PHILODEMUS OF GADARA'S RHYTHMIC PROSE*

Abstract: In this paper, I show that Philodemus of Gadara, an Epicurean philosopher writing in Greek and roughly contemporary with Cicero, wrote rhythmic prose according to the standard Hellenistic practice developed by Hegesias of Magnesia (fl. c. 300). Additionally, he shows different percentages of rhythmic endings before heavy punctuation in several treatises, indicating different levels of stylistic polish. I suggest that these different levels are a sign of his intended audience for the treatises, that treatises dedicated to debates within the Epicurean school were less rhythmic, and those engaged with members of other schools were more rhythmic.

Keywords: Philodemus of Gadara, Prose Rhythm, Herculaneum Papyri, Stylistics

§ 1 Introduction

Modern study of ancient prose rhythm is beset with difficulties of various sorts, and the most serious are the distance between what ancient theoretical discussions prescribe as best practice and what actual practitioners wrote, and the uncertainty about whether we should study the rhythm of complete sentences or limit ourselves to consideration of the the final few syllables of sentences or clauses or phrases.[1] For instance, Aristotle (Rhet. 3.8, 1409ª1–21)

---

1) Modern scholarship also suffers from disagreements about certain details of scansion; see below. For a basic introduction, see Dover's article in the Oxford Classical Dictionary s. v. "Prose Rhythm, Greek." For bibliography, see G. Hutchinson, Appian the Artist: Rhythmic Prose and its Literary Implications, CQ 65 (2015) 788–806 and Plutarch's Rhythmic Prose (Oxford 2018). All citations to Hutchinson in this paper are to Plutarch's Rhythmic Prose. A. C. Clark, Fontes Prosae Numerosae (Oxford 1909), is a still-useful and convenient collection of ancient material. J. Hammerstaedt, Diogene di Enoanda e le clausule ritmiche. Un'indagine sulla scia delle ricerche di Daniele Mastai, in: Festschrift Mastai (forthcoming) will be a use-

recommends first paeons ($-\cup\cup\cup$) at the beginnings of clauses and fourth paeons ($\cup\cup\cup-$) at their ends, but these rhythms were never common. Theophrastus also recommended a paeonic rhythm (fr. 703 Fortenbaugh = Ps.-Demetrius, De Eloc. 41) and recommended a generally rhythmic prose, meaning, I suppose, that the hearer should get a general sense of movement and liveliness, or that phrase and clause boundaries should be articulated as clearly and perhaps emphatically as possible.[2] Sometime later, Ps.-Demetrius (De Eloc. 118) stated that excessively metrical phrasing is a cause of frigid prose. This may represent a retreat from Theophrastus' position. But Demosthenes, that master orator and almost exact contemporary of Aristotle, tries to avoid placing m o r e than two short syllables adjacent to each other throughout the sentence, a nearly direct contravention of Aristotle's suggestion, and one that would not cause the prose to be obviously metrical.[3] The effect may have been one of calm stateliness when the speeches were delivered. Work on pre-Hellenistic Greek prose has not revealed any kind of consistent system shared by two or more authors.[4] If they intended to be rhythmic, they each had their own system and taste.

The best known system, the so-called Asian *clausulae*, is said to have been invented by Hegesias of Magnesia in the early part of the third century BCE (or perhaps a bit earlier), and it quickly became dominant in Greek belles lettres; some Romans began to use it in the second century BCE, but it only became common from Cicero's time onwards. In the last four to eight or so syllables of phrases, clauses, or sentences, we find a limited set of metrical combinations

---

ful investigation of a related author; he makes the interesting suggestion that bad rhythm can be used to emphasize the key terms of a treatise.

2) Fr. 701 Fortenbaugh, Cic. De Orat. 3.184: (sc. prose) *non astricte sed remissius numerosam esse oportere*.

3) This phenomenon is known as Blass' Law after its discoverer; cf. F. Blass, Attische Beredsamkeit: Abteilung 3, Abschnitt 1: Demosthenes (Leipzig ²1893) 105–12: "Dass die Anhäufung von mehr als zwei kurzen Silben möglichst vermieden wird, wobei natürlich solche Silben, die durch Elision in Wegfall kommen, nicht mehr zählen." He allows certain exceptions. Later editors have disagreed about the existence or extent of Demosthenes' practice.

4) S. Usher, Eurhythmia in Isocrates, CQ 60 (2010) 82–95, examines Isocrates' practice, and see the previous note on Demosthenes. J. Heßler, Epikur, Brief an Menoikeus: Edition, Übersetzung, Einleitung und Kommentar (Basel 2014) 86–99, discusses Epicurus' *Ep. Men.* along similar lines.

in the authors who write rhythmically. This is usually what we modern scholars mean when we discuss ancient prose rhythm: we limit ourselves to consideration of the ends of the more important clauses and sentences, where heavy punctuation (i. e. English colons, semicolons, periods, exclamation marks, and question marks) is felt to fall. The question of sentence rhythm as a whole is usually left to the side, though Usher's article on Isocrates is an exception, as is Hutchinson's work on Plutarch (and see below, §§ 3 and 4).[5]

There are several systems of analysis on offer, depending on how many syllables are counted, which patterns are anointed as canonical, and which are counted as modifications of canonical forms (e. g. resolutions of longs into pairs of shorts), less common forms, or unacceptable forms. The dispondee, for instance, is sometimes allowed, sometimes disallowed, depending on the critic and time period studied – it seems to have been acceptable in Classical, i. e. pre-Hegesian, *clausulae*, but not in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods.

Gregory Hutchinson recently wrote a book on prose rhythm in Plutarch, supplemented with comparanda from other Imperial Greek authors. These authors are generally believed to have used the system developed first by Hegesias. These are the so-called 'Asian' rhythms, but they seem to be the common property of all rhythmic Greek prose authors.[6] It is understood in less detail than Cicero's practice. Hutchinson recognizes the following group of *clausulae* as rhythmic (final syllables are printed as long, which is assumed to be their regular value in prose rhythm, see below for details):[7]

---

5) There are of course exceptions, and debate simmers. Hutchinson scanned every word of Plutarch's *Lives* for his book, but defines authors as rhythmic or not on the basis of their sentence ends alone.

6) The classic statement of Asianism vs. Atticism is U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Atticismus und Asianismus, Hermes 25 (1900) 1–50, reprinted in: Kleine Schriften (Berlin 1969) III. 223–73, but it is hard to find evidence to bear out this distinction in practice, at least as regards prose rhythm. See now J. Wisse, Greeks, Romans, and Atticism, in: J. G. J. Abbenes et al. (edd.), Greek Literary Theory After Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of D. M. Schenkeveld (Amsterdam 1995), 65–82.

7) Hutchinson's book (n. 1), especially the first three chapters, should be essential reading for anyone interested in Greek prose and the interplay between style and meaning generally.

— ∪ — — ∪ — / — — — — ∪ —	2Cr(etic) / Mo(lossus)+Cr
— ∪ — —	2Tr(ochee)
— ∪ — — —	Cr+Tr
— ∪ — ∪ —	H(ypo)d(ochmiac)

Other familiar patterns are considered unrhythmic:

— ∪ — — — ∪ —	Epitrite
— — — —	2 spondees
— ∪ ∪ — —	2 dactyls
∪ — ∪ —	2 iambs
— ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ —	Pentameter

Two initial short syllables (one before the *clausula*) are necessary to distinguish 2Ia from Hd. Most of the disallowed rhythms can be analyzed as spondees with one or more resolutions.

Two resolutions are allowed per *clausula*, and resolution is marked by a superscript double-short to the left or right of the abbreviation to indicate which *longum* is resolved. For example, ⁀⁀Cr indicates ∪ ∪ ∪ —, Tr+⁀⁀Tr indicates — ∪ ∪ ∪ —, and ⁀⁀Cr+Cr indicates ∪ ∪ ∪ — — ∪ —. More than two resolutions apparently make for a pattern too shapeless to feel rhythmic. Resolutions of the middle *longum* in a molossus or hypdochmiac are notated by M⁀o and H⁀d respectively; these stand for — ∪ ∪ — and — ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — respectively. Two resolutions are marked with two pairs of shorts in the symbol, e. g. M⁀o⁀ indicates — ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪.

I mark final syllables in all these patterns as long: when a text was read out by someone who was concerned with prose rhythm, I assume that a pause, however brief, at the appropriate place would be sufficient to trigger the perception of a short syllable as long for metrical purposes, in the same way that even a very slight pause at the end of a line of stichic poetry is enough to make an audience hear, e. g., — ∪ ∪ — ∪ as — ∪ ∪ — — and feel the cadence of the dactylic hexameter. In prose, this pause will normally correspond with punctuation, a phrase boundary, or a place where we might expect a pause in speech (see below, § 2, for details).

Hutchinson introduces a category that he calls "overlap" to account for the rhythm of very short clauses; see (n. 1) 62–3. In an overlapped rhythm, the last syllable of the previous rhythmic unit is included to provide enough syllables for a complete *clausula*. For

example, in *καὶ διερεθισμοῦ* (Cr‿+Tr) *καὶ βριμώσεως* (*Mo+Cr), the real scansion of καὶ βριμώσεως is − − − ◡ −, but if -μου from διερεθισμοῦ is counted again as the first syllable of the molossus, we have the regular *clausula* Mo+Cr. The asterisk to the left of the analysis marks overlap. The purpose of this is to account for the rhythms of word groups that are too short to make up a *clausula*. It is also an interesting exploration of how sentence-internal rhythms may have worked. This procedure is dubious: if there is a pause at the end of a *clausula* and the *clausula* marks the end of some kind of unit, how can the last syllable of a *clausula* jump this boundary and count again?[8]

For the purposes of his statistics, Hutchinson only counts sentence ends, but in his scansions and analyses of passages, he finds these patterns at the ends of clauses and even phrases. I generally follow his practice of only considering sentence ends. It is possible that an author had different rhythmic preferences for different parts of his sentences, e. g. that he took care to write rhythmic sentence ends, but did not concern himself with rhythmic clause ends. In my statistics, I have counted sentence ends and other heavy punctuation (i. e. the ends of parenthetical statements, , and –), with the exception of the *De Morte*, where I also consider the *clausulae* before the commas that Henry prints.[9] Whenever I refer to 'endings' *simpliciter*, I mean those before heavy punctuation. '*Clausula*' refers to the rhythmic patterns themselves, regardless of where it falls in a sentence.

Hutchinson's scheme permits up to two resolutions in each, assumes Attic correption regularly, and counts diphthongs before another vowel as long.[10] He also cautiously allows hiatus if it gives

---

8) I note instances where overlap may occur in footnotes. Hutchinson admits that the idea may not be convincing to all of his readers, but claims to have found it in Plutarch, Cicero, and Appian. I wonder if we might just say that, in very short phrases, partial *clausulae* suffice to register as rhythmic. See also n. 35.

9) This is because the treatise is highly metrical; see below.

10) He discusses Attic correption on p. 46, where he says that he considers it a feature of "spoken Attic in every period." But Philodemus did not grow up in Athens, did not write in Attic, and lived before the Atticizing movement, so I have left it aside. He goes on to deny that word-initial rho can make position after a short vowel because the resulting rhythms are better, which is my license for scanning prevocalic diphthongs short (though there are some cases where they should be long).

a good rhythm.[11] He does not allow substitution of two shorts for one short, nor resolution of the final syllable of the schema. These *clausulae* have an expected incidence of 60,5 % at sentence end in Greek prose, but Hutchinson sets 73,75 % as the low boundary for being 'rhythmic.'[12] This boundary excludes authors whom we might want to include, such as Lucian and Dionysius of Halicarnassus' critical works (both 73,50 %). More marginal cases are Pausanias (72,00 %) and Iamblichus' *Mysteries of Egypt* (70,75 %). Iamblichus as a whole is at 63,25 %, so the *Mysteries* is a notable departure from his usual practice. Chariton (89,75 %) is the most metrical author that Hutchinson considers; Xenophon of Athens (56,00 %) is the least of those surveyed. Xenophon of Ephesus is at 75,75 %, and if this novel is an epitome, we can expect that in its original form it would be comparable with Chariton.

These data are suggestive: no author ends every sentence rhythmically, and perhaps none ever tried to do so. Authors can control their prose rhythm: Aristides' prose *Hymn to Sarapis* is 77,78 %, but his works in general are 66,25 % (and so not rhythmic for Hutchinson), and see Iamblichus' numbers, noted above. A higher proportion of rhythmic endings indicates a higher level of stylistic refinement, but being unmetrical does not ipso facto indicate a lack of style. Some philosophers, rather unexpectedly, rate quite highly: Musonius has rhythmic endings 80,05 % of the time, Alexander of Aphrodisias 81,75 %, and Philo Judaeus comes in at about 85 %. The highly rhetorical pseudo-Aristotelian *De Mundo* comes in at

---

11) See his discussion at pp. 63–6, and my comments below. But note that, in many of Hutchinson's cases, the phrase is still rhythmic after elision is accounted for.

