col. XXII 10 f., p. 217 LONGO AURICCHIO 1977) τοι μέλλοντι εὐδαίμονι εἶναι probably falls under the «chain of concordant words» exception, though it is a notable instance of it. In fr. 25 KOERTE (*Phld. Rh.* II, *PHerc.* 1674, col. XXVII 9 f., p. 101 LONGO AURICCHIO 1977: τοῦ] ὃς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ is a notable example of the noun-phrase exception (and it probably appears again in l. 36). Lastly, note the elision of οὐκέτι in fr. 3 KOERTE (*Phld. Rh.* VIII, *PHerc.* 832/1015, col. 32 [*sic*] 10, vol. II, p. 45 SUDHAUS).

<sup>27</sup> This should fall under the «chain of concordant words» exception: the whole phrase is τὰς αὐτὰς Λυκούργου καὶ Κόλωνι ἐπιθυμίας, but the names could have come after the noun without any question of hiatus arising, a fact which perhaps betrays unconcern with hiatus on Metrodorus' part.

<sup>28</sup> Conceivably a generous critic could find a phrase pause here to excuse the hiatus.

<sup>29</sup> This is a first οὐδέ, not a second, so hiatus before it ought to count as objectionable by Reeve's accounting (above). But I am skeptical that first and second οὐδέ were really treated differently. Later in the fragment, παρασκευάζει, ἀλλὰ is excused by punctuation.

<sup>30</sup> For bibliography and discussion, see LONGO AURICCHIO 1988, pp. 127-129. She follows GIGANTE 1983, pp. 153 f., in thinking that it is an *excerptum*. In general, see her commentary for notes and bibliography.

<sup>31</sup> I leave aside here fr. 24 LONGO AURICCHIO 1988, which is highly stylized and poetic (θνατός twice, but cf. θνητός in Metrodorus fr. 37 KOERTE), and may in fact be poetry. See her commentary for discussion. Note that the second to last sentence, θεὸς δὲ πάντας ἐν κινδύνοις θνατοὺς κυβερνᾷ, is hardly Epicurean (noted already by LONGO AURICCHIO 1988 *ad loc.*), which casts doubt on authenticity of the fragment.

<sup>32</sup> Note in this connection Philodemus' possible statement that it was difficult to tell Metrodorus' and Hermarchus' works apart (in *Against Those Who Claim to be Literalists*, *PHerc.* 1005, col. XI 5-18 ANGELI = Hermarchus fr. 26 LONGO AURICCHIO 1988, overlooked by Koerte), and see above for Metrodorus' practice.

Insufficient material from Polyaenus survives for a judgment; most of the fragments are mentions or reports rather than *verbatim* quotations.<sup>33</sup> Fr. 44 may show an attempt to avoid hiatus: at the end, we read ἀρα οὐ κόμπος ταῦτα καὶ τερατέα σοφιστῶν καὶ μειρακίων ἀκοὰς ἐκπλήττειν ἐσπουδακότος; if ἐσπουδακότος were placed directly after σοφιστῶν, there would be hiatus. Against this is fr. 54, an apparently *verbatim* quotation (*n.b.* καθάπερ ἔφης Πολύαινος ll. 8 f.) in Philodemus' *On Wealth* I (PHerc. 163, col. XL 10): θεραπεύει [οὐ λόγος].

For Polystratus, we have primarily the treatise *On Irrational Contempt*.<sup>34</sup> I noticed the following hiatus in coll. I-XX 15:

Col. II 1 f.: προφέ[ρο]ντι [ι ἐν παν]τὶ οὐ (two cases)

Col. III 3: τρόπου ἀπὸ

Col. VI 6: ἥδη οὐδ' (perhaps excused by punctuation)

Col. VII 7: οὗ[ρ]ου ἡμεῖς

Col. VIII 24: ἐκτ]ρεπόμενοι οὐ

Col. X 2 f.: τα[ρ]άτ[ει] ἀφαιρεῖν (excused by punctuation, I think)

Col. XI 29-XII 1: θραυσνόμενοι ἀ||ποτολμήσωσιν

Col. XII 6 f.: ἴερωι | ἵστοροῦσιν

Col. XII 8: `αὐτῶι' ἀλλοτρ[ί]ου

Col. XII 24 f.: οὐδαμ[ή]ι | ἀντιμαρτ[υ]ροῦσα

Col. XIII 9: ἀνάγκη ἐν

Col. XVI 29-XVII 1: παρ|[ρη]σίαι ἀ]κολούθων

Col. XVII 25: ἥδη [ίδ]ε

Col. XVII 29: α]ύτοι ἐπὶ

Col. XIX 15 f.: [ε]πιθυμίαι εἰσὶ]

Col. XIX 24: το]ίς ἐπάνων είρημένοις (a chain of concordant words)

Col. XX 5: ἐχόμενοι ήμιν

It seems clear that Polystratus does not bother to avoid hiatus in this treatise.

As for Colotes, I noticed the following in his treatise *Against Plato's Lysis* (PHerc. 208).<sup>35</sup>

T. III, p. 7b, l. 8 (p. 164 Crönert): ]η οὐθὲν

T. IV, p. 10b, ll. 8 f. (p. 164 Crönert): Ἰπ|ποθάλ[ε]ι ἐχρῆν[ν]

T. IV, p. 10d, ll. 6 f. (p. 165 Crönert): ὅμιλία ἦν

T. IV, p. 10f, ll. 4 f. (p. 165 Crönert): το[νδι]λ ἀγα[θὸ]ν

T. V, p. 11d, l. 2 (p. 166 Crönert): σοφοὶ ἐν

T. V, p. 11d, ll. 8 f. (p. 166 Crönert): σοφωτά[τ]οι εν | ας

In his treatise *Against Plato's Euthydemus* (PHerc. 1032), I noticed the following.<sup>36</sup>

T. II, p. 5a, l. 4 (p. 167 Crönert): ]λει ὠλι[γώρει

T. III, p. 6a, l. 10 (p. 167 Crönert): ὠφελ[ή]ι οὐδέτοις

T. III, p. 6c, ll. 8 f. (p. 168 Crönert): τ[ιν]ι εὐρίσ[κωνται]

T. V, p. 9c, ll. 6 f. (p. 169 Crönert): εὐδαιμονί|[α] ἔπεται

T. V, p. 9e, l. 5 (p. 169 Crönert): οὐπω ἐξ

T. VII, p. 11b, l. 2 (p. 170 Crönert): σημαίνει ἐ[π]

The clear impression is that Colotes does not bother to avoid hiatus.

