

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## On the Fragments of Euripides

T. G. Tucker

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 07 / October 2009, pp 350 - 352

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030948, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00030948](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030948)

### How to cite this article:

T. G. Tucker (2009). On the Fragments of Euripides. The Classical Review, 15, pp 350-352  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030948

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

Legend, and to give the house of Theseus its definite place at Troy, in the same way as he justified the mention of Asteropaeus in the later books of the Iliad by inserting his name among the leaders of the Paenonians.

The difference about the Aenianes may be met by altering Γουνεύς δ' ἐκ Κύφου ἦγε δύο καὶ εἴκοσι νῆας into Γουνεύς δ' ἐκ Κύφοιο ἄγει δύο καὶ δέκα νῆας, and the noun and adjective κύφος may excuse the violence done to the quantity.

The variants of fact imply the addition or omission of lines, which it would be idle to attempt to invent; moreover I am far from suggesting that all Eur.'s disagreements with Homer were included in his or any edition.

Another combination may be made. I have noticed that Euripides' number 12 for the Aenianes' ships corresponds with the fragmentary reading of a papyrus in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri vol. i. It is singular that this papyrus adds a line in the Cata-

logue, namely, ἔνθα ἴδον πλείστους Φρύγας ἀνέρας αἰολοπώλους after 798. It has therefore in one place Euripides' actual reading in the play, in another it resembles Euripides in his known characteristic of adding a line. I suggest that this second century papyrus is in very fact the Εὐριπίδειος. 'Ammonius' quotes it, in the first or second century A.D., and there is nothing to prove he did not quote it first-hand; and we know that a nameless edition which Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt found in a papyrus of the third century B.C. was used and quoted by Plutarch in the second century of our era.

I do not present this hypothesis as true, but as possible. The certainty belonging to combinations of surviving statements of particulars must always be slight; and this is in most cases, and especially in literary history, all the license that Fortune has permitted us upon the patient ancients.

T. W. ALLEN.

## ON THE FRAGMENTS OF EURIPIDES.

(NAUCK'S NUMERATION.)

### Fr. 262 :

παλαιο σκοποῦμαι τὰς τύχας τὰς τῶν βροτῶν,  
ὡς τ' εὖ μεταλλάσσουν· ὅς γὰρ ἂν σφαλῇ  
εἰς ὀρθὸν ἔσται χὼ πρὶν εὐτυχῶν πίπτει.

εὖ cannot stand, but extant conjectures do not account for themselves. Read ὡς πνεύματ' ἀλλάσσουν ('how they change their winds'), and cf. Eur. *H.F.* 216 ὅταν θεός σοι πνεῦμα μεταβαλὼν τύχη.

### Fr. 456 :

†ὠνητέραν δὲ τήνδ' ἐγὼ δίδωμί σοι  
πληγὴν.

Read ἐν ἡτρίαν ('the blow that gives thy quietus') and cf. Soph. *O.T.* 961 σμικρὰ παλαιὰ σώματ' εἰνάξει ῥοπή, *Trach.* 1041 εὐνασον, εὐνασόν μ' ὠκυπέτα μόρω, *Ap. Rh.* 4, 1058 εἰνήγεται νύξ ἔργων.

### Fr. 533 :

τερπνὸν τὸ φῶς μοι †τόδ' ὑπὸ γῆν δι' ἄδου  
σκότος

οὐδ' εἰς ὄνειρον οὐδ' εἰς ἀνθρώπους μολεῖν†

Read

τερπνὸν τὸ φῶς μοι τὸ δ' ὑπὸ γῆν Ἄιδου  
σκότος

οὐδ' εἰς ἐνερθεν οἷδ' ἐς ἀνθρώπους μολών.

i.e. 'but the darkness under earth not one knoweth, having come among mankind from beneath.' [The neut. σκότος ought to have been frankly accepted: cf. *fr.* 555].

### Fr. 555 :

†οὐ δῆκται πως κύνες οἱ θεοί,

ἀλλ' ἡ Δίκη γὰρ καὶ κατὰ σκότος βλέπει....

The second line is sound (cf. *fr.* 533). For the first I suggest

οὐ <κ ἀκρο>δῆκται, κύνες ὅπως, εἰσὶν  
θεοί

i.e. 'the vengeance of the Gods is not hasty; they are not like dogs always ready to bite.' Cf. ἀκρομανής, ἀκροσφαλής, ἀκράχολος.