12) Hutchinson uses a χ^2 test to get his statistical basis for this figure (n. 1) 19–24, additional details on 28–32. In brief, he scans 400 random sentence ends from a particular author and 400 from a control group, counts the number of rhythmic and unrhythmic closures, and performs the following formula twice, the first time for rhythmic, then for unrhythmic closures: $(n_1 - n_2)^2 / (n_1 + n_2)$. n_1 is the author in question, n_2 is the control group. The two resulting values are added together to get a χ^2 value, from which a p-value is derived, and this indicates statistical significance. Maximus of Tyre, at exactly 73,75 % rhythmic, had a one in 15,151.5151… chance of doing so; Ptolemy, at 69,25 %, had a much better one in 104,8878 chance. Hutchinson sets his cut off at one in ten thousand. His control group is a set of 400 random sentence ends taken from 5th and 4th century authors (i. e. pre-Hegesias) and he gets the figure of 60,50 % (242 rhythmic sentence ends, 158 unrhythmic sentence ends) for them.

84,33 %. Stylistic refinement and philosophical content, even in such unpromising genres as commentary, need not be strangers.

All this suggests a few basic considerations. First, to the extent possible, we should compile statistics for individual works rather than generalize across an author's entire œuvre. When a single work contains two styles, as Philodemus' *On Anger* does (see below), we should consider them separately. Intended audience and performance context certainly should affect the percentage of rhythmic endings, and other factors are likely to as well. For example, we might expect mature works to be stylistically more sophisticated than juvenilia, and consequently to have a higher proportion of rhythmic endings.

A second thought: despite Hutchinson's figure of 73,75 %, one could reasonably suggest that any author clearly above 60,5 % is trying to be rhythmic. Conversely, we might suggest that an author is also going for an effect (e. g. intentional roughness or rugged manliness) when he has less than the average figure. Rhythm and the lack of rhythm are under the control of accomplished authors, and we should assume by default that their rhythmic effects are intentional.

Hutchinson discusses at length how rhythmic closures affect attention, especially when an author writes *clausulae* for each phrase rather than just sentences. In Plutarch's *Vitae Parallelae*, such rhythmically dense passages are those treating points of narrative excitement or climaxes, but also philosophy, speeches, and comparisons; such passages are also more common in the second of each pair of *Lives*. That is to say, an author or work may be rhythmic on the whole, but a given passage more or less rhythmic than other passages, depending on the aims of the author in that passage. This will turn out to be the case in Philodemus' *De Ira* and *De Oeconomia* (see below). This is really just the first principle on a local level: an author can control his style sentence by sentence, even phrase by phrase, and can elevate, lower, or alter his style for specific effect. Rhythm can simply reinforce parallelisms or contrasts that are already obvious in the text, e. g. when synonyms or antonyms are used in close succession, or words are marked by alliteration, assonance, or another phonic effect. But rhythm can also create these connections even in the absence of another marker, because words in the same *clausula* go together more closely, and

words in different *clausulae* are marked by that fact. It seems that
even the juxtaposition of words inside and outside a *clausula* can be
used to effect: Hutchinson examines several cases where, he argues,
words a f t e r the rhythmic phrase gain interest and point from that
juxtaposition.[13] Special density of rhythmic phrases, in a work that
is otherwise rhythmic but not to the same degree, can focus atten-
tion on a critical point in a narrative or argument.[14]

Examination of several treatises by Philodemus reveals that
he too writes rhythmic prose. He refers to "experts on rhythms in
speech" in De lib. dic. fr. 54.6–7 Olivieri and to "the good rhythm
from those schools" in Rhet. 3, pp. 23–25 Hammerstaedt. I exam-
ined the *De Ira* (edd. Armstrong / McOsker, forthcoming), the
De Morte (ed. Henry), *De Rhet.* I (ed. Nicolardi), the *De Signis*
(edd. De Lacy / De Lacy), and the *De Oec.* (ed. Jensen, reprinted
with minor alterations by Tsouna). The first three I chose because
they are moderately long and the editors used the infrared photo-
graphs taken by Brigham Young and the Biblioteca Nazionale di
Napoli (I first noticed the phenomenon while editing the *De Ira*).
I chose the *De Signis* as a test case because of its unusual composi-
tion. I chose the *De Oec.* after proving to myself that Philodemus
wrote rhythmic prose because I wanted to see how Philodemus
treated the lengthy paraphrase of Metrodorus in the middle. The
De Morte received special attention because of its generally higher
rhetorical level and high proportion of rhythmic *clausulae.*

In the following section, I shall provide the rules that I used to
scan, statistics, and very brief discussion of the results. In § 3, I shall
scan a few sample passages from the *De Ira* as wholes, to demon-
strate the difference in Philodemus' usage of rhythms between the
diatribe part and the rest of the treatise. I suggest that the genre as
well as unavoidable technical terms and ways of phrasing argu-
ments are responsible for Philodemus' differing rhythmic practices.
In § 4, I shall provide a brief stylistic commentary to the conclusion
of the *De Morte*, in order to show that prose rhythm accompanies
and contributes to a higher style as a whole. In § 5, I shall provide
a few considerations about Philodemus' use of prose rhythm and
what it might mean for his intentions, for our appreciation of his

---

13) Hutchinson (n. 1) 52–5.
14) Hutchinson (n. 1) 67–74 with analysis of Plut. Adv. Col. 1127d–e.

style, and for his composition technique. In §6, I shall discuss a short miscellany of interesting or problematic passages from the treatises that I scanned for this article.

A few words on the difference between poetic meter and prose rhythm may be in order. Several ancient critics (Arist. Rhet. 3.8.1, Dion. Hal. De Comp. Verb. 11, Demosthenes 50) who demand rhythmic prose say that it should not be too poetic, that is, a prose writer should write shapely and rhythmic p r o s e , not poetry. For the Greeks generally, meter is a defining feature of poetry: Aristotle famously defends an alternative view at the beginning of the *Poetics*. Poetic meter works by regular repetitions, either line by line (in stichic meters like dactylic hexameter or iambic trimeters) or stanza by stanza (in Aeolic and Doric meters). (Astrophic lyric is another matter entirely.) The regularity of the repetitions is what makes clear that a particular piece of writing is intended to be a poem rather than prose that happens to have a peculiar rhythm.

Prose rhythm is not meant to work this way. Instead, as Aristotle and Dionysius say, prose s h o u l d lack the regularity of poetic meter, or else it becomes poetry. Instead, prose rhythm is meant to give shape or point to parts of sentences, to emphasize particular words or phrases, and to give a sense of flow or pace to the writing when it is read. Prose rhythm is a subtle stylistic tool, one among many, and not a basic constraint on composition, as poetic meter is. So we should not expect to find exact responsions between parts of sentences, nor do we need to believe that ancient authors or audiences recognized exactly what the rhythms were: I do not think that Cicero's audience (most of them anyway) knew that *esse videatur* was a resolved cretic followed by a trochee, but I do think that they recognized that the words had a pleasing rhythm that worked some effect on them. Most modern readers of poetry, I would guess, can recognize that a poem is metrical without being able to identify the meter. Resolutions of the four canonical patterns apparently do not damage the perception of these *clausulae* as rhythmic, just as substitution of a long for two shorts in dactylic hexameter does not ruin the meter. In fact, some resolved *clausulae* seem to have been favored over their unresolved versions: Cicero was famous for the *esse videatur* pattern (Cr ⏑⏑ +Tr), and Quintilian (9.4.119) explicitly prefers *hunc per hosce dies* (Cr+ ⏑⏑ Tr) to *hunc per hos dies* (Hd). Quintilian, himself a writer of rhythmic prose,

uses *mea facilitas* (⁔Tr+⁔Tr) at 9.4.111.[15] But the apparent ban on substituting two short syllables for a single short one, the apparent limit on resolutions to two per *clausula*, and the ban on resolutions of the final syllable probably indicate that too many short syllables would make a phrase strike the audience as shapeless or unrhythmic. *Clausulae* with two resolutions are less common than the canonical forms and those with only one resolution, so perhaps they were dispreferred, while remaining acceptable. The most shapeless acceptable pattern is probably Cr⁔ + ⁔Cr (i. e. − ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ −), and I only found it once in my corpus, in the rather less rhythmic argumentative part of the *De Ira* (35.21); the other extreme, an unbroken succession of long syllables, does not count as rhythmic.

Prose rhythm was one of the features of the artistically composed literature that ancient authors studied in school. From these works, they developed their style and taste, which included some kind of feeling or sense for rhythm, though perhaps an unconscious one. For such authors, writing stylish prose often meant writing rhythmic prose.

§ 2 Rules for Scansion and Statistics for Several of Philodemus' Treatises

These are the criteria I used for scansion:

1. I have adopted most of Hutchinson's schema and practices as described above, save for the exceptions below at 3–5 in this list, and for the fact that I scanned not only sentence ends, but also the the last words of parenthetical statements and last words before heavy punctuation i. e. semicolons and the ends of parentheses. In the case of the *De Morte*, I also scanned the last words before commas.

2. Final syllables count as long, for the reasons given below.

3. I have assumed that Philodemus used elision, prodelision / hyphairesis, or crasis for vowels written in *scriptio plena* in accordance with the practice described in my article on hiatus.[16] That

---

15) For these examples and a discussion of resolution generally, see Hutchinson (n. 1) 16–9.

16) M. McOsker, Hiatus in Epicurean Authors, CErc 47 (2017) 145–61. Permitted hiatus are a source of scansional difficulty.

is, γε ἐν αὑτῶι is scanned ◡ − − on the assumption that it was read out as γ' ἐν αὑτῶι. In one case, I have assumed that Philodemus intended for a whole word to be pronounced, even though the scribe wrote an elision instead of a final vowel at sentence end. Long vowel + vowel is a difficult case, and I have usually provided several possible scansions.[17]

4. It seems that better *clausulae* are obtained if we assume that Philodemus did not allow Attic correption (i. e. he scans a syllable long before *muta cum liquida*, especially word-internally). He was not an Athenian, and Attic correption was probably not a feature of his speech. This applies to both word internal and word initial cases.[18]

5. We also usually obtain better *clausulae* if we count word-internal diphthongs that are followed by another vowel as short, e. g. πλείων and οἰκεῖον = ◡ − and − ◡ ◡ respectively. All of these diphthongs are 'short' diphthongs, i. e. a short vowel followed by a semivowel. There are cases where the other pronunciation gives a better *clausula*, e. g. τὴν τοιαύτην γρυμέαν, the last sentence end of the diatribe in the *De Ira*, which is Mo+Cr with -οι- scanned long but an epitrite with it scanned short (see § 6 for more discussion of this phrase). On the other hand, the last *clausula* of the *De Oec.* requires a short scansion to be metrical, and given how rhythmic that work is otherwise, it is very hard to believe that Philodemus would have written an unrhythmic final *clausula*. It may be that Philodemus' practice was inconsistent, or that he was going for a deflationary effect at the end of the diatribe in the *De Ira*, which would match the rhetoric.[19]

---

17) It is by no means clear how Philodemus or his readers would have pronounced these phrases. The hiatus in question are not objectionable, but that does not help resolve the question of their rhythm.

18) See above, n. 13. In a few cases in my own scansions, I have noted when the opposite scansion provides a better rhythm.

19) 'Long' diphthongs must count as long, but I do not find any examples in my corpus. W. S. Allen, Vox Graeca (Cambridge ³1987) 81–4, notes that 'short' diphthongs originally were short vowels followed by a doubled semivowel, i. e. ει = /ejj/, but they are often scanned with a single semivowel to give a short syllable. Cf. Wilamowitz (n. 6) 36 n. 4, who chooses to scan Θηβαίων as − ◡ − and comments: "Ich messe das kretisch, wie z. b. damals Artemidoros von Perge in seinen Epigrammen immer Θηραῖοι. Natürlich ist das Willkür, aber die kann niemand aus diesen Analysen bannen, wenigstens so viel wir bis jetzt erkennen." Artemidorus lived in the third century BCE.

6. In all other cases in which I had to exercise discretion, I opted to count the worse rhythm.

7. When a violation of my usual practice in 3–6 produces a good rhythm, I have noted that fact, and provided a second, 'generous' count of *clausulae.*

A few terminological clarifications: by 'phrase,' I mean a group of words in a sentence that belong together conceptually and finish with a natural break before the next phrase, e. g. noun phrases (article + adjective or dependant genitive or other modifier + head noun), genitives absolute, articular infinitives, and prepositional phrases are all phrases. I assume a brief pause at the ends of phrases, and so I count their final syllables as long, though punctuation need not be written. Similarly, I assume pauses at other places, such as before relative pronouns, before the words before μέν and δέ, and before words like ὥϲτε (I call this 'notional punctuation' in my article on hiatus in Philodemus, cf. n. 16).

I hope that a generally consistent, clearly described practice will give clearer and more secure results. In the 'generous count,' I assume the most generous interpretation of the rhythm that seems plausible to me. Different people surely pronounced Greek somewhat differently even in the same time and place. Those variations could have an effect on rhythm, and Philodemus could not have controlled other people's pronunciation, and I prefer to give a range because of our rather imprecise understanding of Greek pronunciation and rhythm. The difference between the two counts is usually c. 4 %, and in all likelihood, the true percentage is somewhere in between my regular count and my generous count. In English, at least, people pronounce words more carefully when delivering a speech or reciting a poem than when speaking casually, and ancient literature was read out loud, often by specially trained slaves, rather than silently.[20] I assume, then, that they were alert to rhythms and tried to pronounce them correctly, i. e. rhythmically, but individual habits must have interfered.

With all of these preliminaries out of the way, here are the statistics:

––––––––––

20) See recently St. Busch, Lautes und leises Lesen in der Antike, RhM 145 (2002) 1–45.

De Ira (Argumentative parts)
Total passages scanned: 109
Total unrhythmic endings: 32 = 29,4 %
Generous count: 28 = 25,7 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 70,6–74,3 %

De Ira (Diatribe, coll. 8–31.24)
Total passages scanned: 59
Total unrhythmic endings: 15 = 25,4 %
Generous count: 12 = 20,3 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 74,6–79,7 %

The *De Ira* is an interesting case. The argumentative part of the treatise falls just below Hutchinson's cut-off, and is unrhythmic by his standard. But the model diatribe is well above the cut-off, and it is clearly intended to be so.[21]

De Morte (heavy punctuation)
Total passages scanned: 121
Total unrhythmic endings: 12 = 9,9 %
Generous count: 8 = 6,6 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 90,1–93,4 %

The *De Morte* presents quite a surprise: it is extremely rhythmic, one of the most rhythmic prose texts known. Because of the high rate of rhythmic endings in the *De Morte*, I scanned all the phrases that Henry punctuates with commas. Here are the results:

De Morte (commas)
Total passages scanned: 188
Total unrhythmic endings: 41 = 21,8 %
Generous count: 34 = 18,0 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 78,2–82 %

---

21) The diatribe is a 'model' because it was not delivered, nor was it intended to be delivered. It was a demonstration of what a philosophical lecture blaming anger (ψόγος ὀργῆς) could look like. The figures for the whole treatise are as follows: 47 unrhythmic endings in 167 total endings = 28,1 % (or, on the generous count, 39 endings = 23,4 %). If one wishes to consider the treatise as a whole, it is probably rhythmic by Hutchinson's standard. But note that this is only good for the treatise as we have it, and that more of the argumentative portion would probably tend to bring the proportion of rhythmic endings down.

In addition, at least two phrases which were too short to yield nor-
mal *clausulae* ended with cretics, which I take to mean that Philo-
demus intended them to feel rhythmic. The *De Morte* is thoroughly
rhythmic, not just at sentence end, but before any punctuation that
Henry marked. In fact, in at least some passages, the rhythm is
thorough-going; see below, § 4.

> The figures for the *De Morte* as a whole are
> Total passages scanned: 309
> Total unrhythmic endings: 53 = 17,2 %
> Generous count: 42 = 13,6 %
> Range of rhythmic endings: 82,8–86,4 %
>
> *De Signis*
> Total passages scanned: 212
> Total unrhythmic endings: 61 = 28,8 %
> Generous count: 44 = 21,2 %
> Range of rhythmic endings: 71,2–78,8 %

The *De Signis* is probably to be counted as rhythmic, which is quite
surprising in light of what we might consider to be its idiosyncratic
composition and a subject matter that cannot have appealed to a
very wide audience (a collection of reports of lectures rebutting
another school's attack on Epicurean induction and sign inference).
It may be the case that Philodemus' reports of other authors retain
some aspects of their styles. Four stretches of text provide enough
sentence ends for small samples:

> Initial Stoic criticisms
> Total passages scanned: 45
> Total unrhythmic endings: 14 = 31,11 %
> Generous count: 10 = 22,22 %
> Range of rhythmic endings: 68,89–77,78 %
>
> Dionysius' criticisms
> Total passages scanned: 62
> Total unrhythmic endings: 13 = 20,97 %
> Generous count: 8 = 12,9 %
> Range of rhythmic endings: 79,03–87,1 %

Report of Bromius
Total passages scanned: 48
Total unrhythmic endings: 14 = 21,15 %
Generous count: 9 = 18,75 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 78,85–81,25 %

Report of Demetrius
Total passages scanned: 51
Total unrhythmic endings: 15 = 29,41 %
Generous count: 14 = 27,5 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 70,59–72,5 %

If these samples are representative, Dionysius and Bromius wrote rhythmically, the anonymous Stoic at the beginning probably did, and Demetrius probably did not. There are difficulties with the material: beyond the small sample size, we do not know how much Philodemus rewrote or otherwise intervened in the composition of the reports. He clearly makes a number of authorial comments in the section dedicated to Dionysius, which may be a sign that he more substantially rewrote this opponent's words (and he certainly could have done so in other cases).

De Rhet. I
Total passages scanned: 49
Total unrhythmic endings: 18 = 36,7 %
Generous count: 14 = 28,6 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 63,3–71,4 %

The small amount of preserved treatise, and its poor state of preservation, are reflected in the low number of scannable endings, but as far as we can tell, the *De Rhet.* I was not rhythmic according to Hutchinson's standard, though it is above the predicted 60,5 % for the rhythmic endings. The small amount of preserved text, and its generally poor condition, may contribute to the low proportion of rhythmic endings.

De Oec.
Total passages scanned: 139
Total unrhythmic endings: 36 = 25,9 %
Generous count: 24 = 17,3 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 74,1–82,7 %

Metrodorus section (coll. 12.25–21.35)
Total passages scanned: 56
Total unrhythmic endings: 21 = 37,5 %
Generous count: 14 = 25 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 62,5–75 %

Remainder of the Treatise
Total passages scanned: 83
Total unrythmic endings: 15 = 18 %
Generous count: 11 = 13,3 %
Range of rhythmic endings: 82–86,7 %

These results are quite interesting. The whole treatise is rhythmic, but it becomes even more rhythmic, more or less on par with the average for the whole *De Morte*, when the Metrodorus section is excluded (he is mentioned at its beginning and end). This section has been suspected of being a close paraphrase of Metrodorus since Sudhaus, and it also deviates from Philodemus' regular avoidance of hiatus.[22] The evidence from hiatus and prose rhythm combine to make it all but certain that Philodemus is paraphrasing Metrodorus, and kept fairly close to Metrodorus' original phrasing, thereby preserving his unrhythmic prose as well as his hiatus.

§ 3 The *De Ira*: Arguments vs. Diatribe (coll. 8–31.24)

As the figures above show, Philodemus intended the diatribe section of the *De Ira* to be more rhythmic, and indeed it is more rhythmic throughout, not just at the ends of sentences and before heavy punctuation. Here are three sample passages from the diatribe (the first and last columns and one from the middle) and two from the argumentative section (the first and last well preserved columns). In all these passages, I scan all *clausulae*, wherever they occur. In these examples, I hope to show that Philodemus is in control of his use of rhythms, and that in the *De Ira*, rhythmic density is correlated with the genre of the section of treatise (diatribe vs. argument) and its style. I have removed underdots and most sigla,

---

22) Cf. S. Sudhaus, Eine erhaltene Abhandlung des Metrodor, Hermes 41 (1906) 45–58 and McOsker (n. 16), esp. p. 160–1.

and regularized the spelling for ease of reading. I otherwise strictly follow the text of Armstrong / McOsker. I do leave brackets in when the text is uncertain in a way that might implicate the rhythm. The italicized words and parts of words represent the *clausula* and its identification follows in parentheses.

Diatribe:

Col. 8.20–9.1

ὡσπερεὶ ϲυνκείμενον ἐξ *ἐκπυρώϲεωϲ* (Hd) *καὶ διοιδήϲεωϲ* (2Cr) *καὶ διερεθιϲμοῦ καὶ βριμώϲεωϲ* (Mo+Cr[23]) *καὶ δεινῆϲ* |²⁵ *ἐπιθυμίαϲ* (Mo‾+Cr) τοῦ *μετελθεῖν κἀγωνίαϲ* (Mo+Cr[24]), *εἰ δυνήϲεται* (Hd), καθάπερ *ἀποδείξουϲιν αἱ φωναὶ* (Cr+Tr) τοτὲ μὲν *εὐχομένων* (‾Cr+ ‾Tr) περιζώ|³⁰*ϲαϲθαι τοῖϲ ἐντέροιϲ* (Mo+Cr) *τοῦ λυπήϲαντοϲ* (Cr+Tr), τοτὲ δ᾽ "*ὠμὰ δάϲαϲθαι*" (quotation). εἶτ᾽ ἐπὶ *τὰϲ διαδιδομέναϲ* (Cr ‾+ ‾Tr) τῶι *ϲώματι κινήϲειϲ ἀϲταθεῖϲ* (Mo+Cr), οἷον λέ|³⁵*γω τὴν ὑπὸ τῆϲ κραυγῆϲ διάϲταϲιν* (Hd) *τοῦ πλεύμονοϲ* (2Tr) ϲὺν αὐταῖϲ *πλευραῖϲ, τὸ μετεωρότερον ἆϲθμα* (Cr ‾+Tr) τῶν *χίλια δεδρα*|⁴⁰*μηκότων ϲτάδια* (Cr+ ‾Tr) *καὶ τὴν πήδηϲιν τῆϲ καρδί*|¹*αϲ* (Mo+Cr).

Col. 18.14–40

πα|¹⁵*ρὰ χαλκοῦν ἐϲ[τιν ἀνυ]πέρβατοϲ* (Cr ‾+Cr), ἐπ[ειδὰν τὴν γῆν οὐρ]ανῶι *μιγνύωϲι* (2Tr[25]) παραπεμφθέντεϲ ὑπό τινοϲ *ἑϲτιῶντοϲ* (2Tr), ὥϲπερ |²⁰ ὁ Ϲοφοκλέουϲ *Ἀχιλλεύϲ* (2Tr), ἢ κατά τι τοιοῦτο (‾2Tr) παρολιγωρηθέντεϲ[26]· οὔπω γὰρ "*ἀδικηθέντεϲ*" *λέγω* (‾Mo+Cr). καὶ τῶν μὲν κυνῶν |²⁵ οἱ πρὸϲ τὰϲ θήραϲ, ἂν *οἰκουρὸϲ αὐτοὺϲ* (2Tr) ὑλακτῇ παριόνταϲ, *οὐκ ἐπιϲτρέφονται* (2Tr), τὸν δ᾽ Ἀλεξάνδρου φαϲὶ μηδ᾽ ὅταν ἄλ|³⁰*λο κινηθῇ θηρίον* (Mo+Cr) *ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν λέων* (Hd) – οἱ δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν *θεοὶ* (2Cr[27]) *μικροῦ καὶ ταῖϲ ὑϲὶν* (Mo+Cr) *ὀργίλωϲ διατίθενται* (Cr ‾+Tr). τί γὰρ δεῖ |³⁵ *τοὺϲ βαϲιλεῖϲ λέγειν* (Mo ‾+Cr); *ἐμποδίζονται* (Cr+Tr) δὲ καὶ πρὸϲ τὴν ἐν φιλοϲοφίαι *ϲυναύξηϲιν* (Cr+Tr), οἷϲ *μεταδιώκεται τοῦτο* (Cr+Tr), *διὰ πολλὰϲ* |⁴⁰ *αἰτίαϲ* (‾Mo+Cr).

Col. 31.10–24

πλὴν τ[οῦ] *καν[ονικοῦ] λογοῦ* (Cr ‾+Cr). τοὐναντίον δὲ πᾶϲ ἀντίδικοϲ, ὁ μὲν ἔξωθεν *καὶ διερεθίζων* (Cr ‾+Tr) παντοδαπῶϲ, γονεῖϲ δὲ |¹⁵ καὶ

---

23) With overlap, this and the preceding phrase would be καὶ διερεθιϲμοῦ (Cr ‾+Tr) καὶ βριμώϲεωϲ (*Mo+Cr).

24) With overlap, this and the preceding phrase would be τοῦ μετελθεῖν (2Tr) κἀγωνίαϲ (*Mo+Cr).

25) With overlap, this and the preceding phrase would be οὐρ]ανῶι (Mo+Cr) μιγνύωϲι (*2Tr).

26) Putting παρολιγωρηθέντεϲ into an emphatic position at the end seems to have been more important than writing a *clausula*.

27) If the -οι- is scanned long, then we have the equally rhythmic Mo+Cr.

πᾶς προϲήκων τὰ πολλὰ (2Tr[28]) καὶ ϲυνχαίροντεϲ ὡϲ ἐπάνδροιϲ (2Tr),
τῶν δὲ φιλοϲόφων (H d) οἱ μὲν φλυαροῦντεϲ (Cr+Tr) ἐν ταῖϲ παρα-
μυθίαιϲ (Mo +Cr), οἱ δὲ |[20] καὶ μετὰ ϲυνηγορίαϲ (Cr+ Tr) ἐπιρ-
ρωννύντεϲ· ἀφίημι μὲν ῥήτοραϲ (2Cr) καὶ ποιητὰϲ (2Tr) καὶ πᾶϲαν τὴν
τοιαύτην γρυμέαν (Epitrite![29]).

Out of 198 words in these passages, the diatribic columns have a total
of 103 words at least partially in rhythmic *clausulae* at some point in
the sentence and 95 words not in rhythmic *clausulae* (i. e. 52 percent
of the words in these passages are at least partially in *clausulae*). By
"at least partially in a *clausula*," I mean cases like Ϲοφοκλέουϲ in
ὁ Ϲοφοκλέουϲ Ἀχιλλεύϲ (2Tr), whose last syllable is part of the *clau-
sula*. Therefore, the word is counted here. These figures ignore two
words in a quotation, and would increase if Hutchinson's "overlap"
is taken into account. The most rhythmic column is the first one
(39 rhythmic words to 25 non-rythmic words), where Philodemus
wants to make an impression. The middle column is less rhythmic
(39 to 40), but the final one is more rhythmic (25 to 25) and includes
the deflationary final unrhythmic phrase. Throughout the passages,
most of the words outside *clausulae* are small function words, like
articles, prepositions, conjunctions, and particles. Most nouns and
verbs are included in *clausulae*.

Argumentative Columns:

Col. 1.5–27

.... οὐ]δ᾽ [ἀνα]ίνομαι τοῦτο (Cr+Tr). πᾶϲι γὰρ ὡϲ ἐκεῖνο φα[νερόν ἐϲτιν]
(Tr+Tr) ὅτι κα[κόν], οὕτω καὶ τοῦτο. διὰ μὲν δὴ τοιούτων (2Tr[30]), ὅτι
ληρῶδεϲ ἐϲτι (2Tr) τὸ ψέ|[10]γειν ἐγκεχείρηκεν (Cr+Tr), ἀδολέϲχωϲ δὲ
καὶ καθάπερ εἴωθεν (Tr+Tr[31]). εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐπετίμα τοῖϲ ψέγουϲι μόνον
(Cr+ Tr), ἄλλο |[15] δὲ μηδὲ ἓν ποιοῦϲιν ἢ βαιόν (Hd[32]), ὡϲ Βίων ἐν
τῶι Περὶ τῆϲ ὀργῆϲ καὶ Χρύϲιππος ἐν τῶι Πε[ρ]ὶ παθῶν Θεραπευ[τι]κῶι
(Mo +Cr), κἂν |[20] μετρίωϲ ἵϲτατο (2Cr). νῦν δὲ τὸ καθόλου (H d)
τὰ παρακολουθοῦντα κακὰ τιθέναι πρὸ ὀμμάτων καταγέλαϲτον εἶναι
(2Tr) |[25] καὶ ληρῶδεϲ ὑπολαμβάνων (Cr +Cr), αὐ[τόϲ ἐϲτι ληρώ]δηϲ
(Cr+Tr) καὶ κα[ταγέλαϲτοϲ … (Cr +Tr)

------

28) With overlap, this and the preceding phrase would be πᾶϲ προϲήκων (2Tr)
τὰ πολλὰ (*2Tr).

29) If the -οι- is scanned long, we have Mo+Cr which is better; see my dis-
cussion in § 6.

30) If the -οι- is scanned long, we have the non-rhythmic 2Sp.

31) If the -ει- is scanned long, we have the equally rhythmic Cr+Tr.

32) If the -αι- is scanned long, we have the equally rhythmic Cr+Tr.

Coll. 49.1–50.8

τῶι καὶ τοὺς χαρίεν[τας, φλ]υαροῦϲιν³³· εἰ δ' ἑαυτούς (2Tr), ἀτόπωϲ
περὶ ἐκείνου (⏑2Tr) φ[ανερὸ]ν ἐκ τούτων (⏑Cr+Tr) ϲυλλογίζεϲθαι
(Cr+Tr)· τῶι τε |⁵ παραπληϲίωι τρόπωι (Hd) πορευόμενόϲ τιϲ ἀποδείξει
(Cr ⏑+Tr) τὸ καὶ φιλοδοξήϲειν ἢ ἐραϲθήϲε[ϲθ]αι τὸ[ν ϲο]φὸν (Mo+Cr)
[καὶ μυ]ρίοι[ϲ ἄ]λλοιϲ (Cr+Tr) ϲυϲχεθήϲεϲθαι |¹⁰ πάθειν, εἴ[περ ἄλ-]
λο[ι (2Tr) κ]αὶ τῶν πάνυ χαριέντων ϲυνεχ[ῶϲ πό]νουϲ ἐ[χου]|¹³ϲιν
(2Tr?)…|¹⁹…θαι πρόχειρό[ν ἐϲτ]ι (2Tr), καὶ τὸ τὸν ϲο|²⁰φὸν προϲδεκτέον
εὐεμπτωτότερον ἐνίων ἀλογίϲτων εἰϲ τὰϲ ὀργὰϲ ὑπάρχειν (2Tr). καὶ τὸ
μὴ τῶν ἀφρόνων ἧττον τοῦτο πάϲχειν (2Tr), ἐπειδήπερ |²⁵ οὐχ ἧττον
αὐτῶν μεθύϲκεται (Hd³⁴), καθὸ λέγεται μεθύειν (⏑Cr+⏑Tr). ὁ δὲ τε-
λευταῖοϲ λόγοϲ ἀπέραντοϲ ἐϲτιν (2Tr) ἐκ τοῦ τὴν ὀργὴν χωρὶϲ ὑπολή-
ψεωϲ (⏑Hd) τοῦ |³⁰ βεβλάφθαι μὴ γίνεϲθαι καὶ τοῦ τὸν ϲοφὸν ἑκουϲίωϲ
βλάπτεϲθαι ϲυνάγων τὸ καὶ ὀργίζεϲθαι. καθάπερ γὰρ χωρὶϲ τοῦ γράμ-
ματα μαθεῖν (Tr+⏑Tr) οὐχ οἷ|³⁵όν τε γενέϲθαι ϲοφόν (M⏑o+Cr), ἀλλ'
οὐκ, εἰ γράμματά τιϲ ἔμαθεν (Mo ⏑+ Cr or ⏑Tr+⏑Tr), ἐποιϲθήϲεται
τὸ καὶ ϲοφὸν αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν, οὕτωϲ οὐδὲ |⁴⁰ τῶι προϲτηϲαμένωι τὸ ὑπο-
λήψειϲιν τοῦ βεβλάφθαι |¹ τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπακολουθεῖν (⏑Tr+Tr), ἄλλωϲ
δ' ἀδυνατεῖν (Tr+⏑Tr), τὸ πάντωϲ ὀργιϲθήϲεϲθαι τὸν ἔμφαϲιν (Hd)
εἰληφότα |⁵ βλάβηϲ (2Tr), ἂν μή τιϲ ἐπιδείξηι (⏑Tr+Tr) καὶ δραϲτικὸν
αἴτιον ὀργῆϲ εἶναι τὴν ὑπόληψιν τ[ῆ]ϲ [βλ]άβηϲ (⏑Mo+Cr).

In the argumentative passages, out of a total of 235 words, only
97 (42,3 %) are at least partially included in a *clausula* while 138
(58,7 %) are not. The last column, whose argument is denser than
the first column, is less rhythmic (62 rhythmic words : 93 non
rhythmic in coll. 49–50, as opposed to 35 : 45 in col. 1).³⁵ In the ar-
gumentative section generally, while meaning-bearing words like
nouns and verbs are typically included in rhythmic *clausulae*, they
are also more commonly found outside of them. Function words
are again typically not in *clausulae*.

---

33) If the comma is wrongly placed or the rhythm carries over it, we have
Cr+Tr here.

34) With overlap, this and the preceding phrase would be ἧττον αὐτῶν (2Tr)
μεθύϲκεται (*Hd).

35) Interestingly, there are many fewer possible cases of overlap in the argu-
mentative passages: I identified only one case in the argumentative part as opposed
to four cases in the diatribe (235 words to 198 words). This may be a sign that some
real phenomenon underlies overlap, even if the definition as Hutchinson stated it is
not accepted.

It is clear that the diatribe is more rhythmically dense, but this does not mean that the argumentative parts are unrhythmic. On the contrary, they too keep up a minimum standard (one lower than Hutchinson's), though Philodemus develops his sentences differently, partly because his choice of terminology is not free (i. e. he is bound by the technical terms of Epicurean philosophy and those used by his opponents) and partly because he has a more practical goal: writing convincing argumentation. Arguments must be couched in certain forms and use certain terms, and consequently, authors are limited in choice of phrases and terms, and cannot compose them as freely as they can in other genres.

§ 4 Discussion of the Conclusion of the De Morte

As mentioned above in § 2, Philodemus' *De Morte* is especially rhythmic, not only before heavy punctuation and commas, but even in words and phrases that do not end with punctuation. This high proportion of rhythmic endings correlates with other features of high style: the *De Morte* is written in ornamented prose, which includes balanced clauses, poetic vocabulary, and literary references. In other words, rhythm is one facet of this ornamented style, not a feature that appears independently. The whole text is very carefully and artistically written. This exercise demonstrates how rhythm can thoroughly permeate a sentence, even when there is no punctuation, and help articulate it. Further, the examination of a lengthy passage may shed some light on the choices that Philodemus made as he composed.

The last section of the *De Morte* (coll. 37.12–39.25) is not really argumentative; rather, it is exhortative. Readers should accept the state of affairs that Philodemus describes and be at peace with it, because death is unavoidable. There is no explicit opponent, and the topics are quite general in application: how "sensible people" (i. e. Epicureans) and non-Epicureans approach old age and fear of death. My observations are heavily indebted to Henry's notes. As above in § 3, the most of various papyrological sigla have been removed. We will proceed sentence by sentence through about three columns' worth of material.

37.12–18[36]

ϲυνελόντι δ' εἰπεῖν (2Tr) ἀνειρημένων τῶν μάλιϲτα λυπεῖν εἰϑιϲμένων (Mo+Cr[37]), οὐδὲν κατεπεί|[15]γει τὰϲ τῶν παντοδαπῶϲ ἀδημονούντων (2Tr) καὶ ῥιπταζομένων προφάϲειϲ ἐκπεριοδεύειν (Tr+ ̆ Tr[38]), εἰ καὶ κατὰ τὸ παραπίπτον (̄Tr+Tr) ἀξιοῦται λόγου (2Cr).

This sentence concludes the previous section of the treatise and introduces the miscellany that concludes the treatise. Both ἀδημονέω and ῥιπτάζω are used in the Hippocratic corpus, and some of that medical flavor may be present here: Epicureans often compared their philosophy with medical treatment. ἐκπεριοδεύω is rare, and served to emphasize the breadth (περι) and thoroughness (ἐκ) of his survey. κατὰ τὸ παραπίπτον strikes a lighter, more casual note.

37.18–27

τὸ τοίνυν ϲυναρπάζεϲϑαι θανάτου προϲπίπτον|[20]τοϲ, ὡϲ ἀπροϲδοκή-του τινὸϲ (2Cr) καὶ παραδόξου ϲυναντῶντοϲ (Cr+Tr), ἠλίϑιον μέν ἐϲτι (2Tr), γίνεται δὲ περὶ τοὺϲ πλείϲτουϲ (̄Cr+Tr), ἀγνοοῦνταϲ (2Tr) ὅτι πᾶϲ ἄνθρωποϲ, κἂν ἰϲχυρότεροϲ ἦι (Tr+ ̄Tr) τῶν Γιγάντων (2Tr), ἐφήμε|[25]ρόϲ ἐϲτι πρὸϲ ζωὴν (Cr+Tr?[39]) καὶ τελευτήν (2Tr), καὶ ἄδηλόν ἐϲτιν (2Tr) οὐ τὸ αὔριον μόνον (Hd[40]), ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ αὐτίκα δή· …

I have broken this extremely long sentence into two for easier treatment. There is a contrast in length with the shorter, more business-like sentence just before, but Philodemus continues the feel of that sentence by taking a little while to begin writing fully rhythmic prose. πᾶϲ ἄνθρωποϲ is unavoidably unrhythmic, but the lack of rhythm in ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ αὐτίκα δή at the end is truly surprising. Without the δή (and eliding τό), we would have 2Cr, so Philodemus must have wanted the shade of meaning that δή provides. The phrase also rhetorically caps the preceding τὸ αὔριον: "not only the next day, but actually the very next instant."

---

36) Henry's translation includes an "us" which is not in the Greek text, but is found in one of his parallels (De Mus. IV, col. 88.5: οὐδὲν ἡμᾶ[ϲ ἐπ]είγει). I wonder if we should insert it: οὐδὲν ⟨ἡμᾶϲ⟩ = 2Tr.

37) The preceding words have a notably trochaic rhythm, even though it is not clear where phrase breaks should fall: ἀνειρημένων τῶν (2Tr) μάλιϲτα but also τῶν μάλιϲτα (2Tr).

38) Assuming correption in -ευ-.

39) Assuming that πρ- does not make position at the beginning of a word. If it does, the phrase is not rhythmic.

40) Assuming that τό was elided in pronunciation.

The reference to the Giants is decorative and hyperbolic, but does not bear any argumentative weight. ἐφήμεροϲ is primarily a poetic word (though it appears eight times in Aristotle and occasionally in other prose authors). The combination of the mythological reference, the poetic word, and the rhythm approaches more closely to poetry than Philodemus usually does: the situation of humanity is elevated and made worthy of serious consideration, and this leads directly into the second half of the sentence.

37.27–38.3

πάντεϲ γὰρ ἀτείχιϲτον πόλιν (⏑Mo+Cr) πρὸϲ θάνατον οἰκοῦμεν (⏑Cr+Tr), καὶ πάντα γέμει ποιητικῶν αὐ|³⁰τοῦ (Cr+Tr) παρά τε τὴν φυ-ϲικὴν ϲύϲταϲιν (M⏑o+Cr), ἡμῶν οὕτωϲ ἀϲθενῶν ὄντων (Cr+Tr) καὶ τῆϲ ψυχῆϲ ἑτοιμοτάτουϲ πόρουϲ εἰϲ ἐκπνοὴν ἐχούϲηϲ (2Tr), καὶ τοῦ περιέχον-τοϲ (Cr⏑+Tr) ἅμα τῆι τύχηι διακρίϲεωϲ (Cr+⏑Tr⁴¹) ἡμῶν ἀ|³⁵μύϑητα γεννῶντοϲ (Cr+Tr) καὶ πολλάκιϲ ἅμα νοήματι (⏑Hd), καὶ πονηρίαϲ ἀνϑρώπων, καὶ ταῦτα καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτοὺϲ (2Tr), δυϲτόπαϲτα (2Tr) καὶ πάμ-πολλ᾽ ὅϲα προϲεπειϲφορούϲηϲ (2Tr), ὥϲτ᾽, εἰ μή τίϲ ἐϲτιν εὐτελέϲτατοϲ (Hd), ἄλογον ἡγεῖϲϑαι (⏑Cr+Tr) καὶ παράδοξον οὐ|ᵏ εἰ τελευτᾷ τιϲ (Cr+Tr), ἀλλ᾽ εἰ διαμένει (Tr+⏑Tr) πρὸϲ ποϲὸν χρόνον (Hd), τὸ δὲ καὶ μέχρι γήρωϲ (2Tr) καὶ τερατωδέϲτατον (M⏑o+Cr).

The sentence continues with a quotation of a striking slogan from either Epicurus or Metrodorus (Gnomologium Vaticanum 31), which Philodemus uses as an appeal to the authority of the Founders for belief that death can come at any minute. It serves to explain the end of the first half of the sentence, with its memorable, slightly hyperbolic statement. The rhythm of this statement is a bonus. The image of the unwalled city also continues the poetic feel of the previous two clauses. Philodemus continues with an extended gloss of the quotation, which is quite rhythmic except for the technical terms in τῆϲ ψυχῆϲ ἑτοιμοτάτουϲ πόρουϲ εἰϲ ἐκπνοὴν ἐχούϲηϲ, which nonetheless ends rhythmically. Philodemus probably sacrificed a little bit of style for precision here, and he was lucky that the technical language of the previous phrases allowed rhythms.

After that, the sentence becomes extremely rhythmic, which might have been felt suitable to the excited rhetoric and the climax. δυϲτόπαϲτοϲ is first in Euripides (twice), then Erasistratus (fr. 25 Garofalo); the word is rhythmic (2Tr), recherché, and perhaps a bit poetic. The paradox at the end of the sentence, that it is not

---

41) Assuming that -κρ- makes position word-internally.

surprising when people die, but rather when they live to old age, is reinforced by the concluding phrase καὶ τερατωδέϲτατον, which has an acceptable, but perhaps slightly irregular rhythm (M‾ o+Cr). That rhythm draws attention to the word and emphasizes the irregularity of actually surviving to old age, given that there are so many causes of death all around us at all times. The Mo+Cr rhythm also repeats the rhythms from the beginning of this part of the sentence, and may link the initial quotation more closely with the closing paradox: because, as regards death, we live in an unwalled city, it is absolutely miraculous when someone survives to old age.

> 38.3–14
> ἔνιοι δ' οὕτωϲ εἰϲὶν τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βί*ον παρῳκηκό*|⁵*τες* (2Cr[42]), οὐ χυ-
> δαῖοι μόνον[43], *ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν φιλοϲοφεῖν* (Tr+‾ Tr) *δὴ λεγομένων* (Tr+
> ‾ Tr[44]), ὥϲτε καὶ διατ⟨άτ⟩ονται *τοϲαῦτα μὲν ἔτη* (Tr+‾ Tr) *διατρίψειν*
> *Ἀθήνηϲιν* (Cr+Tr[45]) *φιλομαθοῦντες* (‾ Tr+Tr), *τοϲαῦτα δὲ τὴν Ἑλλάδα*
> *καὶ τῆς βαρβάρου* (‾ Mo+Cr)|¹⁰ *τὰ δυνατὰ θεωροῦντες* (‾ Cr+Tr),
> *τοϲαῦτα δὲ οἴκοι* (2Tr[46]) *διαλεγόμενοι* (‾ Tr+‾ Tr), *τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ μετὰ*
> *τῶν γνωρίμων* (‾ Cr+Cr)· *ἄφνω δ' ἄφαντον* (2Tr) *προϲέβα μακρὰϲ*
> *ἀφαιρούμενον* (2Cr) *ἐλπίδαϲ τὸ χρεών* (2Cr[47]).

The metaphor in παρῳκηκότεϲ "being foreigners" is striking, and it elegantly varies the metaphor of the unwalled city in the previous sentence: foreigners have a rather slippery and dangerous social position, comparable to the dangers faced by those without fortifications. The lack of rhythm in οὐ χυδαῖοι μόνον may reflect the meaning: unphilosophical people do not get described in artistic language, whereas those who are said to be philosophers (τῶν φιλοϲοφεῖν δὴ λεγομένων) are described in rhythmic prose. The δή adds an important note of hesitation: as becomes clear in

---

42) Further, τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον = Hd, if Hutchinson's "overlap" is accepted.

43) Without correption in -αι-, we have 2Cr, but see below in the main text. οὐ μόνον χυδαῖοι would have given 2Tr (but with a long diphthong before a vowel). Perhaps Philodemus wanted to avoid the permissible hiatus in χυδαῖοι, ἀλλὰ more than he wanted the *clausula*, or, as suggested in the main text, unphilosophical people get described in unrhythmic language.

44) Alternatively, φιλοϲοφεῖν δὴ λεγομένων could be taken as ‾ Mo+‾ Cr.

45) Note that the moveable *nu* might be 'making position' here.

46) This scansion assumes that the epsilon in δέ would be elided in pronunciation.

47) This scansion assumes that Philodemus does not use Attic correption.

the next sentence, these people have incorrect beliefs and should
probably not be counted as real philosophers. As Henry notes,
these two phrases seem to be a reworking of Epicurus' statement
at De Nat. XIV, col. 30.1–3 (29.18.1–3 Arrighetti), but Philodemus'
restatement is more concise and rhythmic than Epicurus' original:
οὐ μόνον τῶν χυδαίων τινὲς ἄνδρες πράττουϲιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν
προϲαγορευομένων φιλοϲόφων (Tr+ ‾ Tr).[48]

ὥϲτε διατάττονται would have been ‾ Cr+Tr (and we might
expect a *clausula* before the word before a μέν), but Philodemus is
willing to sacrifice the rhythm for the emphasis that καί provides.[49]
Then the tetracolon τοϲαῦτα μὲν ἔτη … τοϲαῦτα δέ … τοϲαῦτα
δέ … τὰ δὲ λοιπά emphasizes the length of time young men spend
travelling studying.

As Henry notes, the end of the passage is an adaptation of a
bit of lyric attributed to a tragedy (adespoton fr. 127 Sn.-K.), but
Philodemus has adapted it to Epicurean views by swapping in "ne-
cessity" for "Hades."[50] He retained the poetic word ἄφαντον, and
his word for necessity, τὸ χρεών, is also a poetic usage, but he drops
the otiose θνατῶν, which would have been visibly out of place in
Philodemus' *koinē*. The repeated double cretic *clausula* might signal
the end of the period.

38.14–25
ὁ δὲ νοῦν ἔχων, ἀπει|[15]ληφὼϲ ὃ δύναται (Tr+ ‾ Tr[51]) πᾶν περιποιῆϲαι
(Cr ‾ +Tr[52]) τὸ πρὸϲ εὐδαίμονα βίον αὔταρκεϲ (‾ Cr+Tr), εὐθὺϲ ἤδη τὸ
λοιπὸν ἐντεταφιαϲμένοϲ περιπατεῖ (Tr+ ‾ Tr) καὶ *τὴν μίαν ἡμέραν* (2Cr)
ὡϲ αἰῶνα κερδαίνει (Cr+Tr), παραιρουμένηϲ |[20] δὲ οὔτε ξενίζονθ'
(ἡγεῖται τὰ προϲπίπτοντ')[53] οὔθ ὡϲ ἐλλείπων τι *τοῦ κρατίϲτου βίου*
(2Cr) ϲυνακολουθεῖ (‾ Tr+Tr), προβὰϲ δὲ δὴ καὶ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ χρόνου
προϲθήκην ἀξιολόγωϲ (Tr+ ‾ Tr) ἀπολαβὼν ὡϲ παραδόξωι ϲυγκεκυρη-
κὼϲ εὐτυχίαι καὶ κατὰ |[25] *τοῦτο τοῖϲ πράγμαϲιν* (2Cr) *εὐχαριϲτεῖ* (2Tr).

---

48) I have left out the papyrological sigla in this line as well.
49) Bücheler's correction to the papyrus' διαττονται is certain. διάιττω seems
not to occur in the middle or be construed with an infinitive.
50) Henry takes μακρόϲ as "great," and that usage is poetic, but Prof. Schröder
compares Horace, Odes 1.4.15: *vitae summa brevis spem nos vetat inchoare longam*.
51) Depending on the treatment of the relative clause, this phrase may not
be admissible.
52) Assuming correption in -οι-.
53) Because of the relatively lengthy editorial insertion, I abstain from com-
menting on rhythm here.

Then the sensible man who has already reached ataraxia goes about "already buried," a paradox related to the ones that Philodemus uses in Ep. 3 Sider: ἐν μονοκλίνωι / … εὕδειν ἀθανάτως πουλὺν χρόνον … πετριδίωι (vv. 3–4) and ἐν μονοκλίνωι / … βιοῦν αἰεί … πετριδίωι (vv. 7–8), and see Erler's comments.[54] This man has all the Epicurean pleasure in one day that he would have in eternity – an idea summed up by αἰῶνα κερδαίνει, a rhythmic phrase before a comma, and a poetic way of summarizing the contents of KD 19, to which Henry compared it. The sensible man here forms a contrast with the lay-persons and those so-called philosophers that the previous sentence discussed.

The next part of the sentence is damaged by a lacuna, but the long stretch of relatively unrhythmic prose is interrupted in a noticeable way by a single *clausula*, which serves to emphasize the meaning of that adverb: the addition is received ἀξιολόγως ("in a remarkable manner," so Henry).[55] τὴν ἐκ τοῦ χρόνου προσθήκην could have been written τὴν *προσθήκην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ χρόνου* to provide Mo+Cr, and this fact may indicate that Philodemus wanted his readers' attention focused especially on ἀξιολόγως.[56] ὡς παραδόξωι συγκεκυρηκὼς εὐτυχίαι cannot be arranged rhythmically, so Philodemus does the next best thing and uses a slightly mannered word order that avoids even the acceptable hiatus that would have occurred in παραδόξωι εὐτυχίαι. The sentence goes on to end rhythmically, as we would expect: κατὰ τοῦτο ("accordingly") refers back in part to the notably rhythmic adverb earlier in the clause, and the pair of *clausulae* reestablish the readers' regular expectations for the rhythm after the long stretch of unrythmic prose.

38.25–39.1

πᾶς δ᾽ ὁ κηφηνώδης καὶ *γέρων γενόμενος* (Tr+ ͜ Tr) ἀνενθύμητος ἐστὶ *τοῦ θνητοῦ* (Cr+Tr) καὶ ἐπικήρου τῆς συστάσεως, καὶ πιθανὸν οἴεται *λέγειν* (͜ Hd[57]) τὸν φάσκοντα *παράδοξον* (Cr ͜ +Tr) |³⁰ εἶναι γέροντα

_____

54) M. Erler, Leben wie im Leichentuch. Anmerkung zu Phld. De morte col. 38, 16 Henry, CErc 41 (2011) 139–42.

55) The following phrase, ἀπολαβὼν ὡς, appears rhythmic (͜ Tr+Tr), but I suspect there was a pause before ὡς, which would prevent the words from being pronounced together.

56) This depends on the exact treatment of article-noun-article-modifier phrases; see below n. 65.

57) If -οι- is scanned long, we have the equally rhythmic Hd.