Carneiscus presents an interesting case.<sup>37</sup> In the second book of his biography of Philistas, we find only three offensive hiatus, two of which rely on uncertain readings: in col. XVI 12 f., we find τοιούτου | [ε]ιδον, and in col. XVIII 6, we

<sup>33</sup> The fragments are collected in A. TEPEDINO GUERRA, *Polieno, Frammenti*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da M. GIGANTE, vol. 11 (Napoli 1991).

<sup>34</sup> Edited by G. INDELLI, *Polistrato, Sul disprezzo irrazionale delle opinioni popolari*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da M. GIGANTE, vol. 2 (Napoli 1978). Fragments of other treatises are extant, but I have not considered them here.

<sup>35</sup> I used the edition in the *Nachträge* of CRÖNERT 1906, pp. 163-167, for the *Against Plato's Lysis* and pp. 167-170 for the *Against Plato's Euthydemus*. Note that in Crönert's numeration, T(abula) means *cornice* and p(agina) means column (numbered continuously across *cornici*); these are followed by line numbers.

<sup>36</sup> The reading [ἥδη ἔξετιν] at T. I, p. 3b, l. 1 (p. 167 Crönert) is completely restored, but is an offensive hiatus. The hiatus at T. III, p. 7a, ll. 2 f. (p. 168 Crönert), εὐ[τ]υχία ἔετι, is a quotation from Plato (*Euthyd.* 276d6). These cases appear to be offensive hiatus, but the text is quite insecure: T. V, p. 9c, l. 9 (p. 169 Crönert): αὐτῶι ἀπ]ο; T. V, p. 9f, l. 3 (p. 169 Crönert): Ιοδή ἀρέσκουσιν; and T. V, p. 10a, ll. 2 f. (p. 169 Crönert): Ιοτού [οὐ]λία.

<sup>37</sup> I have used CAPASSO 1988. For Carneiscus' style, see p. 130, including the notice that Carneiscus tended to avoid hiatus.

read εἰσάγει οὗτος.<sup>38</sup> The case at XIV 11, ψεύ[δ]ην ἐν, is harder; it is possible that punctuation should intervene or that the phrase is to be attributed to Praxiphanes, who is the object of the polemic and the subject of the sentence. Because the sentence is damaged, it is hard to tell. There is a possible case which depends on restoration at col. XVIII 6: ]τηι ἀλλοῖον. Note also col. XVII 16 ]μη ἐπὶ μὲν τ[, which is almost certainly not an offensive hiatus due to the μέν, regardless of the restoration of the first word, and col. XVIII 11 f.: cu[v]||αγαστραφήσεται οὐ[. which is excusable due to elision. My opinion is that Carneiscus tried to avoid hiatus and that we should attempt to find explanations or alternative readings for the problematic cases. Given that he appears to belong to the early generations of the Garden, that he avoided hiatus might be thought notable.<sup>39</sup> The genre of the work, an encomium of a friend, probably intended to serve as a memorial to his friend and an exhortation to similar behavior, probably has bearing on Carneiscus' stylistic choices.<sup>40</sup>

The extent to which the anonymous author of the *Life of Philonides* avoided hiatus has been overstated.<sup>41</sup> I noticed these not very many apparent cases:<sup>42</sup>

Col. VI 9 (p. 98 Gallo): |τει ονο[  
 Col. VII 7 f. (p. 100 Gallo): Ἀρτέμωνι ἀπὸ<sup>43</sup>  
 Col. XI 6 (p. 105 Gallo): [μέχρι εἰ]c  
 Col. XII 11 (p. 106 Gallo): οὖν οκ[  
 Col. XXI 6 (p. 118 Gallo): δέλ]φων ον . . ac  
 Col. XXVI 10 (p. 123 Gallo): ]ωι εἰc  
 Col. XXX 11 (p. 126 Gallo): ἀρετῆι ἐχρ[ήσατο]

Taking into account the broken contexts in which most of these occur, I suspect that the author did try to avoid hiatus. The instance at col. VII 7 f. in particular is a good candidate for a phrase-boundary exception, and that at col. XI 6 is perhaps an extension from the allowable μέχρι ἄν.

Apollodorus, the «tyrant of the Garden», was a scholarch in the middle and second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE. None of his extremely numerous works are extant, but his historiographical and biographical fragments have been collected recently by Schorn for the *New Jacoby project*.<sup>43</sup>

Among them, we find problematic hiatus, at col. VII 181 (F 2 Schorn): Ἐπικούρου οἰκείαι and at the same place, in an explicit quotation: αὐτῶι ὁ χάρτης.<sup>44</sup>

It is not clear if the first of these hiatus is to be ascribed to Apollodorus, or if Diogenes is paraphrasing. The second is clearly a *verbatim* statement, but it is possible that we have an originally oral statement handed down as an anecdote, in which case we should probably not expect him to avoid hiatus. Additionally, there are two fragments of Apollodorus in philosophical works by Philodemus, at *Di III (PHerc. 152/157)*, col. IX 36-42 Essler and the *On the Senses (PHerc. 19/698)* col. XXIIIa 5-18 Monet.<sup>45</sup> Neither shows any hiatus (which may be due to Philodemus' rephrasing of the material). On balance, we are justified in suspecting that he did not avoid hiatus, but the evidence is extremely flimsy.

Not enough *verbatim* fragments of Zeno of Sidon, the teacher of Philodemus and friend of Demetrius Laco, survive for us to determine his practice with certainty. None of his fragments has an objectionable hiatus, but the corpus is so small that this fact could very easily be accidental.<sup>46</sup>

The lengthy reports of his teaching in Philodemus' *Sign.* (*PHerc. 1065*) are a

<sup>38</sup> Besides the hiatus, it is probably too late in the sentence for οὐν. I wonder if νῦν is a possibility. Repunctuating to begin a sentence before εἰσάγει will not remove the hiatus.

<sup>40</sup> On the history and Epicurean context of this work, see CAPASSO 1988, pp. 37-53.

