

C. CHANDLER

A NOTE ON *PHERC.* 1018 COL. II.5

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 106 (1995) 53–55

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A NOTE ON *PHERC.* 1018 COL. II.5

In his recent superb edition of *PHerc.* 1018,¹ 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):

ό Κασσανδρεὺς Ἀπολ-
λόδωρος, καὶ δικαίους
ὑπάρχειν, ἀδικοτά-
τους ὄν[τα]ζ, καθά[π]ερ Ἀρ-
παλος καὶ Φιλέτ[αιρ]ος, ἀ-
σεβεῖς ὑπάρχοντ[ες] . .].
Μέντωρ εἰς Ἐρμί[αν]

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:²

[τοῖς μὲν γὰρ πολλοῖς τοὺς πλουσίους ἐνίστε δοκεῖν εὐδαίμονας εἶναι, κακοδαιμο-
νεστάτους ὄντας, καθάπερ]

ό Κασσανδρεὺς Ἀπολ-
λόδωρος, καὶ δικαίους
ὑπάρχειν, ἀδικοτά-
τους ὄν[τα]ζ, κα[θάπ]ερ Ἀρ-
παλος καὶ φίλο[υς θε]ο[ί]ζ, ἀ-
σεβεῖς ὑπάρχοντ[ας, ώς ὁ]
Μέντωρ κτλ.

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 ἀδικοτάτους and ἀσεβεῖς

¹ *Filodemo. Storia dei filosofi: la Stoà da Zenone a Panezio* (Leiden, 1994).

² H. von Arnim, Bemerkungen zum Index Stoicorum Herculaneensis, *SBWienAk* 143 (1901), XIV, pp. 2–3.

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 φίλο[νς θε]ο^τς (col. II.5), while notionally plausible, is ruled out since the traces of ink on the papyrus do not permit a deviation from ΦΙΛΕΤ[...]ΟΣ (p. 137).³ 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 Parente⁴ in their supplement of line 6 which prefers the nominative form of the participle (ὑπάρχοντ[ες ὁ τ]ε), but he still feels that something like καθάπερ . . . καί 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:

δ Κασσανδρεὺς Ἀπολ-
λόδωρος, καὶ δικαίους
ὑπάρχειν, ἀδικοτά-
τους ὅν[τα]ς, καθά[π]ερ "Αρ-
παλος, καὶ φιλετ[αίρ]ο<υ>ς, ἀ-
σεβεῖς ὑπάρχοντ[ας, ώς ὁ].
Μέντωρ εἰς Ἐρμί[αν]

This emendation retains von Arnim's accusative for the participle in line 6 and his suggested supplement for the end of that line. This emendation requires a scribal error in that the letter *v* has been left out, but this is by no means implausible. In col. I.2 there is an example of dittography (διαθέ{σε}σεως), and both Comparetti and Gomperz suspected that there were other words missing in lines 5 and 9 of col. I. Letters have almost certainly been left out elsewhere in the papyrus.⁵ As to changing the case of the adjective and participle in lines 5–6 to the accusative, there can be no firm reason to reject it, given the fragmentary nature of the passage. There should certainly be no problem in the ellipse of an infinitive

³ A. Wilhelm, Parerga, *Wiener Eranos* (Graz, 1909), p. 134, proposed a slight variant, φιλ[οθ]έο<υ>ς.

⁴ D. Comparetti, Papiro ercolanese inedito, *RFIC* 3 (1875), p. 475; M. Isnardi Parente, *Stoici antichi* (Turin, 1989), p. 116 n. 56.

⁵ E.g. coll. VI.4, VII.4, XIII.7, XIX.4 etc., and a whole word is omitted in XXII.5.

after φιλετ[αίρ]ο<υ>ς, because it can logically be supplied from the parallelism of the preceding clause.

By taking φιλετ[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 ἀσέβεῖς. 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 ἀσέβεῖς “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:⁶

Μέμνων δ’ ὁ Τρόδιος ὑπηρετῶν τότε τοῖς Πέρσαις καὶ στρατηγῶν, προσποιησάμενος φιλίαν καλεῖ πρὸς ἔαυτὸν ξενίας τε ἄμα καὶ πραγμάτων προσποιητῶν χάριν, συλλαβὼν δ’ ἀνέπεμψεν ὡς τὸν βασιλέα, κἀκεῖ κρεμασθεὶς ἀπώλετο (Strabo 13.1.57).

Thanks to Dorandi’s new text, the precise aspect of Mentor’s ἀσέβεια in the Philodemian 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 δικαίους ὑπάρχειν, ἀδικοτάτους ὅν[τα]ς, καθά[π]ερ Ἀρπαλος . . .); and it provides an appropriate positive counterpart to ἀσέβεῖς.

Cape Town

C. Chandler

⁶ Cf. Arist. *Oec.* 2.28, Diod. 16.52.5-6, and Polyaenus 6.48, where Mentor himself is given credit for the operation against Hermias.