κυβερνήτην ἰδεῖν (ˉˉˉ Mo+Cr) *καὶ τύραννον* (2Tr), οὐχ ἡγεῖται δὲ καὶ τὸ κοινῶϲ ἄνϑρωπον, ἀλλὰ καὶ λοιμικῶν κατεχόντων αὐτὸν ⟨τὸν ϑάνατον⟩ οὐ προϲδοκᾶι,[58] *μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀδιάληπτον φορὰν* (ˉˉˉ Cr+Cr) *οὐδὲ τὴν ἀϑαναϲίαν ἀπελπίζει* (Cr+Tr), *καϑάπερ ἐϲτὶ* (ˉˉˉ Tr+Tr) *δῆ|[35]λος ἄρτι* (2Tr) *κυπαρίττουϲ φυτεύων* (2Tr[59]) *καὶ περὶ δύο χαλκῶν ἀπαγχόμενος* (Cr+ ˉˉ Tr) *καὶ ϑεμέλια* (Tr+ ˉ Tr) *καταβαλλόμενοϲ οἰκήϲεων* (ˉˉˉ Cr+Cr) *οὐδ᾽ εἰϲ χιλιοϲτὸν ἔτοϲ* (Cr+ ˉ Tr) *ἐπιτ[ε]λεϲϑῆναι|[1] δυνηϲομένων* (Cr+ ˉ Tr).[60]

Now the drone-like man comes to contrast with the Epicurean wise man of the previous sentence. The statement that every "drone-like" man is "unmindful" of his mortality may recall Plato, Resp. 554b, but it is followed by a particularly Epicurean note in "and of his constitution that is liable to death." No arrangement of the words ἐπικήρου τὴϲ ϲυϲτάϲεωϲ results in an acceptable rhythm. ἡ ϲύϲταϲιϲ is an Epicurean technical term, and I suspect that ἐπίκηροϲ is as well, or at least the *vox propria* for the concept in question; both words were probably unavoidable.[61]

In the middle, the passage is disfigured by a corruption. The phrase τὸ κοινῶϲ ἄνϑρωπον cannot be arranged rhythmically, but Philodemus might have preferred to match form to content here rather than find synonyms or a different way of phrasing it.

As we reach the end, each phrase describing the delusional acts of an old, confused man on the brink of death is rhythmically articulated and distinct. We might print more commas, but the rhythm obviates any need to do so. Again, a repeated *clausula*, in this case Cr+ ˉˉ Tr, concludes the sentence.

---

58) Again, the corruption prevents certainty about the rhythm of the passage. Henry's text, ϑάνατον οὐ προϲδοκᾶι, yields ˉˉˉ Cr+Cr, but λοιμικῶν κατεχόντων αὐτόν is not rhythmic, and we might therefore suspect that the corruption extends further.

59) With a 'generous' scansion of -ευ- as long before a vowel; otherwise, the phrase is not rhythmic.

60) περὶ δύο χαλκῶν yields ˉˉ 2Tr, but its last syllable is already included in another *clausula*. If Hutchinson's "overlap" is accepted, the passage becomes slightly more rhythmic than shown here.

61) ἐπίκηροϲ appears only here in a genuinely Epicurean author, but it is also found at [Plato] Ax. 367b2, a text which has Epicurean affinities.

39.1–6
καίτοι τὰ πάθη ταῦτα διαφέρειν (H‒D) οὐκ ἄν τις εἴπειε (Cr+Tr)
τοῦ νομίζειν (2Tr) ὑάλινα καὶ κεραμεᾶ σκεύη (‒Hd[62]) ϲυγκρούοντα
(2Tr[63]) παμπόλλουϲ χρόνουϲ |⁵ ἀδαμαντίνοιϲ ἀκάτακτα διαμενεῖν[64]
(H‒d).

This shorter sentence breaks up the run of quite long sentences,
and perhaps it is to be read as an aside or at least a change of pace
from the rest of the section. Henry compares Seneca (Marc. 11.3)
for the image of humans as breakable vessels, and one might suspect
a shared source in an earlier philosopher or poet. If Philodemus
is closely following another author, that could explain this longer
stretch of unrhythmic language. It is worth noting that the sim-
ple transposition ἀδαμαντίνοιϲ παμπόλλουϲ χρόνουϲ would have
yielded Mo+Cr, which is evidence in favor of a paraphrase. But
the composition of the whole sentence is more relaxed as well: at
the beginning, ταῦτα τὰ πάθη, οὐ διαφέρειν, and πάθη διαφέρειν
would all yield Tr+‒Tr, so it is possible that Philodemus is inten-
tionally being casual in this sentence.

39.6–15
ἀλλ' ἐοίκαϲι (Cr+Tr) διὰ τὸ φιλόζωον (‒Cr+Tr) ἐκ τοῦ πεφρικέναι
τὸν θάνατον, οὐ διὰ τὸ βιοῦν ἡδέωϲ (‒Cr+Cr), καὶ τὰϲ ἐπιβολὰϲ
(Tr+‒Tr[65]) τὰϲ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐξωθεῖν (Cr+Tr), εἶθ' ὅταν ἐναργ|¹⁰ηϲ αὐτοῦ
γένηται θεωρία (Hd), παράδοξοϲ αὐτοῖϲ (2Tr) ὑποπίπτει, παρ' ἣν
αἰτίαν[66] οὐδὲ διαθήκαϲ (‒Tr+Tr) ὑπομένοντεϲ γράφεϲθαι (2Tr) περι-
κατάληπτοι (‒Tr+Tr) γίνονται καὶ διξυμφορεῖν (Mo+Cr) ἀναγκάζον-
ται κατὰ Δη|¹⁵μόκριτον (M‒o+Cr[67]).

Philodemus continues his discussion of the plight of normal,
non-philosophical people. The articular infinitive phrases at the
beginning are all clearly marked out rhythmically, and this leads

---

62) This scansion assumes the -ευ- is short. If it is taken to be long, then we
have ‒Cr+Tr.
63) Assuming that -ου- counts as short. If it is long, we have the unrhythmic
2Mo.
64) Henry prints διαμένειν.
65) Given that we do not know the real pronunciation of phrases of the type
article-noun-article-modifier, it may be illegitimate to find a rhythm here. But a
slight pause in pronunciation after the first half is plausible.
66) If the comma before παρ' is eliminated, we would have 2Cr here. ὑποπί-
πτω seems to have been the mot juste for what Philodemus wanted to express.
67) This scansion assumes that Philodemus does not use Attic correption.

into well-articulated prose which is easier to follow if one pauses
for an instant after each *clausula*. The arrangement ὑποπίπτει παρά-
δοξος αὐτοῖς would have yielded 2Tr, but Philodemus may have
been more interested in emphasizing παράδοξος by placing it at the
front of its clause, or he wanted to avoid the acceptable hiatus in
θεωρία, ὑποπίπτει (normally, the punctuation would obviate it, but
Philodemus is being especially strict in this treatise).

   The quotation or paraphrase of Democritus at 39.13–5 is
purely ornamental and has no doctrinal significance; that is, it serves
to flatter the audience's literary education, rather than serving as
support for an Epicurean argument. It is worth noting that διξυμφο-
ρέω ("to bear a double share of misfortune," so Henry) is a *hapax*,
and that this rare, marked word stands in notable contrast with
the quotidian image of writing wills. (It is not quite clear what the
double share of misfortune really is: fear of death is one part, per-
haps the other is anxiety over normal tasks like writing wills? Or a
very intense fear of death is twice as bad as a normal fear of death?
Or fear of death combined with uncertainty regarding what will
become of one's possessions?) The repeated molossus-cretic pattern
may help round off the end of the long sentence.

> 39.15–25
> οἱ δὲ φρενήρεις (2Tr[68]), κἂν διά τινος αἰτίας ἀναγκαίας (Hd[69]) ἀνεννό-
> ητοι γένωνται (2Tr) τοῦ τάχ᾽ ἤδη (2Tr) cυγκυρήcειν (2Tr) τὴν τοῦ βίου
> παραγραφήν (Hd), ὅταν ἐν ὄμματι γένηται (Cr +Tr), περιοδεύcαντες
> ἀρρή|²⁰τωc (Cr+Tr) τοῖc ἀγνοοῦcιν (2Tr) ὀξύτατα καὶ τὸ πάντων (2Tr)
> ἀπολελαυκέναι (⌣Hd) καὶ τὸ τελέαν αὐτοὺc (⌣Cr+Tr) ἐπιλαμβάνειν
> ἀναιcθηcίαν (2Cr), οὕτωc ἀκαταπλήκτωc ἐκπνέουcιν (2Tr) ὡc εἰ μηδὲ
> τὸν ἐλάχιcτον χρό|²⁵νον (⌣Cr+Cr) ἐκλείπουcαν ἔcχον (2Tr) τὴν ἐπι-
> βολήν (Tr+⌣Tr).

Though the sentence is not obviously poetic or in a high style,
it shows evidence of careful composition. We have seen Philode-
mus write shorter rhythmic phrases in this kind of density in other
places.[70] Here, he uses fewer of these and rather longer phrases, so

---

the effect is more expansive, relaxed prose, though the rhythms still help give shape and movement to the sentence. Note that the final seven words are in rhythmic phrases, and that the sentence even begins with one. As Armstrong notes, the mention of the παραγραφή is a nice pun: it is at once the close of the paragraph and treatise, the mark used to indicate that end, and the end of the life of the man under discussion.[71]

A few conclusions: the rhythm and other stylistic features produce a mannered, carefully composed prose. Rhythm is primarily an adornment, but it can also help readers navigate long sentences (which Philodemus likes quite a bit) and even call attention to certain words or ideas by contrasting their rhythms with surrounding unrhythmic prose or by repeating a rhythm that he used recently. It is possible that Philodemus, when he can, marks sentence ends with repeated rhythms of the same type.

This passage of the *De Morte* contains a few certain and possible references to earlier literature; these are all primarily ornamental and do not support an argument. Usher notes that prose authors in the Classical period could borrow some of the prestige and authority from poets by borrowing "the impressive rhythms used by the great poets."[72] Even though Philodemus did not grant poetry that kind of importance, he may well have continued the habit of writing poetically-inflected prose at stylistic or argumentative high points or, as Jan Heßler suggests to me, in passages that were meant to be memorized (or at least memorable).

Unrhythmic passages can be explained as intentional, to provide contrast with rhythmically emphasized words, or as being forced by vocabulary or usage. Vocabulary is sometimes metrically

---

his particles and grammatical constructions; I quote for example Romulus 9.3: ἐδέ-χοντο πάντας (2Tr), οὔτε δεσπόταις δοῦλον (Cr+Tr) οὔτε ϑῆτα χρήσταις (2Tr) οὔτ᾽ ἄρχουσιν ἀνδροφόνον (Cr+ Tr) ἐκδιδόντες (2Tr). Here, the repeated οὔτε clearly articulates the sentence into short phrases, and this is reinforced by the rhythm. Note that every word in the sentence, save the repeated οὔτε, is at least partly involved in a *clausula*. Philodemus is a bit more relaxed in comparison, though still highly rhythmic.

71) See D. Armstrong, All Things to All Men: Philodemus' Model of Therapy and the Audience of *De Morte*, in: J. T. Fitzgerald / D. Obbink / G. S. Holland (edd.), Philodemus and the New Testament World (Leiden 2004) 15–54, at 51–2.

72) Usher (n. 4) 82–3.

intractable, especially when Philodemus uses technical terms, and I have identified one place above where he uses a particle at the expense of rhythm. The passages examined here and those collected in § 6 lead me to believe that, for Philodemus, avoiding even acceptable hiatus is more important than writing *clausulae*. Two possible reasons for this occur to me, that avoidance of hiatus was more important because it had been established longer and more firmly as a stylistic practice, or that hiatus was more noticeable than an unrhythmic sentence end and so more easily censured by critics.

This longer passage can be profitably compared with the end of De Ira, coll. 49.1–50.8 (printed and discussed in § 3). Both passages come from the ends of their works, and we might expect Philodemus' style and practices to be similar in both cases. But this is not the case: the *De Ira* ends with full-blown philosophical argumentation against opponents whose identities were probably known to Philodemus' readers. That ending contrasts with *De Morte*'s diatribe-esque description of a generalized picture of the life of many non-Epicureans, which is designed to convince them to take up Epicureanism as a practice. In the *De Ira*, the *clausulae* are less dense, and this correlates with a much lower degree of ornamentation: there are no ornamental references to or reworkings of poetry, his sentences, while still stylish to a certain degree (e. g. he still avoids hiatus), are not as carefully worked out as they are in the *De Morte*.

§ 5 *Reflections*

Not all rhythmic texts were intended to be read aloud to large, public audiences, and so we cannot conclude anything from Philodemus' practice about circumstances of publication or performance – rhythm is not evidence for or against these treatises' being lecture scripts, though I doubt that they were. At the least, his texts could have sustained being read out before a cultured public without embarrassing their author. Musonius (80,05 %) is quite a rhythmic author by Hutchinson's standard, but Epictetus (66,75 %) is not; philosophical texts could run the gamut.