<sup>41</sup> First noted by W. CRÖNERT, *Studi ercolanesi*, a c. di E. LIVREA (Napoli 1975), p. 59 (trans. of ID., *Der epikureer Philonides*, «Sitzb. kön. preuss. Ak Wiss. Berlin» 61/1900, pp. 942-959), who was followed by I. GALLO, *Studi di papirologia ercolanesi* (Napoli 2002), p. 65 (revision of his edition in his *Frammenti biografici da papiri II: la biografia dei filosofi* (Roma 1980), pp. 51-95). Note that the use of double sigma instead of double tau still remains valid as evidence against Philodemus' authorship.

<sup>42</sup> A case at XIX 7 f. (p. 116 Gallo), [ταῦτη]ι ἀντὶ τῶν | βασιλείων οἰκίαι, and another at XXVIII 24 f. (p. 125 Gallo), [τὸν σύντροφον]ι ἀντοῦ Ἡλιόδωρον, fall under the «chain of concordant nouns» exception. A case at XX 12 f. (p. 117 Gallo), cu|νεργῶ[ι ἐχρῆτο] might be mis-restored.

<sup>43</sup> Apollodorus' testimonia and fragments are gathered by Stefan Schorn at *FrGH* IV 1028. The volume covers biographical writing, but has not been printed yet. The completed sections are available on the Brill Website (with subscription), which I have used.

<sup>44</sup> The saying is marked by φησὶν οὗτος αὐτῆι (τῇι) (add. Stephanus) λέξει before it and καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ἀπολλόδωρος after it.

<sup>45</sup> A. MONET, *[Philodème, Sur les sensations]*, *PHerc. 19/698*, «CErc» 26/1996, pp. 27-126.

<sup>46</sup> For the fragments, see A. ANGELI-M. CO-LAIZZO, *I frammenti di Zenone sidonio*, «CErc» 9/1979, pp. 47-133. I have double checked fragments against more recent editions when possible.

<sup>47</sup> I assume that ἔξε[θηκε] is said by Philodemus and breaks off the previous report in favor of giving a more rapid summary.

<sup>48</sup> Comparable might be the modern formulation (with «mortal» instead of «animal») of Sextus Empiricus' example syllogism «Every man is an animal, Socrates is a man, ergo Socrates is an animal» (*Hyp. Pyrr.* II 164) which lives on in logic textbooks.

<sup>49</sup> I am not certain that the text is correct here.

<sup>50</sup> I am not certain that the text is correct here either.

<sup>51</sup> In distinction to the previous case at col. IX 22, in this and the following cases, ταύτη is used adverbially (cf. LSJ s.v. οὗτος VIII 4); is it excusable like ἦ;

<sup>52</sup> STRATHMANN 1893, p. 19, had already noticed the hiatus in this part of the treatise, and concluded from it that Zeno allowed hiatus.

<sup>53</sup> A few notable features of the treatise are: the word group *σὺν τῷ δὲ λέγοι|[μ]εν αὐτῷ κατ' ἀνάγκην εἰναι* (I 14 f.), and hiatus after relatives in the following two phrases: *πάνθ' ἀ εἰ|[θί]μεθ[α] II 19 f.* and *ἀ [ἄ]ρτι* (XVI 1), which might be permitted generally by Zeno, but instances are lacking. Note that the apparent hiatus in *ἄνθρωποι, ἦ[ι] ἄνθρωποι* (III 31) are excused by punctuation in the first instance and is acceptable in the second.

<sup>54</sup> First noted, as far as I know, by M. McOSKER, *A New Edition of PHerc.* 188 (*Demetrius Laco, On Poems I*), *«CErc»* 44/2014, pp. 19-48, at p. 27. The only addition that I add here is that forms of πᾶς are included in the «chain of concordant words» exception (e.g. at *PHerc.* 1012, col. LVIII 3). Note the instances in col. LVII 11-13, which are heavily restored.

<sup>55</sup> I found no objectionable hiatus in *PHerc.* 1055, published by M. SANTORO, *[Demetrio Lacone], [La forma del dio]*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da M. GIGANTE, vol. 17 (Napoli 2000). I am reasonably certain of Demetrius' authorship of this text because of the spellings τάτο at col. V 3 and XXIII 9, πλήνων and πληνώνων at col. XXI 1 and 4, and Βιωνήν at XXII 3. Note that θεῖον at the start of col. VIII is a restoration.

different matter. Philodemus' own report of Zeno's teaching begins somewhere before the extant text and continues until col. XIX 4, then Philodemus reports Bromius' notes from Zeno's lectures (coll. XIX 12-XX 10),<sup>47</sup> but it is not clear to what extent Philodemus has reworked his material. It is also possible that Zeno was reporting an earlier Epicurean (cf. col. XVI 1-4), which complicates matters. The first problem is the word θνητός, which in the early part of the treatise enjoys an unparalleled freedom: the phrase θνητοί εἰσιν appears at coll. II 27, II 38, III 10, III 12, III 28, III 32 f., θνητοὶ εἰναι appears at col. III 3 f., and θνητοὶ ἄ[v]θρωποι at col. III 11 f. In light of the several other hiatus in this part of the text, one cannot be certain, but it seems likely to me that this was part of a traditional example.<sup>48</sup> It is possible that this is an example of permitted hiatus before forms of εἰμί (see above, n. 16), but I think this is less likely because of the other hiatus.

Also notable are the following:

Col. V 31: ἐπειδή οἱ (*n.b.* ἐπειδήπερ col. XIII 38)

Col. VI 32: ἐπ[ελή]φθη [οὐ]<sup>49</sup>

Col. VII 32 f.: ἐπαρκέ[ει] | ἡμῖν

Col. IX 22: ταύτη ἀντί]ctροφον<sup>50</sup>

Col. IX 34: ταύτη ἐ[ξα]λλάττ[ειν]<sup>51</sup>

Col. XI 25: τ[αύτη]ι ἀναγκά[ζε]ται

The only instance after Zeno finishes his report at col. XVI 1-4, if that is what it is, is γενικοῦ ἐπὶ at col. XVIII 36.

