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A NOTE ON \textit{PHERC}. 1018 COL. II.5

In his recent superb edition of \textit{PHERC}. 1018,\textsuperscript{1} which contains portions of a history of the Stoa by Philodemus, Tiziano Dorandi offers the following text of the fragmentary col. II lines 1–7 (p. 50): \footnote{Filodemo. \textit{Storia dei filosofi: la Stoa da Zenone a Panezio} (Leiden, 1994).}

\begin{quote}
\textcolor{red}{
\textcolor{OliveGreen}{\textit{Kassandreω}} \textit{Apol-lóδωρος}, καὶ \textit{dikaiouς}
\textit{παλος καὶ Φιλέταιριος, ἀ-}
\textit{seβείς ύπárχοντ[ες].}.\textbf{.}
\\
Μέντωρ εἰς Ἐρμίδαν
\end{quote}

The passage falls within the context of a review of the ideas and works of Zeno of Citium. The first intelligible portion of this papyrus (col. I.1–12) refers to Zeno’s theoretical views on καλά and αἰσχρά; the remainder of col. I is too lacunose for one to ascertain its content, but Zeno’s opinions on various ethical issues seem to be presented.

More than ninety years ago, von Arnim offered a reconstruction of the syntactic and semantic structure of the passage from column II quoted above:\textsuperscript{2} \footnote{H. von Arnim, \textit{Bemerkungen zum Index Stoicorum Herculaneensis}, \textit{SBWienAk} 143 (1901), XIV, pp. 2–3.}

\begin{quote}
\textit{to[ων μὲν γὰρ πολλοῖς τοὺς πλουσίους ἐνίοτε δοκεῖν εὐθαίμονας εἶναι, κακοδαιμο-}
\textit{νεστάτους οὖν, καθάπερ]
\\
\textcolor{red}{
\textcolor{OliveGreen}{\textit{Kassandreω}} \textit{Apol-lóδωρος}, καὶ \textit{dikaiouς}
\textit{παλος καὶ φίλο[ω θε]ο[γίς], ἀ-}
\textit{seβείς ύπárχοντ[ας, ὡς ὁ]}
\\
Μέντωρ κτλ.
\end{quote}

Von Arnim’s reconstruction assumed that three categories of people are listed, each category consisting of people who display, probably in theory, appearance, or reputation, a positive ethical quality, but are in fact vicious: the adjectives \textit{ádikotátouς} and \textit{áseβείς}
denote their real ethical qualities. Each category is exemplified by at least one infamous historical personnage: Apollodorus, Harpalus, and Mentor.

Dorandi’s new text is obviously superior in that it is based on a careful autopsy of the papyrus. The major advances that Dorandi has achieved are to show that the end of column I does not permit anything like von Arnim’s hypothetical synopsis of it, and that von Arnim’s \( \phi \iota \lambda [\varsigma \theta \epsilon \omicron \omicron \iota \varsigma] \) (col. II.5), while notionally plausible, is ruled out since the traces of ink on the papyrus do not permit a deviation from \( \Phi \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau [\ldots] \varsigma \) (p. 137). These letters are now taken by Dorandi, with some reservations (p. 137), as a person’s name, Philetaerus, an individual who cannot be identified satisfactorily. With the consequent collapse of von Arnim’s reconstruction, and the ensuing syntactic uncertainties (pp. 5, 156), Dorandi has chosen to follow Comparetti and Isnardi Parente\(^4\) in their supplement of line 6 which prefers the nominative form of the participle (\( \dot{\upsilon} \alpha \rho \chi \omega \nu \tau [\varepsilon \varsigma \dot{\omicron} \tau] \epsilon \), but he still feels that something like \( \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \pi \varepsilon \rho \ldots \kappa \alpha \) should be supplemented in the final lines of col. I (p. 137).

Although Dorandi’s text is undoubtedly superior to von Arnim’s reconstruction, it presents some new difficulties: the syntax now appears even more unfathomable, and we are faced with the mysterious individual Philetaerus.