That Philodemus writes rhythmic prose is an important datum for editors. His habits can suggest solutions to editors and help

them choose between possible supplements, or support a choice among uncertain readings of the papyrus. I have noted a pair of cases in § 6 where the rhythm suggests emendations. Future editors of Philodemus will surely notice more.

Depending on what we believe about Philodemus' practice before commas and in a given treatise, we may learn useful and interesting things about ancient punctuation and phrasing. A textual control on punctuation is useful, because interpuncts and marginal signs are particularly liable to being lost, if Philodemus himself even wrote them in the first place.

Lack of rhythm might also be an important indication of Philodemus' priorities: I have suggested that he abandons rhythm when he wants to use technical language or specific, correct terms and even when he wants the particular nuance that a particle provides. That is to say, content is priviledged above style, and Philodemus tries to say exactly what he means at the cost of rhythm. For Epicurus, clarity was the sole criterion of good writing, and Philodemus tries to follow him on this point. Similarly, he seems to have prioritized avoiding hiatus over writing rhythmically, and he sometimes seems to sacrifice rhythm to avoid even an acceptable hiatus.

The data from the *De Oeconomia* and *De Signis* indicate that when Philodemus paraphrased another author, he did not totally eliminate the features of that author's style, though he might smooth it out somewhat and rewrite or summarize it in his own style. As the texts indicate (to the extent that the data are reliable), Metrodorus of Lampsacus and Demetrius (Laco?) are less rhythmic than Philodemus, Dionysius of Cyrene is more. Passages of text whose rhythms are distinct from the rest of the treatise can come under suspicion of being paraphrases of other authors. For instance, we should expect Phildemus' *De Dis* III to have a distinct rhythmic practice because he follows Hermarchus so closely in much of the treatise.

I wonder if we should consider a figure of 70 % to be the baseline for Philodemus' practice. This is somewhat below the number for the *De Ira*'s argumentative sections and in the upper range of the figures for the *De Rhet.* I, and it is somewhat lower than Hutchinson's figure. But it probably does indicate an effort to be rhythmic, since it is well above the predicted figure for randomly

occurring rhythmic *clausulae* at sentence ends.[73] I suggest that, gen-
erally, Philodemus will not have been l e s s rhythmic than 70 %.
Conversely, when he has good reason to, he will be much more
rhythmic. Even if we choose not to consider a rate of 70 % to be
rhythmic, at least it gives editors a reasonably firm foothold. If a
treatise by Philodemus is about 70 % rhythmic, it is stylistically
unmarked. If it departs noticeably in either direction, it is marked,
and a reason should be sought, either in terms of audience (as I have
been suggesting throughout this paper), compositional technique
(i. e. is Philodemus paraphrasing?), or possibly chronology, not to
mention the general stylistic demands of a passage or genre. That is,
70 % indicates Philodemus' basic prose style, which is correct, well-
suited for philosophical argument, flexible, and mostly uncompli-
cated by frippery or rhetorical effects. It is even somewhat artful.
He uses this style for writing clear arguments without ostentation
in treatises which he does not expect to reach a wide public. He
will write more carefully and stylishly in certain passages (e. g. the
diatribe in the *De Ira*) or treatises that call for it (e. g. the *De Morte*,
the *De Oec.*), either because of the demands of the passage or the
audience of the treatise.

These data serve to show that Philodemus, on the whole, is a
rhythmic author, or at least could be when he wanted to be. The less
rhythmic character of the *De Ira* may be a sign that he intended a
smaller audience. Its content is potentially of broad interest, but the
actual argumentation is quite narrowly directly primarily against
a few figures – heterodox Epicureans – who might not have been
widely known or of much interest outside the school. It is quite
noteworthy that the diatribe (coll. 8–31.24) is written in a higher
style than the other parts of the treatise. Its rhythmic character
matches its heightened rhetoric and intensity, and it is important
that diatribes were intended to be delivered for effect. This model
diatribe must convincingly mimic the characteristics of real ones.
As we saw, some philosophical lectures could be quite rhythmic,
as Musonius Rufus' practice (quoted above) shows. Other aspects
of the style of this diatribe bear out that suspicion: Philodemus'

---

73) The p-value of 70 % rhythmic sentence ends is 0,004781 (using Hutchin-
son's control group numbers and formula), or about a 0,5 % chance (1 in 209,2 odds)
of happening randomly.

prose is more artistic here than elsewhere in the treatise: more references to literature, a greater variety and intensity in the imagery, and more emotional language. Of course, in his arguments, he was more tightly constrained by technical terminology and the demands of the argument.

As for the *De Rhetorica* I, I suspect that an increase in material might change the overall impression and that this book was not written as unrhythmically as it appears: the book is quite fragmentary and many of the *clausulae* are at least partially restored. It is true that the rhetorically heightened conclusion does not show any increased attention to rhythm, which may mean that Philodemus did not have any real concern with rhythm in this treatise. It is hard to see a reason for this, except that both this book and the *De Ira* focus on polemics against other Epicureans. Perhaps less stylistic polish was felt necessary for these works which were intended to be read inside the school rather than outside it? (For another possible explanation of the *De Rhet.* I's relative lack of rhythm, see below.)

Quite surprisingly, the *De Signis* should probably be counted as falling above Hutchinson's cut-off. The different sections show different rates, and there are a few possible explanations. One is that this result is purely accidental, since the sample sizes are small. The second is that Philodemus is paraphrasing the authors whom he reports and preserving their rhythmic practice in some instances. None the less, the high over-all rate suggests that Philodemus put a good deal of compositional effort into the text. Perhaps he wanted to leaven the rather dry, technical material with an attractive presentation. The fact that it is largely an attempt to defend school doctrine against Stoic attacks is relevant: Stoics would read it to rebut it, as would other philosophers who were interested in questions of epistemology, such as Academics. It could even concievably have found a broader audience among interested non-professional philosophers: Philodemus promises a discussion of medical epistemology in the next book, and perhaps he expected doctors to read the whole work. So, despite the technical nature of the arguments, the book might be expected to reach a wider audience of non-Epicureans, a wider one than those of the *De Ira* and *De Rhet.* I. Thus, Philodemus probably wanted a higher degree of stylistic polish. It is not an intramural treatise like the others, for private, Epicurean consumption, but a public work.

The thoroughly elevated style of the *De Morte* IV may possibly be due to the fact that we have, substantially, the peroration to the work, where the style might have risen a bit (though it seems not to in other works by Philodemus). One may reasonably doubt that books I–III, or even the first part of book IV, were so elevated. Unrhythmic phrases are very rare at sentence end in the work as we have it, and they are even rarer towards the end of the treatise. In addition to the fact that we have peroration, Philodemus may have had a different audience in mind for this treatise, one which demanded more polish. As noted above, the treatise is rhythmic even before commas, and as I showed in § 4, it is rhythmic even where editors do not punctuate, and more generally is at quite a high level of style. When he wanted to use a more ornamented style, more thoroughly rhythmic prose was one of the ornaments he could use alongside literary references, more careful arrangement of the parts of his sentences, and other rhetorical effects.

The *De Oec.* is similarly rhythmic, and this treatise too may have been destined for a broader audience. The mention of Romans (col. 25.28) and their household management habits suggests that they were a potential audience. The *De Oec.* and *De Morte* are about topics of great significance to many people (many w e a l t h y people in the case of the *De Oec.*), and this must have had an impact on their composition. The *De Morte* is written in a more attractive style than the *De Ira*, at least, and rhythm is a large part of that. Perhaps Philodemus intended for these works to reach a broad audience, and he hoped that one of philosophically interested lay-persons could be enticed to join and sponsor the school by an attractive (and doctrinally rigorous) presentation of school doctrine.

I have suggested that Philodemus varied his rhythmic practice on the basis of the audience expected for each treatise. Another possibility is worth consideration. The *De Signis* must date to near the end of Philodemus' life because of the reference to Antony and the dwarves.[74] This treatise, despite its topic, is quite rhythmic. Similarly

---

74) Cf. De Signis 2.15–18 De Lacy / De Lacy: … ἔτ[ι δ᾽ οὓ]ϲ ἐν Ἀκώρει πυγμαίουϲ δ[εικνύ]ουϲιν, ἀμέλει δ᾽ ἀνα[λ]όγο[υϲ τοῖϲ οὓϲ] Ἀντώνιοϲ νῦν ἐξ Ὑρία[ϲ ἐκο-]μίϲ[ατο. ("… and further the pygmies that they display in Acoris, just like those whom Antony just now brought back from Hyria"). On this passage, see J. Carruesco, Le nain d'Alexandrie (Philodème, De Signis, col. 2,4 ss.), in: A. Antoni /

the *De Morte* is very rhythmic, and commentators have felt a personal note in the discussion of dying far from one's homeland, as if Philodemus were an old man near to death and depressed because he no longer hoped to see Gadara again. I wonder if Philodemus wrote more rhythmically over time, and that the treatises he wrote near the end of his life were more rhythmic than those written as a young man. The *De Rhet.* I, if he wrote it as a young man, would not be very rhythmic. To test this hypothesis, we would need complete editions of the works whose dates can be reasonably suspected, namely the *Index Academicorum* (datable to the period 67–57), the *De Bono Rege*, dedicated to Piso and perhaps to be dated to his consulship (58), *Rhetoric* IV, dedicated to C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus and perhaps to be dated to the year of his consulship (43), and the *De Signis* from near the end of Philodemus' life (40 or later). If we think that the books of the *Rhetoric* were written in their final numerical order and that several years separate the beginning from the end of the composition, then we might expect to see an increasing proportion of *clausulae* in them.[75] (Of course, when writing the later books, Philodemus may have continued to use the style that he used for the earlier ones, and no change in his practice may be visible.) Because almost all of these datings are hypothetical, the result might end up being inconclusive, but the data would certainly be interesting and suggestive. The fact that we have a draft text of the *Index Academicorum* rather than the final version may also interfere with our findings.

In general, we see yet again that Philodemus is a careful and accomplished prose author who could control the stylistic level of his treatises. This result should not be surprising. Philodemus was, after all, a famous and accomplished (and anthologized) poet; it would be a surprise if his prose was carelessly written and slovenly. In fact, we already knew that it was not: he avoided hiatus, which already betrays a good deal of concern with style.[76] Yet the apparent contradiction – was the same man an elegant poet a n d

---

G. Arrighetti / M. Isabella Bertagna / D. Delattre (edd.), Miscellanea Papyrologica Herculanensia Vol. I (Pisa 2010) 133–6 and F. Longo Auricchio, I nani di Antonio: valore di una testimonianza, CErc 43 (2013) 209–13.

75) If we take the term ὑπομνηματικόν to refer to a draft edition or otherwise think that there are draft and final copies, perhaps the final editions were more stylistically polished.

76) See McOsker (n. 16) on hiatus in Philodemus.

a completely careless writer of prose? – puzzelled Preller (in his
encyclopedia article on Philodemus) and many others in his wake.[77]

In 2013, Gigante wrote about "il processo di debarbarizzazi-
one di Filodemo," which was the process of fully integrating Philo-
demus into the literary (and philosophical) history of the Greeks.
Despite its primary meaning for Gigante, the word 'debarbarizzazi-
one' almost inevitably calls to mind the questions of Philodemus'
prose style and even grammar, both of which were even in 2013
widely believed to have been terrible. There were of course several
causes of this; most important are the damage to the papyri and his
argumentative method, in which he summarizes opponents' views
in the beginnings of his books, then refutes them at length. But of
course the beginnings of the books are the most heavily damaged
parts, and scholars were left to try to read half of a running philo-
sophical argument. No wonder he was found obscure and difficult.
The condition of the papyri and the consequent difficulty of doing
the careful philological and papyrological work necessary to answer
basic questions, such as compiling a lexicon or accurately determin-
ing the size of lacunae are also obvious causes. These difficulties can
be avoided by considering Philodemus' style only where the text is
secure a n d where we understand the arguments. We cannot judge
the clarity of presentation and effectiveness of argument when we
cannot understand the debate.

But in the final account, even Gigante (23–4) rendered a nega-
tive judgment on Philodemus' style: "sconnesso, accumulato, strut-
turalmente duro, stringato … lo stile di Filodemo è una creazione
originale che abbiamo il dovere non di ammirare, ma di capire."
Gigante was right to attempt a process of 'debarbarizzazione' on
Philodemus. I hope that we now understand his style a bit better,
and can perhaps even admire it.

---

77) L. Preller, Philodemos, Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und
Künste, Dritte Sektion XXIII (1847), 345; see F. Longo Auricchio, Su alcune biografie
nuove e vecchie di Filodemo, in: U. Criscuolo / R. Maisano (edd.), Synodia: Studia
Humanitatis Antonio Garzya (Naples 1997) 581–93 and M. Gigante, Filodemo nella
storia della letteratura greca (Naples 1998) 9–25. As Gigante, 11–2, indicates, the more
positive evaluations of T. Gomperz, Review of S. Sudhaus, Philodemi Volumina Rhe-
torica, Philologische Wochenschriften 13 (1893) 40–2, and F. Bücheler, Antediluviani-
sches aus Philodemos, RhM 20 (1865) 311–314, reprinted in: Kleine Schriften (Leipzig
1915) I 531–4, did not have much impact on the subsequent history of scholarship.