It is not clear what conclusion to draw from this.<sup>52</sup> It appears as if Zeno himself is reasonably strict, and we can excuse the one instance in his section on phrase-boundary grounds, or chalk it up to necessity. The unknown earlier Epicurean whom he discusses is apparently much freer. There is no hiatus in Philodemus' report of Bromius' notes, but he may have more substantially redacted them. The technical subject matter may require a bit more flexibility on the part of the authors, though I do not know of any other place in Philodemus' corpus where he loosens his practice. If, as I think reasonable, hiatus was generally permitted after ἐπειδή and adverbial ταύτη, then there are only a few instances left, and they are somewhat textually dubious as well. I note that in the subordinate cause δὲ δὴ τοῦ κ[αθ'] ὁμοιότητ[α] ἔχεται τ[ρό]που (col. XII 30 f.), the verb is placed in the only place where it will not cause objectionable hiatus, which probably shows that the author was concerned to avoid hiatus. For now, *non liquet*, but I suspect that Zeno himself avoided hiatus fairly strictly, and that the author whom he quoted did so less strictly.<sup>53</sup>

Demetrius Laco, as a rule, avoids hiatus with the same strictness as Philodemus, though there are two provisos to this statement.<sup>54</sup> First, it is my impression that he arranges words to avoid even allowed elisions to a higher degree than Philodemus does, but, second, he may admit more exceptions at phrase boundaries (so some hiatus involving nominatives might be explained, see below). I found these notable and difficult instances in Demetrius' work preserved in *PHerc.* 1012:<sup>55</sup> Col. XXXVII 11 f.: ἥγει ὁ Ἐπί[κουρος]; the first half of the column is missing, and it could easily be mis-restored. Alternatively, it could be a quotation from the adversary, *n.b.* the introduction to this section at ll. 2-4: φιλο]τείμως δέ τις ἐ[λέγχει καὶ λέγων ὡς ὁ Ἐπί[κουρος] ...

Col. XLVII 2: δεῖ ἐν: prodelision (and perhaps a quotation in any case, *n.b.* φαμένων in l. 1).

Col. XLVII 16 f.: κεφαλῆι ὁ λογισμός: another quotation, *n.b.* λέγων ὡς at l. 13 and ὥ[c φησι]ν at l. 19.

Col. LIX 3: ἔσυτῶι ὁ Ἐπίκουρος: another quotation; the context is πῶς οὐκ ἀνακόλουθός | ἐστιν ἔσυτῶι Ἐπίκουρος, ὅτε γ[ (cf. col. LXVI 5-9 for a quoted question of the nearly the same form, which Demetrius proceeds to rebut).

Col. LXVI 9 f.: σημα[ι]νομέν[ον] ὑπὸ: translated correctly by Puglia as «pur essendo indicato da» (without an explicit subject) but passive participles used impersonally take the accusative absolute construction, not the genitive (cf. Smyth §2076B, Kühner-Gerth II 88), so we should read σημα[ι]νόμεν[ον], which eliminates the hiatus.

Col. LXVIII 6 f.: ἀκουσίου | ἡ ἀντίπραξις: I will write out this section of the treatise:

τῶν

γάρ κατ' ἀνάγκην γινομέ-  
5 νων ἴδιον τὸ ἀκούσιον, πα-  
ρακολούθημα δ' ἀκουσίου  
ἡ ἀντίπραξις, ὁ προδήλως  
ἀπεκτιν τῆς τῶ[ν] τέκνων  
10 ζτοργῆς.

Note that the papyrus has a space after ἀντίπραξις, which may indicate the end of a quotation. If so, it probably would not be of the adversary, since Demetrius is explaining how one of the four meanings of φύει, namely κατηνογκασμένος, he gave in the previous column is not applicable in this instance. It may be a quotation from an earlier Epicurean. This sort of unmarked quotation is not foreign to Demetrius: there is another at *On Poems* II (*PHerc.* 1014, col. XXXVI 4-10), introduced by ὡς ἀν οὐ βλέπων ὅτι (ll. 3 f.), where the hiatus φωνὴ ἔναρθρος appears twice and alerts us to the possibility. Romeo *ad loc.* took it to belong to a Stoic and I suggest might be Epicurus'. The argument is rhetorically phrased and paradoxically might also have compelled Demetrius to admit the hiatus, if he preferred that structure. Another possibility is that Demetrius accepts hiatus before the article, which could explain two of the previous cases. If neither of these explanations is not accepted, then this instance is inexplicable.<sup>56</sup>

The *On Poems* II shows a similar situation.<sup>57</sup> Beyond several more easily explicable cases, we find the following more difficult ones.<sup>58</sup> In col. XXXV 6, ὥσπερ [ἡ] ἀκοή ἐμ[βάλλει, we should perhaps punctuate with a comma after ἀκοή. In col. LXI 3-5, ζή[της]ι πραγματική | αὕτη, Romeo seems to take αὕτη (printed *sic*, instead of the usual αὐτή) as a crasis of ἡ αὐτή in her translation, «la stessa ricerca empirica». If this is accepted, the phrase would probably qualify as a chain of concordant words. But there are reasons to doubt it: the position of πραγματική is odd and the crasis would be difficult for a reader, though the force of the second objection is lessened somewhat by use of τοῦν (or τοῦν) for τὸ ἐν in the same column at l. 7 (perhaps read ἡ αὐτή?). A final possibility is that the demonstrative falls under the same license suggested above for the

<sup>56</sup> Perhaps, in that case, read {δ'} ἀκουσίου {δ'}.

<sup>57</sup> I have relied on C. ROMEO, *Demetrio Lacone, La Poesia*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da M. GIGANTE, vol. 9 (Napoli 1988), and double checked the readings of the papyrus.

<sup>58</sup> The easier cases are as follows: τὸ παρ' Εὐριπόδη ἐν | Α[ι]κυμνίωι (col. XXX 6) is a prodelision, ὥσπερ ἡ ἀκοή ἐμ[βάλλει (col. XXXV 6) should probably have a comma (and it at least falls under the phrase boundary exception), and ἐνρύθμου ἡ ζή[της]ιc (col. LXI 12 f.) should have a comma.

article. These instances involving nominatives may also be fall under the chain of concordant nouns exception.

Because Demetrius' texts are less well preserved and less studied, they present more interpretative difficulties. It is harder to recognize quotations, and broken sentences mean that we cannot recognize punctuation as easily. Nonetheless, it is clear that Demetrius avoids hiatus as a rule, though his practice is apparently different than Philodemus'.