### Fr. 674 :

In Hesych. 2 p. 67 ἐλίσσων· πλέκων, ψεδόμενος, οὐκ ἐπὶ εὐθείας λέγων, †ἡ κοινὸν the ordinary emendation is ἡ κινῶν. Better, I think, is μὴ κύνων.

### Fr. 730 :

ἅπανα †Πελοπόννησος εὐτυχεῖ πόλις.

Read νήσου Πέλοπος (since Πελοπόννησος is not a πόλις and, as Nauck observes, 'mira est Πελοπόννησος forma.')

Fr. 739 :

φεῦ, φεῦ, τὸ φῦναι πατὸς εὐγενοῦς ἄπο  
ὅσῃν ἔχει φρόνησιν ἀξιώμα τέ.  
κὰν γὰρ πένης ὦν τυγχάνῃ, χρηστός γεγώς  
τιμὴν ἔχει τιν', ἀναμετρούμενος δέ πως  
τὸ τοῦ πατὸς γενναῖον ἴσ' ἀφελεί τρόπῳ.

The passage is sound except in the word marked.

Read  $\phi \alpha \iota \nu \epsilon \iota$  τρόπῳ ('he shows in his own character his father's nobility'). The corruption was assisted by  $\alpha \iota = \epsilon$ .

Fr. 813 :

ὦ πλοῦθ', ὅσῳ μὲν ῥᾶστον εἴ βάρος φέρειν,  
πόνοι δὲ κὰν σοὶ καὶ φθοραὶ πολλαὶ βίου  
ἔνεισ'. κ.τ.λ.

[Al. ὦ πλοῦτ', ὦ πλοῦτε].

Read  $\omega \pi \lambda \omicron \upsilon \tau'$ , ἴσως μὲν κ.τ.λ. ('it may be very true that...')

Fr. 833 :

τίς δ' οἶδεν εἰ ζῆν τοῦθ' ὃ κέκληται θανεῖν,  
τὸ ζῆν δὲ θνήσκειν ἐστὶ; πλὴν ἴσ' ὁμῶς βρωτῶν  
νοσοῦσιν οἱ βλέποντες, οἱ δ' ὀλωλότες  
οὐδὲν νοσοῦσιν οὐδὲ κέκληνται κακά.

Read πλὴν ὅπως, i.e. 'except (for the knowledge) that...'

Fr. 1027 :

παῖς ὦν φυλάσσειν πραγμάτων αἰσχροῦν ἄπο.

Read  $\acute{\alpha} \phi \acute{\alpha} \varsigma$ .

Fr. 1035 :

δύστηνος ὅστις καὶ ἴτ' ἀ καλὰ ψευδῇ λέγων  
οὐ τοῖσδε χρήται ἴτοις κακοῖς ἀληθέσιν.

Read

δύστηνος ὅστις  $\mu \alpha \lambda \theta \alpha \kappa \acute{\alpha}$  ψευδῇ λέγων  
οὐ τοῖσδε χρήται  $\mu \alpha \lambda \theta \alpha \kappa \omicron \iota \varsigma$  ἀληθέσιν.  
[Cf. fr. 1036].

Fr. 1042 :

ἅπαντές ἐσμεν εἰς τὸ νουθετεῖν σοφοί,  
αὐτοὶ δ' ἀμαρτάνοντες οὐ γινώσκμεν.

This may be right, of course. I merely wish to observe that when, in Stobaeus, there appear *ὅταν σφάλωμεν* (*sic*) and *ὅταν ποιῶμεν* as variants to *ἀμαρτάνοντες*, we may guess that the original of Stobaeus had *ὅταν πταίωμεν*.

Fr. 1059, 4-6 :

ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὕτω δεινὸν ὥς γυνὴ κακόν·  
οὐδ' ἂν γένοιτο ἱγράμμα τοιούτ' ἐν ἱγραφῇ,  
οὐδ' ἂν λόγος δείξειεν.

τοιούτον Nauck. I should read

οὐδ' ἂν γένοιθ' ὅραμα τοῖον ἐν γραφῇ.

In some other instances I advance suggestions which may be worth consideration, even if the context is not sufficient (or sufficiently explicit) to admit of anything like certainty.

Fr. 154 :

<A.> τὸ ἱζῆν ἀφέντες τὸ κατὰ γῆν τιμῶσί σου.

<B.> κενόν γ' ὅταν γὰρ ζῇ τις, εὐτυχεῖν χρεῶν.

Probably τὸ ζῶν, as σου and the context indicate.

Fr. 170 :

οὐκ ἔστι Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος,  
καