S. A. Stephens

THE RHETORICAL EXERCISE *P. HAMB.* 134

The Rhetorical Exercise *P. Hamb.* 134

P. Hamb. 134 (P[2] 2811), originally published as "prose," was identified by Joachim Dingel in *ZPE* 14.2 (1974) 169-170 as a fragment of a rhetorical declamation, based on an extremely popular theme, to judge from the number of surviving examples,[1] namely, that "the valiant in war (ἀριcτεύc) receives whatever reward (γέραc) he demands." The reward that the *aristeus* demands, of course, conflicts with the desires of some other party, and this forms the basis of the exercise. In a large number of these exercises the *aristeus* wishes to use his reward to save a deserter (λιπὼν τὴν τάξιν) from the consequences of his action. Sometimes the *aristeus* is a father, the deserter a son,[2] sometimes one brother is the *aristeus*, another the deserter (Quintilian 287 [=375]), sometimes the *aristeus* is a rich man, the deserter a poor man (Sopatros 322-324 [Walz *RG* VIII]). Elements of all three may be combined, and plots may be further elaborated by a deserter subsequently becoming an *aristeus* or vice versa. Although *P. Hamb.* 134 is too fragmentary to be dogmatic, it would seem to share a number of features in common with the *aristeus*-deserter type of exercise. Dingel observed that there were at least two parties involved who were father and son (see line 13), and that the father was in all probability the speaker. He also improved the text in a number of places. Building on his work a few further observations about text and context are possible.

The editio princeps assumed on the basis of the wide right margin (7.5 cm.) that this piece was written on a single sheet, not a roll (p.83). Not necessarily; the papyrus contains the last 25 lines of the declamation, what appears to be the *epilogos*, involving, to judge from the language, a conventional excursus about τύχη. Further, the exercise is carefully written, hiatus is consistently avoided and there are a number of ornaments that bespeak an attempt at rhetorical elegance. In general, the piece gives the appearance of a finished declamation, rather than a sketch. Almost certainly, therefore, the whole would have occupied several columns. Of the parallels available for comparison, either of the speeches of Libanius on a similar theme (37 and 48), as opposed to the sketches in Quintilian and Sopatros, would have required a small roll.

---

[1] Dingel lists for Greek, Libanius 37 (239-259 VII Förster), Sopatros 306-308, 320-322 (Walz, *Rhetores Graeci* VIII); for Roman, Seneca, *contr.* 8.5, 10.2; Quintilian, *inst.* 9.2.85; *decl.* 258, 271, 287 (=375), 304; Calp. Flacc. 10.2 and S. Bonner's comment on this type, *Roman Declamation* (Liverpool, 1949) 89. Add to these, Libanius 48 (612-639 VII Förster), a variant of Quint. *decl.* 287; Sopatros 286-306, 322-324 (Walz *RG* VIII), both related in type to Quint. *Decl.* 271 (*pauper et dives inimici erant)*; casual references in Hermogenes 89.20-90.4, 99. 23-100.1, 101.23-102.6 (Rabe) and in the commentary to Hermogenes attributed to Sopatros 44. 27-45.10 (Walz *RG* V).

[2] Sopatros 306-308 (Walz *RG* VIII); 44.27-45.10 (Walz *RG* V).

On the basis of the photograph printed in the editio princeps the following text seems possible:

— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —

	]ου νεανίϲκο[ ] κ[α]ὶ τοῦτον ἀπεκτονειϲ
	]ϲ ἀριϲτεὺϲ ἐχθρόϲ, ὡϲ ἐγώ, τῆϲ πολιτεί-
αϲ	]ὼϲ ἐγώ, τῆϲ ἐπιθυμίαϲ. ἐγώ ϲ’ ἔτι δια-
4	]α γέγοναϲ ἀριϲτεὺϲ φιλονικῶν ἐμοὶ
	θ]αυμαϲτῆϲ εὐγενείαϲ ἀπολέλαυκαϲ κλά-
ων	]ν καὶ διὰ τῶν δακρύων αὐτομολεῖϲ
	]οϲ ἀνανδρίαν καὶ ῥίπτειϲ ἣν ἔλαβεϲ
8	]ϲ καὶ ϲὺ τὴν τάξιν τοῦ γέρωϲ καὶ οὐ
	]ϲατο τὴν ἀνδρίαν τὴν ϲήν. ϲὺ δὲ τὴν
	] ιμη. μεγάλην μὲν οἴϲει κἀμοὶ τὴν
	ἐπὶ τοι]αύτῃ προφάϲει βίοϲ· γενήϲομαι δὲ καὶ
12	] λειαν ἀπεχθὴϲ ὀνειδιῶ ϲε πολλάκιϲ
	]λου πατέρα . ἐγώ ϲέϲωκά ϲ’, ἐγώ μελ-
λ-	]ριαν. ἠλέηϲ[ ] ἔργον. ἀμφότεροι
	] ιϲτευϲαϲεκ [ ]λεμηϲαϲ, λιπ[ό]ντοϲ δὲ
16	φιλαν]θρωπίαϲ ϲώζ[εϲ]θαι. ἀλλὰ δε[ι]νόν, εἰ πε-
	]ν τοῖϲ ἐπινικ[ίο]ιϲ α ρούμε[ν]ον
	]οτε ταῦτα [ ]ιϲ [.]ειχεν
	]του πολέμου [.] [ ]]πτειϲ
20	]ειϲ ὅτε τῷ [τ]ῆϲ τύχ[ηϲ]ωχω
	] πρὸ τοῦ δαίμονοϲ αμ[ ] ου
	]βραχεῖαν ἀναϲτροφὴ[ν]ω
	]ώρηϲιϲ ἐκ τῶν πάλαι κεχ[μέν]ων η
24	]δέ ϲοι πρὸϲ παραμυθίαν τὰ τ[οῦ] τεθνη-
κότοϲ	ν]εανίϲκοϲ καὶ γὰρ νόμιμοϲ γέ[ρ]ων.