Smith 1993, p. 112, in his discussion of Diogenes' style, makes several observations about his avoidance of hiatus, which, although phrased differently from how I have done above, nonetheless lead to much the same result. He lists the following apparently problematic hiatus in his introduction:<sup>59</sup>

fr. 10.IV.14: προσλαλεῖ ἡμεῖν

fr. 12.IV.9: f. πλήθη ἔνα: conceivably a very surprising chain of concordant nouns, but also perhaps intentional for effect. The full phrase is c[ονα]γαγεῖν μέν | τινα τὰ [το]cάδε πλήθη | ἔνα τνγ[χά]νοντα «that some one person chanced on and collected so many multitudes [sc. of names for things]». Placing ἔνα directly after τινα would have prevented the hiatus, but perhaps the words referring to the single person are meant to surround the phrase about the words.

fr. 16.II.9 f.: θεοί εἰσιν: the whole clause is εἰ θεοί εἰσιν - perhaps hiatus was preferable to the collocation εἰ εἰ-. Alternatively, Diogenes could have availed himself of the license for forms of εἰμι suggested above.

fr. 32.IV.1 f.: ἀρετὰὶ ἀνταὶ (a chain of concordant words)

fr. 37.IV.10: αἰτία ἡ (another chain of concordant words)

fr. 72.II.6 f.: ξάνθη ἀλιβρῶσι (a quotation, as Smith suggested, of Epicurus' poetical description? N.b. that Mette conjectured ξάνθη ⟨δ⟩ because of the asyndeton)

Also noteworthy are the following:<sup>60</sup>

fr. 14.3 f.: λέπτη | [ά]τονος (but Hammerstaedt reads χιόνος)<sup>61</sup>

fr. 30.I.2 f.: ταν|[τεὶ ἐς]κευωρούμεθα (for ταντί, but n.b. ταντην proposed by Smith himself in his apparatus)

fr. 33.I.11 (2003): [αἰεί ἐστ]ίν (prodelision, if correctly restored)

fr. 33.I.14: σοφικ]ταὶ οὐτοι (a chain of concordant words)

fr. 33.VI.5: φέρει ἡ [κ]αῦσις

fr. 39.III.7 f.: γε]νήσεται | [c]οι ἀφ[θαρπί]α (probably an elision, thought not a common one)

fr. 39.V.10: ψυχῆ] ἔσται (prodelision; Smith 2003 p. 100 suggests the insertion of γ')

fr. 47.I.11: ξ]ίφει [ίc]ω (a good candidate for notional punctuation or a phrase boundary)

fr. 49.I.13: [δ] ἄμεινον

fr. 79.3: ἡ αἰτία

fr. 125.II.8: τῇ ὅτε: a surprising and grammatically difficult chain of concordant words: the sentence is τὴν αὐτὴν ... ἔχουσι δύναμιν | πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας | τῇ ὅτε καὶ παρόντων | ἐκείνων ὑφειστήκε|σαν, which Smith translates «they have the same power» (sc. τὴν αὐτὴν ... δύναμιν) «for persons who are present as when» (as if τῇ δυνάμει, ἦν εἶχον ὅτε) «they existed with those other persons

<sup>59</sup> He excuses two instances involving proper names: fr. 62.I.1 f. Ἀντι[πάτρω] ε]ῦ (εῦ being an extremely uncertain reading) and fr. 70.I.6 f. Ἀβε[τιά]ν]ω ειρήκαμεν (but now see Barigazzi's suggestion, accepted by SMITH 2003, p. 113).

<sup>60</sup> A few notable instances involve heavy restoration: fr. 10.II.1 f.: ἔ[πει | ἔ]δε[ι, fr. 10.IV.2 ἐπει]δὴ [όναρ, fr. 23.2 f.: ἐπειδὴ] | οὐκ, fr. 34.IV.1 f. ἐπειδὴ | [οὐκ ἀεὶ εὐθέ]ως, fr. 37.IV.8 f. ζῆ ὁ] | ἄνθρωπος, fr. 47.II.14-III.1: κλί|ν]ει [έπτ, fr. 47.IV.1: [ήκει εἰς], and πλανώμενοι] | οἱ [Cτωικοί NF 126 = YF 193 + NF 127 = YF 190 + fr. 20 (SMITH 2003 pp. 74-84, probably a chain of concordant words). At fr. 14.9, one can switch the order of the noun and adjective to eliminate the hiatus. At NF 171.2 f., [τὸ ἐκάστον | ἐνάργημα] is entirely restored in Smith's version, and perhaps a chain of concordant words. It is hard to know what to do with NF 170.2 f.: ]η οὐκε[ι | ]αι η οὐ.

<sup>61</sup> J. HAMMERSTAEDT, *Zum Text der epikureischen Inschrift des Diogenes von Oinoanda*, «EA» 39/2006, pp. 1-48, at p. 17 = J. HAMMERSTAEDT-M.F. SMITH, *The Epicurean Inscription of Diogenes of Oinoanda: Ten Years of New Discoveries and Research* (Bonn 2014), p. 231.

present also». If the letter is by Epicurus, then perhaps its text had suffered in transmission before it reached Diogenes' hands.

fr. 161.I.11 f.: τ]ῆ φύceι | [ῆμῶν (perhaps a chain of concordant words)

fr. 168.II.15 f. (with Smith 2003 p. 137): δν]|γήc[ει] ἔξαρπάζειν

NF 133.II.16 f.: βραχεῖ ἦταν

NF 192.IV.3: πάλαι ἡμῶν (probably an elision)

NF 213: δά] ἔctv (prodelision, if correct)<sup>62</sup>

The clear impression is that, while Diogenes is generally strict, there are some exceptions to his regular practice. Smith 1993, p. 112, said that Diogenes sometimes allowed hiatus after -ει (clear cases at fr. 10.IV.14, fr. 33.VI.5, and NF 133.II.16 f.); it seems clear to me that he tries to avoid it, but does not always do so. Of course, any of these instances might be in a quotation which is obscured by the poor state of the text. An apparent toleration of hiatus after the relative (at frs. 49.I.3, and 79.3) seems likely to be editorial rather than authorial, given the damaged contexts of the examples. That no examples of hiatus are found in the *Letters* is interesting, and may reveal that they were written with special care, but perhaps the phenomenon is merely an accident of our evidence. There is an interesting pattern that we can find in this material. Earlier Epicureans tended to admit hiatus, probably because they were writing technical philosophical treatises that did not demand style or polish. When they did write a more stylish work, like Epicurus' *Ep. Men.* or Carneiscus' memorial-encomium of Philistias, they avoided hiatus. Unfortunately, after the first two generations of Epicureans, we do not have good textual evidence. But at or by the end of the second century BCE, with Demetrius Laco and probably Zeno of Sidon, Epicureans start avoiding hiatus in apparently all of their treatises, regardless of the subject matter.<sup>63</sup> This could be due to changing fashion either generally or within the school, or because they were trying to attract a new audience. But because we do not know when this practice started, because it could be older than our evidence for it, it is hard to ascribe a purpose to it.

