

IAN RUTHERFORD

[PHILODEMUS, Περὶ Ποιημάτων]  
TRACTATUS TERTIUS, FR. E, COL. I, LL. 23-4

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 82 (1990) 58

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

[Philodemus, Περὶ Ποιημάτων]  
Tractatus tertius, fr. e, col. I, ll. 23-4

20 ἄλλ' ὅμως κα-  
θάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς  
χειρουργίας οὐχ ἡγούμε-  
θα χεῖρω{ι} παρ' ὅσον ὑφέ{μ}-  
μενος ὕλην ἑτέρου τε-  
25 χνεῖτου, καλῶς ἡργάσα-  
το, οὕτως οὐδὲ ποιητὴν ἐ-  
ὼν ἀπόητον ὑπόθεσιν λα-  
βῶν προσθή{ι} τὸν ἴδιον νο[ῶν],  
col. II χεῖρω νομίζομεν ...

23|24 ὑφείμενος Sbordone

This is a section of a continuous text of Hellenistic poetics, given the title “Tractatus tertius” in Sbordone’s edition and tentatively ascribed to Philodemus *περὶ ποιημάτων*.<sup>1</sup> The subject seems to be the relation in which an artist stands to his predecessors, in another words literary μίμησις. It is of especial interest because it has been shown to be close in spirit to Horace *Ars Poetica* 441-2: *rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus ...*<sup>2</sup> I want to focus here on the obviously corrupt ὑφέμενος (ll. 23-4). Sbordone’s text implies ὑφείμενος, though in his apparatus he suggests the longer form ὑφείμενος. The sense in either case would have to be “diminishing”, and in the context it would refer to one artist in some way diminishing the material of another. However, that makes no sense. What we want is the idea that one artist removes, borrows or steals material from another. There is an easy emendation available in ὑφελόμενος. Palaeographically this is intelligible: λo has been misread as μ. I offer this translation of the whole sentence: “But just as in the case of the manual arts we do not think worse of someone in so far as he steals material from another artist and works well with it, so we do not think worse a poet if he takes an unpoetic theme and adds his own sense”.<sup>3</sup>

Harvard University

Ian Rutherford

<sup>1</sup> F. Sbordone, *Ricerche sui papiri ercolanesi* II (Milan, 1976): [Φιλοδήμου περὶ ποιημάτων] *Tractatus Tres*, 206 (= CA VII 87 and IV 195, the two fragments having been united by C. Jensen, *Philodemus: Über die Gedichte V* (Berlin, 1923), v ff., n. 2).

<sup>2</sup> See C.O. Brink, *Horace On Poetry 2: The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge, 1971), 209, 441-2.

<sup>3</sup> I would like to thank John Morgan for helpful discussion on this point.