

W. B. HENRY

NOTES ON PHILODEMUS, *ON ANGER*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 201 (2017) 59–63

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON PHILODEMUS, *ON ANGER*¹

Fr. 17 app. 15–17

15] καὶ ΔΟΥΜ[- --
] ΕΙΔΕC[- --]
 ΛΕΥCΥ[- --]

At the end of line 15, I read λ[. Perhaps then a contrast was drawn between a slave or slaves and a king (17 βασι]λεύς, supplied by R. Philippson, *RhM* 71 (1916) 437). But it is not easy to take matters any further.²

3.6–7

τὰ μὲν ἀ[γ-]
 νοο[ύμεν]α τελέωc

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.³ 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 ο, correctly placed, and lacking only the very top. We may then print ἀ[γ]νο[ούμενα;⁴ the second ο given by the second hand of N is probably no more than a conjecture.

3.18–25

τοῦτ[ο] γὰ[ρ] δὴ προσ-
 τιθέαcιν [κᾶ]μ μετρί-
 20 ω[ς] τῶν φιλο[ο]φῶν οἱ
 δὴ γενν[αῖοι] καὶ τοὺς τρό-
 [πο]υc, δ[ι] ὧν ἄν ἤκιcτα
 τοῖc ὀργ[ί]λοic πάθεcιν
 περιπίτ[οι]μεν, ὑπο-
 25 γράφουcιν.

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 μὲ]νον (Gomperz) ... | μᾶλλ[ο]ν δέ (Spengel)), nor a few places where my readings match those of M. McOsler, who plans to publish a revised text and translation in collaboration with D. Armstrong. The following abbreviations may be noted:

Bücheler	F. Bücheler, <i>ZÖG</i> 15 (1864) 578–95 = <i>Kleine Schriften</i> i (1915) 510–30 (review of Gomperz's edition).
Crönert	W. Crönert, <i>Kolotes und Menedemos</i> (1906).
Delattre	D. Delattre, <i>Le Sage épicurien face à la colère et à l'ivresse: une lecture renouvelée du De ira de Philodème</i> , <i>CErc</i> 39 (2009) 71–88.
Giuliano	L. Giuliano, <i>Segni e particolarità grafiche nel PHerc. 182 (Filodemo, De ira)</i> , <i>CErc</i> 35 (2005) 135–59.
Janko	R. Janko (ed.), <i>Philodemus: On Poems Book 1</i> (2000).
Jensen	C. Jensen, <i>Ein neuer Brief Epikurs</i> (1933).
Wilke, Textkritisches	K. Wilke, <i>Zu Philodems Schrift über den Zorn. Textkritisches</i> , in <i>Festschrift zur Feier des 350jähr. Bestehens des Gymnasiums zu Greifswald</i> (1911) 95–117.

² I briefly record here a few other points in the fragments:

1.9 Perhaps λυπεῖcθ[αι]: 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 Giuliano 136 n. 19.)

3.31–2]οντοc: a participle in agreement with the following τοῦ μὴ κτλ.?

13.14 ἦτι παρῆται. It is not clear which sense of παρήμι is to be assumed.

³ See in general Janko 75–6.

⁴ Wilke reports 'μενα . N 1.' 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 line.

Concerning the structure, Wilke comments (on line 19) ‘κᾶμ μετρίως sc. ὀργισθῆ’, but the ellipse is a harsh one, as Indelli says in his note: the verb to be understood is not present in the context. μετρί[ωσ] 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 [κᾶ]μ, O has space for two or three letters followed by]αι. 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 κ]αί here, with Gomperz, though the κ will not fill the gap by itself. Finally, in line 21, Gomperz was evidently wrong to take γεννάοι 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:

τοῦτ[ο] γὰ[ρ] δῆ προσ-
τιθέασι [οἱ κ]αὶ μέτρι-
20 ο[ι] τῶν φιλο[σο]φῶν, οἱ
δὲ] γενν[αῖοι] 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 οἱ καὶ κα[τ]ραπικώτεροι τ[ῶν φιλοσο]φῶν.

8.24–8

καὶ βριμώσεως καὶ δεινῆς
25 ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ μετελ-
θεῖν καὶ ἀγωνίας, εἰ δυ-
νήσεται, καθάπερ ἀπο-
δηλοῦ[σ]ι] αἱ φωναὶ

O has at the start of line 28 δε ου, the uncertain trace being an unusually broad letter resembling a π. N has δε 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 ἀποδείξουσιν: 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 μετελθεῖν, as Bücheler had proposed (580 = 513).