#### §IV Problem Solving with Hiatus

Avoidance and non-avoidance of hiatus can be used to resolve two different sorts of problems. In cases where the authorship is unknown, it is a valuable indication. For instance, Philodemus avoids hiatus with the same strictness in all of his known prose works, and if a work shows a different level of strictness, it should probably not be attributed to Philodemus. When the author of a work is known, their practice of hiatus can provide important evidence when considering supplements and emendations. First I will discuss several examples where Philodemus' practice of hiatus serves as a guide to correcting the text of the *De Ira*. Then I will discuss the authorship of two works and of two substantial sections in a third and fourth work. The works in question, *PHerc.* 1251 (*The Comparetti Ethics*, most recently published by Indelli-Tsouna-McKirahan 1995 as *[On Choices and Avoidances]*), and *PHerc.* 346 (published as the *Trattato etico epicureo* by Capasso) have both been attributed to Philodemus. A lengthy section, coll. XII 45-XXI 35 of Philodemus' *De Oeconomia*, was attributed to Metrodorus by Sudhaus 1906, and there is a similar section in Philodemus' *De Rhetorica II*. I will examine these attributions from the point of view of hiatus.

<sup>62</sup> Found in J. HAMMERSTAEDT-M.F. SMITH, *New Research at Oinoanda and a New Fragment of the Epicurean Diogenes (NF 213)*, «EA» 49/2016, pp. 109-125.

<sup>63</sup> That the practice began in Demetrius and Zeno's generation is suggested, but not proven, by the fact that Apollodorus does not seem to have avoided hiatus.

### 1. *De Ira* (PHerc. 182)

In this section, I will discuss some textual choices involving hiatus in the *De Ira*.<sup>64</sup>

Col. II 7: καταστο[χάσηται]: Wilke suggested καταστή[σει εἰς ὅψιν, which involves hiatus (beyond contradicting the traces on the papyrus).

Col. II 12 f.: οὐτε π[αρῆχεν] ἡμᾶς: Wilke suggested π[αράγει], which involves hiatus after the verb. The perfect (Philippson's conjecture) obviates the hiatus, and the tense matches with φανερόν ἔστι shortly after.

Col. V 17-19: αὐτῶι μ[ὲ]ν οἱ μέλλοντες παρακολουθήσειν συμφορά: the sentence structure is not clear, and Wilke conjectured μ[ὲ]ν δῆλον to avoid asyndeton. Delattre-Monet restored μ[ὴ]ν for the same reason. Wilke's conjecture causes hiatus, however, and should not be accepted.

Col. VII 24: ]ην εστ[: an apparent case, but without restorations, it is impossible to tell whether the hiatus would be offensive, or whether there might be prodelision. For example, Philippson suggested [δυς]χερέστα[τα κοιγή, ἔστι δ' ὅτε |<sup>5</sup> κα[τὶ τὰ ιδία] λυπή[σαντα κακά for these lines, in which the comma obviates hiatus.

Col. XIII 10 f.: καὶ συμπλεκόμενοι | προ]ς παροινοῦνται: Wilke conjectured ἐπ]ιπαροινοῦνται and ἔτ]ι παροινοῦνται; both involve hiatus and a misjudgment of the space available. My reading of the η clears the way for the supplement, which obviates hiatus. The verb is very rare, appearing elsewhere only at Philostratus *Imag.* II 23.4, in the active.

Col. XVI 34-37: μανίας τ[ο]ιγα[ρο]ῦν<sup>35</sup> οὐχ ὁμο[ιτον]γεν[ὲς] εἰναι συμβέβηκε [τὴν] ὄργην: With Wilke's reading of ὁμο[ιτον]γεν[η] εἰναι, there is hiatus; Croenert's conjecture obviates it.

Col. XXV 1-3: κάνθρωποι ἀφυεῖ... γενόμενοι: an apparent hiatus, but probably excused under the chain of concordant words exception. But the whole passage is doubtfully restored.

Col. XXXVI 3-6: δούλοις | περίπτωσ[ι]ς ἀμαρτωλοῖς |<sup>5</sup> καὶ δι' ἄλλα π]ολ[λὰ] πράγματα: the case of περίπτωσ[- in 1. 4 is a problem. Buecheler restored the nominative, and Delattre-Monet's dative cannot be accepted because of hiatus.

Col. XXXVIII 7-9: καθὸ δηκτικόν ἔστι | τι, π[ερ]ι | ἐλάχιστα γ[εν]ε[ρ]αται: In this crucial sentence, My new reading supports Wilke's conjecture. Previously, Delattre-Monet had conjectured τι γ[εν]ε[ρ]αται | ἐλάχιστους εἰναι.

### 2. [On Choices and Avoidances] (PHerc. 1251)

Tsouna and Indelli, in the introduction to their edition, make an excellent case for Philodemus' authorship, but they are too generous to critics of that position on the basis of hiatus.<sup>66</sup> They identify 20 instances of apparent hiatus (two of which should be subtracted, since they do not actually print them, but they are included in the list in n. 56), to which an additional four apparent cases can be added.<sup>66</sup>

Happily for their case in favor of Philodemus' authorship, none of these alleged cases are actually problematic. The editors correctly excuse the hiatus at coll. XVII 17 and XVIII 4 f. and 13 as belonging to quotations and so not actually Philodemus' writing (though they are not offensive in any case), and that at col. XI 5 as allowed by the punctuation. Once cases of *scriptio plena*/elision and

<sup>64</sup> I have relied on D. ARMSTRONG-M. MCOSKER, *Philodemus, On Anger* (Atlanta forthcoming) for the text. The numeration of the relevant sections is the same as G. INDELLI, *Filodemo, L'ira*, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi diretti da M. GIGANTE, vol. 5 (Napoli 1988).