I should like to propose an emendation that might take advantage of Dorandi’s superior text while resuscitating von Arnim’s syntactic and semantic reconstruction of the passage:

\[
\dot{\omicron} \Kappa \sigma \varsigma \alpha \nu \delta e \nu \zeta \odot \text{Apol-} \\
\text{lo\-} \\
\text{d\-} \\
\text{ou\-} \\
\upsilon \alpha \rho \chi \omega \nu \tau [\varepsilon \varsigma \dot{\omicron} \tau] \epsilon \text{ Ar-} \\
\text{pal\-} \\
\text{os} \text{, kai } \varphi \iota \lambda \tau [\sigma \iota \lambda \omicron \upsilon] \varsigma \text{, } \dot{\alpha} - \\
\text{seb\-} \\
\upsilon \alpha \rho \chi \omega \nu \tau [\alpha \varsigma, \dot{\omicron} \varsigma, \dot{\omicron}]. \\
\text{M\-} \\
\text{e} \text{t\-} \\
e \zeta \text{ E} \text{m\-} \\
\nu \nu \\
3 \text{ A. Wilhelm, Parerga, Wiener Eranos (Graz, 1909), p. 134, proposed a slight variant, } \phi \lambda \delta [\theta \epsilon \omicron \omicron \iota \varsigma]. \\
4 \text{ D. Comparetti, Papiro ercolanese inedito, RFIC } 3 \text{ (1875), p. 475; M. Isnardi Parente, Stoici antichi (Turin, 1989), p. 116 n. 56.} \\
5 \text{ E.g. coll. VI.4, VII.4, XIII.7, XIX.4 etc., and a whole word is omitted in XXI.5.}
after филет[αίρ]ο(υ)ς, because it can logically be supplied from the parallelism of the preceding clause.

By taking филет[αίρ]ο(υ)ς as an adjective, meaning something like “true / loyal to one’s friends”, we now have an adjective which provides a positive counterpart to ἄσεβεῖς. The passage will now present three categories of people, as von Arnim suggested. The first category would have been located in the closing lines of col. I, and hence is lacking, but we do have the exemplar in the person of Apollodorus of Cassandria; the second category appears just, but is in fact most unjust, as exemplified by Harpalus; the third category appears to be loyal to its friends, but is in fact ἄσεβεῖς “impious”, an adjective that can be applied to people who violate a position of trust or responsibility in their relations with others. This third category is exemplified by Mentor in his dealings with Hermias. Mentor well represents those who pretend to be friends but in fact violate their positions of trust or responsibility. Mentor and his brother Memnon, as a team, were responsible for acquiring the territory of Hermias of Atarneus for the Persian king. The incident is best illustrated by Strabo, who makes Memnon, Mentor’s brother, the principal instigator of the crime against friendship and hospitality, although in other accounts Mentor’s role is given prominence:

Μέμνων δ’ ὁ Ῥόδιος ὑπηρετῶν τότε τοῖς Πέρσαις καὶ στρατηγῶν, προσποιησάμενος φιλίαν καλεῖ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ξενίας τε ἅμα καὶ πραγμάτων προσποιητῶν χάριν, συλλαβών δ’ ἀνέπεμψεν ὡς τὸν βασιλέα, κάκει κρεμασθεὶς ἀπόλετο (Strabo 13.1.57).

Thanks to Dorandi’s new text, the precise aspect of Mentor’s ἄσεβεία in the Philodemean passage can be clarified.

To summarise. There are three advantages to this emendation: it removes the difficulty of the mysterious individual Philetaerus; it provides a parallel construction for the clause which precedes it (... καὶ δικαίος ὑπάρχειν, ἀδικοτάτος ὃν[τα]ς, καθαρὲς Ἀρπαλος....); and it provides an appropriate positive counterpart to ἄσεβεῖς.
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6 Cf. Arist. Oec. 2.28, Diod. 16.52.5-6, and Polyaeus 6.48, where Mentor himself is given credit for the operation against Hermias.