2, 4, 14 ἀριϲτεὺϲ Dingel : Αριϲτευϲ *ed. pr.*   2 πολιτεί[[αϲ] Dingel : ποντειl *ed. pr.*
3 ϲ]ωφροϲύνηϲ *ed. pr.*   4]αγετ αϲ *ed. pr.*   5 θα]υμαϲτῆϲ *ed. pr.*   κα *ed. pr.*
7 or]ωϲανανδριαν   8 λείπτει]ϲ *ed. pr.*   10 μὲν οἴϲει *ed. pr.* : μένοιϲ εἰ Dingel
11 ἐπὶ τοι]αύτῃ *ed. pr.*   13 πατέρα: *ed. pr.*   14 ροι corrected from ρρι pap.
15 Α]ριϲτευϲ αϲ *ed. pr.* : ἀ]ριϲτεύϲαϲ Dingel.   εκ τ[ ]εδηϲαητο[ ]υτοϲ *ed. pr.*
16 ϲώζ[ε]ται *vel* ϲώζ[εϲ]θαι *ed. pr.*   17 ἐπινικ[ίο]ιϲ Dingel   νοvl pap.   19
τούτου ἐμοῦ *ed. pr.*   20]ωχω Dingel : ω: χω *ed. pr.*   23 κε [ ]ων *ed. pr.*   25
γὰρ Dingel : πᾶϲ *ed. pr.*   γε[ ]ωνl pap.

1 ἀπεκτονειϲ: either the pluperfect ἀπεκτόνειϲ or ἀπέκτον(α) ειϲ. In the rest of the passage the verbs tend to be first or second person singular. The statement need not express a fact, cf., e.g., Dem. *Against Androtion* §2 αἰτιαϲάμενοϲ γάρ με --- τὸν πατέρ’ ὡϲ ἀπέκτον’ ἐγώ τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ. However, it does indicate that death either was or could be the consequence of some action, and serves to exclude the possibility that the issue was the disowning of a son (as in, e.g, Quint. *decl.* 258, 371, and 375).

2-3 πολιτεί/[ας]: with ἐχθρός the word suggests a political enemy, and in fact one variant of this theme pits πλούσιος ἐχθρός against πένης (Sopatros 322-324 [Walz *RG* VIII]). However, πολιτεί|[ας] may also refer to character and personal behavior. Compare Sopatros 307.9-11 (Walz *RG* VIII) τὴν κατάστασιν εὑρήσεις ἐκ τῆς πολιτείας καὶ τῆς τοῦ πατρός ἀγωγῆς. This meaning is common in patristic texts, see Lampe s.v. F

3 ὡς ἐγώ, τῆς: ed. pr.'s reading, c]ωφροςύνης, is illusory; the vertical descender of what must have been taken as φ belongs in fact to the tail of ρ from the line above. The sense will be "hostile, as I am, to your behavior (in deserting the line ?) [and sympathetic ?], as I am, to your desire (to go into exile or to die ?)."

3-4 ἐγώ ς' ἔτι δια[φθερῶ;] or sim.?

5   The line ends in κλα, not κα as ed. pr. has it. A form of κλαίω comes to mind, considering διὰ τῶν δακρύων in the next line. More than likely a participle in agreement with the subject of ἀπολέλαυκας. Note that the form must be the Attic κλά[ων] or sim., since κλαίων is prohibited by the normal rules for syllable division.

7 ςυνειδ]ὼς ἀνανδρίαν or sim.?

10 μεγάλην requires a noun like ἀτιμίαν, ἀδοξίαν, or αἰςχύνην.