<sup>65</sup> See INDELLI-TSOUNA-MCKIRAHAN 1995, pp. 76 f., for their discussion of the language and style of the work. Philodemus' authorship was asserted by CRÖNERT 1906, pp. 115 n. 515 and 177, and supported forcefully by GIGANTE 1983, esp. pp. 259-276.

<sup>66</sup> They are as follows: col. II 7: πεπεισμένοι ὅτι; col. II 15: γεννῶνται ασκο[; col. III 4: χρὴ ἀμέσως; col. IV 4: καὶ εὐεκκα[ρτ]έρητον; col. VI 7 f.: οἱ | [ημῶν] (n.b. they do not actually print this in their text, instead they read οἱ[τία]; col. VII 16: ὄστε [νπ]ὸ; col. VIII 11: ν[ι]κηθῶνται ὑπό; col. XI 5: εἰν[αι δ]; col. XIV 3: κα[τὶ ἐγγ]ικρατῶς; col. XV 16: περὶ ὕν; col. XVII 11: ὄτου[δήποτε ἀποκλείονται]; col. XVII 17: μηδὲ ἐν; col. XVIII 4 f.: μὴ | εὐχημόνως; col. XVIII 13: δὲ ὑπομενῶ; col. XIX 3 f.: μὴ ἀθανάτους (also not actually printed, instead they read θομητο[; col. XX 15: καὶ ὑπερήφανο[; col. XX 18: καὶ ἀσύγκλαστο; col. XX 19: καὶ ἀσυμπαθεῖς; col. XXII 9: καὶ ἀποκόπτειν; col. XXIII 4: [τι εἰχουσιν. To which we should add the following: col. I 14: ἀντίγραφα] | ἐν; col. VI 1: ἀναγ[ικαία] | οἱ; col. VI 3: ἀναγκ[αῖα], | οἱ; col. XVI 4: δὲ ἀκριβές.

permitted hiatus are removed, we have only a small residue of harder cases, which I will discuss in related groups.<sup>67</sup>

Coll. II 7, VI 1, and VI 3: in all three cases, we should print commas. Punctuation obviates the hiatus.<sup>68</sup>

Col. III 4: we should treat the whole statement as a quotation from an adversary, as follows:<sup>69</sup>

2 οὐδ' [έφασκόν] τινες εἶναι  
δυνα[τὸν γ]ινώσκειν οὐδέ<ν>,  
προς[είπον] δ' ὡς “οὐ χ[ρὴ ἀ]μέ-  
5 σως α[ἰρεῖς]θαι, μη[δε]νὸς ἐφ' ὁ  
[χρ]ὴ π[αρις]ταμένου”.

Some claim that it is not possible to know anything, and they add “one should not make an immediate choice, when nothing is present on account of which one should do so”.

As it is a quotation, the hiatus in χρὴ ἀμέσως does not count against Philodemus.<sup>70</sup>

Col. VI 7 f.: if read, this is a chain of concordant words.

Col. VIII 11: we should write νικηθῶσι<ν> ὑπὸ. The scribe drops a final *nu* at col. III 3 (quoted just above), and moveable *nu* is used to obviate hiatus throughout the treatise (e.g. II 5, VIII 8, XVII 14, XIX 14, and XIX 17).<sup>71</sup>

All of the cases have been accounted for, either by a more detailed understanding of Philodemus' practice, or by recognizing punctuation. In only one case was a minor emendation called for. Hiatus in no way stands in the way of Philodeme's authorship of this treatise.

### 3. *PHerc. 346: The Trattato etico epicureo*

Our second case is that of the so-called *Trattato etico epicureo*, an anonymous treatise preserved in *PHerc. 346*. Capasso suggests Philodemus as author, but recognizes the difficulty that hiatus poses for this possibility.<sup>72</sup> I will handle this and the following texts more briefly, given the longer treatment of *PHerc. 1251* above.

These are the instances of offensive hiatus in the treatise:<sup>73</sup>

Col. III 9 f.: ἐ[λό]μενοι εν[ρεθή]σον[τα]ι

Col. VI 24: ]φου ἀγαθὸν μ[

Col. VI 26: ]ν ἐφάπτεται

Col. VIII 3: αὐτ[ὴ] ἐπεσημήγατο (prodelision?)

Col. IX 3 f.: συμβαίνει | [ά]μα τά τε

Col. XI.1: φύσει ὑπάρχειν

Col. XI 6: τούτου ὕμνον

It is possible that the instances at col. VI 26 and col. IX 3 f. might be excused,

<sup>67</sup> *Scriptio plena/elision*: II 15, VII 16, XVII 11, and XVIII 13, as well as I 14 and XVI 4.

Permitted hiatus: IV 4, XIV 3, XV 16, XVII 17, XVIII 4 f., XIX 3 f. (if read), XX 15, XX 18, XX 19, XXII 9, and XXIII 4. These are mostly cases of καὶ and μη.

<sup>68</sup> Another possibility is reading διότι at II 7, but this is not necessary.

<sup>69</sup> I follow the translation of INDELLI and TSOUNA-MCKIRAHAN with slight changes.

<sup>70</sup> There is another instance of hiatus after χρή, at *Di* III, col. VIII 25 (ESSLER 2011, p. 256 f.), but it is part of a summary of an argument in the fifth book of Epicurus' *On Nature*, in which work Epicurus permitted hiatus. The phrase was simply borrowed from Epicurus.

<sup>71</sup> Similarly, at *Po.* V col. XXXV 12, ἕρωσι<ν> ἦ should be read.

<sup>72</sup> M. CAPASSO, *Trattato Etico Epicureo (PHerc. 346)* (Napoli 1982), pp. 31-40; hiatus is discussed on p. 40 n. 76, where he follows E. BIGNONE, *Epicurea*, «Atti R. Accad. Sc. Torino» 47/1912, p. 679, who was misled by the complicated case of the *On Signs*, discussed above.