9.18–19

τρόμους καὶ κ[ι]νήσεις
τῶν με[λ]ῶν

In line 19, O has between με and ων 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) ἀκούσιος δὲ κίνησις ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω τῶν μερῶν ἐναλλάξ φερομένων ὁ τρόμος.

11.6–9

ἀλλ[ᾶ π]ανπόλλων ἐποικ-
τικῶς συμ[φ]ορῶν, ὅταν
μὴν πάντ[ω]ς [ἔ]χθρας ἀ-
ναλάβωσιν [ἄν]θρωποι

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. . . ιϛ l.’, 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, ἀποδεικνύουσιν, 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 ἐφ[υ]τῶν 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’.⁸ Then πάντ[ω]ς is an emendation of Wilke’s. Gomperz had printed πάντες, and Wilke reports that he read παντες in the papyrus. But there seems to be some confusion here. The trace following μην 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. μην πάντ[ω]ς must then be considered highly dubious. I should read instead μηνί[ς]αντες, ‘having become enraged’. Philodemus refers to Achilles’ μήνις at 29.23; see in general H. Frisk, Μήνις. Zur Geschichte eines Begriffes, *Eranos* 44 (1946) 28–40.⁹

12.20–22

20 κατὰ [τελευταί-]
 ον καὶ καταφε[ρεῖς εἰς]
 λί[θ]ωγ βολάα

Wilke heals the asyndeton that results from his supplement at the end of line 20 by inserting <δέ> before καί in the next line, but the loss would be hard to account for. A likelier supplement is κατὰ [δὲ βαι]όν, ‘little by little’. κατὰ βαιόν has the further advantage of being (unlike κατὰ τελευταίον) an attested Greek phrase: see the *Diccionario Griego-Español* s.v. βαιός 2.

16.34–7

 μανίας τ[ο]ιγα[ρο]ῦν
35 οὐχ ὁμο[γ]εν[ῆ] εἶ-
 ναι συμβέβηκε [τήν] ὀρ-
 γήν

The hiatus in line 35 can be avoided by supplying instead ὁμογεν[έ]ς 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 *Il.* 2.204 in his edition. I have placed an asterisk under the γ, since the *disegni* show a τ.

20.17–19

 ἢ τὰ Μ[.]
 ΤΩΝ ἢ ἐπὶ μ[ικ]ροῖς [ἀναγ-]
 κάζη(ι) κυθρωπάζει[ν]

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 [κατὰ πάν]των, as at *Lib. fr.* 79.4–6 Olivieri μηδὲ συγεῶς ἀπὸ ποιεῖν, μηδὲ κατὰ πάντων. The unreasonable behaviour in question may then be manifested either ‘against everyone or over small things’.

28.16–21

 καὶ φιλονικεῖ[ν καὶ λυπ]εῖ[ν
 καὶ] διασύρειν καὶ πάν[π]ολ-
 λα ποιεῖν ἕτερα δυσχερῆ
 — συναυξόμενον δὲ καὶ μι-
20 κανθρωπίας αἴτιον γίνε-
 ται —, <ένίοτε> 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 βιάζεται¹⁰ and the scribe's eye skipped forward from the first εται to the second.¹¹ Then there is no need to take what precedes as a parenthesis.

33.40–34.4

33.40 [καὶ τ]ό τε κ[ο]λά[ζ]ειν
34.1 τοῖς ἵππικοῖς τοὺς ἵππ[ο]υς
καὶ τοῖς γραμματικοῖς ἀ-
κ[αὶ] μ[ε]λέλει κ[αὶ] τοῖς ἄλλοις τεχνίταις
ἔδω[κε] (τοῦς) μ[α]θητάς

The text of 34.3–4 given above assumes losses in three separate places, none of which would be easy to explain. But there is no need to suppose that any corruption has occurred. The letters on the left-hand side are on a *sovrapposto* and belong one circumference (7.6 cm) further forward, at 35.3–4,¹² where ἀμέλει and ἀπέδωκεν are supplied: we may now print ἀμέλει and ἀπέδωκεν in that passage. Crönert (62 n. 304) had evidently recognized the *sovrapposto*:¹³ he rightly gives the text of 34.2–4 as καὶ τοῖς γραμματικοῖς | καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τεχνίταις | [τοὺς] μαθητάς.¹⁴ Then at the foot of col. 33, Wilke's [καὶ τ]ό 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:

33.40 [καὶ] πρὸς τὸ κ[ο]λά[ζ]ειν
34.1 τοῖς ἵππικοῖς τοὺς ἵππ[ο]υς
καὶ τοῖς γραμματικοῖς
καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τεχνίταις
τοὺς μ[α]θητάς