Dingel suggests that the articulation μένοις εἰ is also possible; surely not. οἴςει is one of a cluster of future tenses, the argument of which appears to be as follows: "[If you do this], (1) life … on this pretext will bring great [shame or dishonor], (2) I will become … [and] (3) an object of hatred (?) I will reproach you." On the basis of lines 10-11, at least 12 letters would appear to be missing from the beginning of the lines, e.g., μεγάλην μὲν οἴςει κἀμοὶ τὴν [αἰςχύνην ἐπὶ τοι]αύτη προφάςει βίος. The lines will be even longer if βίος was further qualified.

12] λειαν: initially only αι or ν are possible; read κ]αὶ λίαν?

13: Ed. pr.'s reading πατέρα: suggests a change of speaker, which is inherently unlikely in such exercises. Further, Dingel has pointed out that what ed. pr. took as a dicolon at line 20 belonged to the left tips of χ (170). Here, from the photograph the plural πατέρας looks a possible alternative.

14 ἠλέης[. . .] ἔργον: before ἔργον traces of a vertical descender, so that [τ]ὸ ἔργον is ruled out as a reading (if not for other reasons, see below, 19 note). Possibly ἠλέης[α τὸ ς]ὸν ἔργον. This is consistent with many of the exercises in which the *aristeus* pities the deserter and wishes to save him, see, e.g., Sopatros 323.25-26 (Walz *RG* VIII): ὅτι ἐχθρὸς ὢν ἐλεεῖς καὶ φιλανθρωπεύη τὸν πένητα. While something like ἠλέης[α γὰρ τὸ ς]ὸν ἔργον would be preferable, the space does not favor it.

15. Initially ἀ]ριστεύςας, as Dingel suggests, or ἠ]ρίςτευςά ς' seem most likely, given the context, but]πιςτεύςας or ἐ]πίςτευςά ς' cannot be excluded. Ed. pr.'s εδηςαη yields no sense, but what is taken as a δ could be the vertical descenders of μ angled slightly toward each other (compare the m at lines 5 and 24). This would give εμηςαι or εμηςας, before which is a clear oblique desecender from λ or α. Letter size is variable enough that the whole might be ἐκπ[ο]λεμῆςαι (or -ςας), or ςε κα[ὶ πο]λεμῆςαι (or -ςας). E.g., ἠ]ρίςτευςά ς' ἐκπ[ο]λεμῆςας ("I was valiant fighting against you") or ἐ]πίςτευςά ςε κα[ὶ πο]λεμῆςαι ("I believed that you too would fight").

λιπ[ό]ντος δὲ: the lacuna seems too small for ed. pr.'s το[ιο]ῦτος. For λι compare line 2, πολιτει; for π, compare line 21, προ. If λιπ[ό]ντος is correct, it strengthens the argument that that one of the parties has deserted his place in battle.

17: Perhaps ἀναιρούμ[εν]ον, though difficult to judge from the photograph.

19: Ed. pr.'s τούτου ἐμοῦ is prima facie unlikely, since elsewhere hiatus is avoided. (Hiatus after καί [line 8: καὶ οὐ] is regularly admitted by most writers who would avoid it elsewhere.) The broken letters look very like πολε (compare above, lines 5 and 24), though τοῦτο γ᾽ ἐμοῦ or τοῦτο τ᾽ ἐμοῦ cannot be ruled out.

20: τῷ [τ]ῆς τύχ[ης κακ]ῷ χω- or sim. Lionel Pearson suggests τῷ [τ]ῆς τύχ[ης ἀγερ]ώχῳ. These lines appear to contain an argument for forebearance in the face of a cruel reversal of fortune. For the thought compare Sopatros' advice for constructing the *epilogos* of an exercise on a similar theme (Walz *RG* VIII 324.4-9): ὁ ἐπίλογος παθητικὸς--- πείθων φρονεῖν μέτρια εἰδότα ὅτι ἡ τύχη πολλάκις οὐκ ἀκόλουθα ταῖς διανοίαις ἡμῖν πρυτανεύεται.

23: Traces after πάλαι appear to be κεχ[or κεκ[, that is, a perfect participle. Space would seem to limit the options to κεχ[υμέν]ων, κεχ[ρημέν]ων, κεκ[τημέν]ων, κεκ[ριμέν]ων.

24 πρὸς παραμυθίαν: compare Sopatros 343.5-6 (from a similar exercise): καὶ μηδέν μοι πρὸς παραμυθίαν ἔτι τῶν πρώην ὑπολειφθῆναι.

τὰ τ[οῦ] τεθνη[κότος]: compare Hermogenes, περὶ εὑρ. 1.1 (100.9 Rabe): τὰ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος δίκαια ἐγκλήματα. From an exercise on a theme similar to this. The perfect participle in this phrase must indicate that someone is already dead, and this suggests that the theme involved at least two brothers, one of whom has died, and a father as in Sopatros 320-322 (Walz *RG* VIII). γένηται] δέ σοι πρὸς παραμυθίαν τὰ τ[οῦ] τεθνηκότος βουλήματα or sim.?

Stanford University   S. A. Stephens

Corrigendum

S.267 Anm.1 Z.3 lies Calp. Flacc. 21