<sup>73</sup> There are notable chains of concordant words at col. II 23 f.: οἰκειώματι ἐλάτ[τ]ονι and col. III 1: καὶ τ' ἀ[ληθῆ] εὐ[το]ν[ία]ν. Phrase boundaries obviate hiatus at col. VIII 27: ἐθεωρήθη ἐφ' ὄσον and col. IX 10 f.: ὑπάρχει ἐν τε τοῖς.

in the first case, depending on the reconstruction of the text, and in the second case, if the τε is felt to reach back and include the ἄμα. This leaves a residue of six or seven cases of hiatus which Philodemus does not admit, which is evidence against his authorship. If the proposal of Philodemus' authorship is rejected, it is possible that the treatise is mid-second century or older, since it seems that only at the end of the second century, with Demetrius Laco and Zeno of Sidon, did Epicureans begin avoiding hiatus regularly.

4. *On Household Management (PHerc. 1424)* and *On Rhetoric II (PHerc. 1674)* Sudhaus 1906 suggested that Philodemus' treatise *De Oeconomia* contains an excerpt, coll. XII 45-XXI 35, from Metrodorus' treatise *De Divitiis*, on the grounds (*inter alia*) that the author of that section allowed hiatus that Philodemus avoided.<sup>74</sup> Recently, the stylistic evidence has been discounted by Asmis and Tsouna.<sup>75</sup>

Let us note the following objectionable hiatus in this part of the treatise, by Philodemus' established standards:<sup>76</sup>

Col. XIV 18: περι[έ]λη[ι] ἔσυτοῦ

Col. XVII 45 f.: ἥ[τ]τω εἰναι<sup>77</sup>

Col. XX 33: σοφ[οῦ] ἥ

Col. XXI 18: δεινο[ι] εἰ[ci]ν

All of these are reasonably securely restored, and none is acceptable by Philodemus' standards. It is important to note that they appear between the crucial mentions of Metrodorus and his *On Wealth* in coll. XII 26 f. and XXI 34, and they are evenly distributed throughout that stretch of text. Sudhaus' other arguments, especially those about the *Zeitbestimmung* of the author, should be kept in mind.<sup>78</sup> This is scanty but firm evidence, and it seems likely that Philodemus is at least closely paraphrasing Metrodorus, though probably not copying him out *verbatim*.

<sup>74</sup> My working definition of objectionable hiatus is somewhat more lax than Sudhaus', and consequently much of his evidence is not useful to me. I also consider «normal» spelling errors irrelevant to deciding authorship, unless they are completely consistent throughout a treatise, so spellings like ὀλίοc for ὀλίγοc and the presence or absence of *iota* adscript do not seem relevant for deciding authorship to me. (Demetrius Laco's peculiarities are a different matter.) I have no comment on the grammatical and lexical issues raised by SUDHAUS 1906, pp. 45 f.

<sup>75</sup> E. ASMIS, *Philodemus' Epicureanism*, ASNRW 36.4/1990, pp. 2386-2388, treats the section as predominantly Philodemus, who drew on Metrodorus. Tsouna, in her introduction, says that Philodemus «draws on an older debate between Metrodorus and the Cynics», but does not think that the columns in question are a «*verbatim* copy»; see V. TSOUNA, *Phi-*

*ludemus, On Property Management*, Writings from the Greco-Roman World, vol. 33 (Atlanta 2012), pp. XXV f. and 93 f. See also V. TSOUNA, *Epicurean Attitudes to Management and Finance*, in G. GIANNANTONI-M. GIGANTE (edd.), *Epicureismo greco e romano*, Atti del Congresso Internazionale III (Napoli 1996), pp. 701-714 (esp. pp. 702 f. n. 6).

<sup>76</sup> There are three questionable instances that I noticed elsewhere in the treatise:

1. εῦρο[ι] ἄλλοc (Sedley: εῦρε[v] Jensen, col. IIIA 16 f.): Jensen's reading does not involve hiatus, but the infrared photograph suggests ο rather than ε. ἄλλοc could also be wrong, however.

2. ἄπορο[ι] ὄντεc (col. VI 29): the participle is unnecessary and can be ejected.

3. τω υπεραco[ (col. VI 33): *sic* Tsouna, following Jensen, where the papyrus is badly damaged.

<sup>77</sup> The whole sentence is τί γάρ· καν αὐτὸν ἀπ[οφῶ]civ τοιοῦτον ὑπάρχειν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατά | γε τὸ διατ[α]κτικ[ὸ]ν καὶ παραμετρητικ[ὸ]ν τῶι φ[υ]κῶι | τέλει τοῦ δέον[τ]ος ἥ[τ]τω εἰναι, which Tsouna translates as «Why, even if they deny that he is that kind of person, they certainly cannot mean that he is worse than he should be regarding classification and measurement in accordance with the natural end», but it could mean «What's this? Even if they deny that he is that kind of person [sc. an expert household manager], at least [sc. they do] not [do so] on account of his being worse at classification and measurement than one ought with a view towards the natural end». If the second interpretation is adopted, then the hiatus is excused by being in a chain of concordant words, since it is part of the articular infinitive τὸ ... εἰναι.

<sup>78</sup> SUDHAUS 1906, pp. 46-48.

A similar case found in a section of Philodemus' *De Rhetorica* II (*PHerc.* 1674, coll. XLIX 27-LI 29, pp. 145-149 Longo Auricchio) is likely to be similarly paraphrased: Metrodorus is mentioned at the start, and Philodemus inserts a transitional note at col. LI 1-2 (καὶ [μ]ι[κ]ρὸν προβά[c π]ωc «and moving ahead a bit [sc. in the work]»). Additionally, he explicitly changes the setting at the end by saying ἀ μὲν [οὖν] | ἔχομεν ἐκ τῆc πραγμ[α|τεία]c παραθέcθαι ... («Well, the statements which we can adduce from his [sc. Metrodorus'] treatment ...»). Note these hiatus: L.16 ἄ[λλου] ὅτο[υδήπ]ο[τ], LI 18 θηρεύε[ι ἀ]πò, and LII 4 αὐταὶ ὁμογνύμωc.<sup>79</sup> A reasonable inference is that Philodemus is quoting or closely paraphrasing Metrodorus' work and that this passage should be included among the fragments of his treatise *On Poems*.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>79</sup> I have not introduced the half-brackets marking text preserved only in a second copy for the citations from *De Rhetorica* II.

<sup>80</sup> Two short excerpts are included in Koerte as frr. 20 and 21.

[mfmcosker@owu.edu](mailto:mfmcosker@owu.edu)