§ 6 *Appendix of Problematic and Interesting Cases*

Here are collected a few instances from the treatises that I studied for this paper where the scansion of a particular phrase seemed either difficult or noteworthy in some way. In several cases, alternative analyses are possible, either because the scansion allows different identifications or because of uncertainties regarding the pronunciation. In a few cases of unrhythmic endings, I point out that a different word order would be rhythmic (or that a *clausula* is impossible with the words that he choose) or try to suggest a reason that Philodemus would have preferred an unrhythmic ending to a rhythmic one. Recurring possibilities for writing unrhythmically are the avoidance of even acceptable hiatus and a preference for certain word order patterns. Further, Philodemus is willing to use a moveable *nu* to get a *clausula.*

In these scansions, I use the signs ⌣ and ⌐ to indicate syllables whose length is questionable for some reason. The symbol on top reflects the scansion that obeys the rules that I laid out in § 2; the lower one is the alternative. I give the column and line numbers, the words in question followed by their punctuation in the edition of reference, then the scansion and notes.

De Ira

2.14–5 ὡς εἴρηκε· – – – – Perhaps the heavy rhythm was intended to emphasize the fact that the opponent made the claim, like pounding a fist on a table?

5.17 καὶ ταῖς ὀργαῖς. – – – – Hammerstaedt (n. 1) points out that unrhythmic *clausulae* often contain the key terms of the text. This may be due to a desire for emphasis or because the technical terms do not allow a rhythmic arrangement. In particular, in the *De Ira*, ἡ ὀργή is always going to be difficult. There are other possible instances in the *De Ira* at 16.18–19, 42.11–2, 37.39, and 49.33.

6.25–6 καὶ δύνατ' ἀποφεύγειν. – ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ – – As written, this is not rhythmic, but by emending to καὶ δύνατ' ἀποφυγεῖν, we get – ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ – = ⌣ Cr+ ⌣ Tr.

10.25–6 ἐνκύκλιον 〚[τ]οις〛 cυμπτώμαcιν. – ⌐ ⌣ – – – ⌣ – If the scribe was mistaken in deleting τοῖς, we would have M ⌐ o+Cr.

16.37 ⟨ὧ⟩δέ τιϲ εἴρ[ηκεν) – ⌣ ⌣ – – – A different restoration could repair the rhythm, e. g. ⟨τοῦτο⟩ δέ … = ‾Cr+Tr. Alternatively, like in 2.14–5 above, perhaps the heavier rhythm is intended to emphasize the fact that the opponent's declared view is at issue, or the phrase is simply too short and businesslike to matter.

19.20–21 ὑπομένει προϲαγωγάϲ) ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ – ⌣ ⌣ – – The whole clause is οὐδὲ τὰϲ τῶν ἠπιωτάτων φαρμάκων ὑπομένει προϲαγωγάϲ, which involves two of Philodemus' favorite word orders: an article + noun pair enclosing another article + noun pair (usually a genitive or prepositional phrase) and the sequence article-adjective-verb-noun. He could possibly have switched the words around: οὐδὲ τὰϲ προϲαγωγὰϲ ὑπομείνει τῶν ἠπιωτάτων φαρμάκων ends in 2Cr, but perhaps he did not want to separate the genitive phrase from its governing phrase.

19.26–7 ϲυζητήϲεωϲ μετέχειν ἀγαθοῦ· – – – ⌣ – ⌣ ⌣ – ⌣ ⌣ – Col. 19 has an odd concentration of dactylic endings, and Philodemus may be using them intentionally for some reason. Here, the simple rearrangement ἀγαθοῦ ϲυζητήϲεωϲ would give Mo+Cr. This phrase has a similar order to that of 19.20–21, see above.

21.33–4 ὡϲ κύων τετοκυῖα· – ⌣ – ⌣ ⌣ ⌣̱ – If the diphthong is scanned long, it would be nearly a paroemiac – suitable given that the phrase appears to be a proverb.

24.36 διαφθειρ[ό]ντων. ⌣ – – – – Perhaps the emphatic word required an arresting rhythm.

31.23–4 τὴν τοιαύτην γρυμέαν. – ⌣̱ – – – ⌣ – An epitrite. It is difficult to decide how to understand what this means. Given their position as the last words of the diatribe part of the *De Ira*, one expects a rhythmic close. I see three possibilities: the situation argues for greater flexibility in scansion of diphthongs before other vowels, the bad rhythm was intended to match the word γρυμέα, or Philodemus wanted to bring the style down as he made the transition back to the argumentative part. Another case of a bad rhythm with a short diphthong is 25.14–5 ἀϲυμπερίφορον δικαιοῦντοϲ. ⌣ – ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ – – ⌣ ⌣̱ – – = two dactyls, but Cr+Tr with a long diphthong. Here too the sentence end suggests that more flexibility was available to Philodemus. There may be relevant details of Greek pronunciation that we do not know.

44.17–8 ἠδ[ύ] τι προϲφέρεται) – ◡ ◡̄ – ◡ ◡ – Rearranging to οὐδὲ γὰρ προϲφέρεϑ᾽ ἡδύ τι gives an acceptable rhythm (Mo⁻+Cr), but the rhythm may be less important than avoiding the elision.

45.36–7 φυϲικόϲ ἐϲτιν ὁ ϑυμόϲ· ◡ ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – An unforced error: φυϲικὸϲ ὁ ϑυμόϲ ἐϲτιν = 2Tr. A possible case of the rhythm or word order emphasizing a key word, and one where the use of technical terms did not force Philodemus to write an unrhythmic *clausula*.

46.22 αὐτὸν ὀργιϲϑήϲεται· – ◡ – – – ◡ – Perhaps read αὐτῶν (McO), for Mol+Cr?

47.29 τούτοι[ϲ ἐ]ξίϲτατ(αι). – – – – ◡ – Mo+Cr. The scribe wrote an elision at the end of the verb, but because of the punctuation, I have eliminated it and scanned the word as if it were unelided.

De Morte IV

8.5 ὀχλήϲεω[ϲ] ἀνυπερβ[λήτου. – – ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – Switching the order of these two words would produce an acceptable hiatus and either Mo+Cr or 2Cr, depending on the pronunciation of -ου before a vowel, but Philodemus seems to have preferred to avoid even acceptable hiatus.

16.6 καὶ μ[ή γε] ἐκ δοξῶν, – – – – – Note the elision γ᾽ ἐκ; without it, we would have Cr+Tr.

21.10 ἔϲτα[ι π]ερὶ ἡμᾶς, – – ◡ – ◡ – – It seems that the iota of περί is never elided; otherwise, we could have 2Tr. There is another case where elided περί would give a *clausula* at De Signis 31.35–6.

22.12–3 διατηρεῖϲϑαι τὼ[νό]μ⟨ατ⟩α, ◡ ◡ – – – – ◡ ◡ – With hiatus instead of crasis, it would be – ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ – (H⁻ d).

24.10 ἤ τιϲιν τέκνοιϲ. – ◡ – ◡̄ – Cr+Tr, but without the moveable *nu*, the rhythm would probably be the unacceptable two dactyls, or else Tr+⁻Tr.

24.31 ο[ὐδ]ὲν ὄ[φε]λος [ἐ]ποίϲει. – ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ – – ⁻Tr+Tr, but ⁻Cr⁻+Tr is also possible.

25.30 ἧττον ἑα[υ]τοῦ· – ◡ ◡ – – With the pronunciation αὐτοῦ, this phrase would yield 2Tr.

30.14–5 ἐπιφανείας ἐϲομένης, ◡◡◡◡̆–◡◡◡– ˉCr+ˉCr or Tr+ˉTr or ˉMo+ˉCr, depending on details of pronunciation and when one feels that the *clausula* begins.

31.10–1 ἀφανίζειν κελευόντων. ◡◡–––◡◡̆–– Perhaps bracketing the phrase with the genitive absolute πολλῶν … κελευόντων was more important than the rhythm? He could have written, e. g., πολλῶν καὶ διὰ φθόνον τούτου κελευόντων ἀφανίζειν τὰς οὐϲίας and thus both avoided hiatus and created ˉMo+Cr for the *clausula*.

32.36 τοῦτο γὰρ ὑγρόν, –◡◡◡̄– γρ allows Attic correption, but not very often; if it is accepted here, we have Tr+ˉTr.

34.8–9 κοινότητας παρέχουϲιν. –◡––◡◡–– Switching the order of these two words would give 2 Tr.

34.28–9 γενήϲ[ε]τ' αὐτῶν. ◡–◡–– 2 Tr. But note that γενήϲεταῖ αὐτῶν = 2 Da; γενήϲεταῖ αὐτῶν = Cr+Tr. This is evidence that Philodemus elided short -αι in verb endings rather than allowed it to stand in hiatus with correption.

35.23–4 καὶ περὶ ἑα[υ]τούς, –◡◡◡–– Crˉ+Tr. Note that here, the spelling αὐτοῦ would yield 2 Da, but cf. 25.30 above.

35.38–9 ἐϲχηκυίας ἐπιγέ[νη]μ' ἐϲτί[ν· ––◡̆–◡◡◡––– ˉCr+Tr. But note that ἐπιγένημα ἐϲτίν (with hiatus) = 2 Tr.

36.16 ἀπέλαυέν τιϲ ἀγαθοῖϲ. ◡◡̆–◡◡◡– ˉCr+ˉCr or Tr+ˉTr. Though the scansion of this phrase is not exactly clear, it seems that the moveable *nu* makes position to provide a long syllable in the midst of all the shorts.

37.1 ἄ]πολιν καὶ ἄϲημον, ◡◡–––– This scansion assumes κἄϲημον. If we read καὶ ἄϲημον with correption, we get two dactyls. It would not be a surprise if Philodemus felt that spondees were preferable to dactyls, since dactyls are more obviously poetic.

37.27 ἀλλὰ καὶ [τ]ὸ [αὐ]τίκα δή· –◡––◡◡– This scansion assumes τ'αὐτίκα or ταὐτίκα; without elision, we would have Cr+ˉTr.

De Signis

1.32–3 ἴϲην ἔχει τῶι ἐμβαδῶι. ––◡–×–◡– There are three possibilities: hiatus without correption, which yields a long epitrite,

hiatus with correption, which yields Hd, and aphaeresis or syni-
zesis (τὠμ-), which yields 2Cr. I think the last should be preferred.

13.1 ἔχειν τὸ ἀναγκαστικόν. ∪ – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ – (reading τὸ ἀν-,
with hiatus) M‾ o+Cr, or 2Cr with elision, or with synizesis (τἀ-
ναγκ-) = Mo+Cr.

14.38–9 τῶν ἄλλων οὐ[δὲ] ἕν. – – – – ∪ – Mo+Cr. οὐδὲ ἕν is
three syllables in metrical authors, and has the benefit of emphasis
over οὐδέν. I have taken it as three syllables in Philodemus too, cf.
McOsker (n. 16) 147 n. 13.

15.27–28 μάχε]cθαι τῆ[ι ἐ]ναργείαι. ∪ – – – ∪ – ∪̲ – Hd, or
Cr+Tr with a long diphthong before a vowel, or Mo+Cr, with
τῆι᾽ναργείαι.

22.16–7 τ]ῶ[ι θ]εῶι [ζ]ῶιά ἐcτιν. – ∪ – – – – Spondees with eli-
sion, but 2Tr if hiatus is allowed. There is an identical case at 27.27–8.

22.28 τούτωι [καὶ ἀθ]ά[νατον. – – – ∪ ∪ – The initial scan-
sion assumes κἀθ-, but with hiatus and correption, we would have
– – ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ – (H‾ d).

De Oec.

7.46 τ]οίνυν [ἃ] προέθηκ[ε]ν· – ∪̲ ∪ ∪ ∪ – – ‾ Tr+Tr. The upsi-
lon in τοίνυν is usually short, and so I have scanned it here. If it is
long, we have Cr‾ +Tr.

9.25–6 ἢ ὑπ᾽ [ἄλ]λων ἠγμένους; ∪̲ ∪ – – – – ∪ – If ἤ is correpted,
then we have ‾ Mo+Cr. But if it is not, then the phrase is not rhythmic.

11.29–30 ἐν ἐπιτροπευ[ομένηι· ∪ ∪ ‾ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ – Given the uncer-
tainties about pronunciation, there are several possibilities: H‾ d,
‾ H‾ d, Cr+ ‾ Tr, and ‾ Cr+ ‾ Tr.

13.2–3 παρενοχλοῦcα φροντίc· ∪ ∪ ‾ – ‾ – – If we allow Attic
correption word-initially, we have 2Tr. Otherwise, the phrase is
spondaic.

17.45–6 δέον[τ]οc ἤ[τ]τω εἶναι· ∪ – ∪ – ∪̲ – – This is rhythmic
if there is hiatus and correption; otherwise it is not.

Köln   Michael McOsker