'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]πῆσαν
δ' [ἐν] αἰτί[ι]α[ις] ποτὲ μὲν αἰ
κοινότη[τε]ς

Jensen (58 n. 2) proposed to read and supply here ἦσαν δ' [ἐν] αἰτί[ι]α[ις] ποτὲ μὲν αἰ κοινότη[τε]ς, with ποτὲ μὲν corresponding to πολλάκις δέ 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 ἦσαν 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 $\overset{\sim}{\eta}$. Wilke himself, adopting a suggestion made to him by Mewaldt, prints [ἐ]πῆσαν, with the underlining used to indicate an uncertain letter (p. 2). But the traces point rather to ἐῖσαν | δ' ἄ[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 αἰ πα[ρα]δεδο[μέν]αι. πα is clear and unambiguous in both *disegni*. The supplement, however, is too short. I suggest αἰ πα[ρα]δεδειγ[μέν]αι. 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 ... | δι' ἃς ὀργίλοι φαίνονται. He now proceeds to list those qualities. The list continues in the lower part of the column: cf. Indelli on 35.17ff.

¹⁰ βιάζεται δέ in line 5 is an uncertain supplement of Wilke's. (The particle has dropped out of Indelli's text.)

¹¹ Gomperz's προάγεται would explain the corruption equally well, but after what precedes, we do not expect a personal subject.

¹² On such *sovrapposti*, see in general H. Essler, *Rekonstruktion von Papyrusrollen auf mathematischer Grundlage*, *CErc* 38 (2008) 273–307, esp. 275–6.

¹³ For Crönert's pioneering work on *sovrapposti* and *sottoposti*, see M. L. Nardelli, *Ripristino topografico di sovrapposti e sottoposti in alcuni papiri ercolanesi*, *CErc* 3 (1973) 104–11.

¹⁴ Gomperz had printed (τοὺς) μαθητάς at the start of line 4, while C. G. Cobet, *Mnem.* 6 (1878) 380, had supplied καί at the end of line 2, conjecturing πᾶσι at the start of line 3.

35.24–6

καὶ πρὶν ἐνθυμηθῆναι
 25 συντετελεσμένως τὴν
 ἀτοπίαν ἐπίπτωζ[ι]ν

ἐπίπτωζ[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 επιπιων, and Wilke appears to be correct in reporting that the papyrus has the same. Jensen (58 n. 2) proposed ἐπὶ ποιῶν: ο 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)ίωv. A good man may castigate even before he has completely pondered the circumstances of the misdeed.

48.38–49.4

περὶ τε γὰρ τοῦ μεθυσθή-
 σεσθαι καὶ τὸν σοφόν, εἰ μὲν
 48.40 ἀποφαίνονται τοὺς πε-
 ρὶ τὸν Ἐπίκουρον κ[ε]χρησθαι
 49.1 τῷ καὶ τοὺς χα[ρ]ίεν[τας, φλ]υ-
 αροῦσιν· εἰ δ' ἔα[ν]τούς, ἀτόπως
 περὶ ἐκείνου φ[ανερό]ν ἐκ τού-
 των συλλογίζ[ε]σ[θ]αι

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 traggono 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 (αὐτούς) is not expressed; and φ[ανερό]ν (Wilke) so placed would naturally be taken with ἀτόπως, to the detriment of the sense. I should supply in line 3 not φ[ανερό]ν but φ[αίεν ἄ]ν:¹⁵ 'it would be strange of them to say that they are drawing conclusions about him (sc. the wise man) from them (sc. the elegant)'.¹⁶

49.40–50.2

49.40 τῷ προσηραμέν[ωι ὑ]πο-
 λήψεσιν τοῦ βεβλάσθαι
 50.1 τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπακολουθεῖν,
 ἄλλως δ' ἀδυνατεῖν¹⁷

In 49.40, we need τό to fill the space between τῷ προσηραμέν[ωι and ὑ]πο-. Then the hiatus (-νωι ὑ-) is removed¹⁸ and the construction is clarified: the premiss introduced by τῷ προσηραμέν[ωι 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 φλ]υαροῦσιν (1–2).

¹⁶ Delattre 78 states that φ[ανερό]ν seems to be confirmed by traces (not further described) 'qui se devinent sur le papyrus: φ[αν]ερ[ό]ν', but there do not appear to be any traces preserved in the relevant place.

¹⁷ ἀδυνατεῖν is of course parallel to ἐπακολουθεῖν 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 (edd.), *Epicurus and the Epicurean Tradition* (2011) 154–5.

¹⁸ Cf. e.g. Janko 77.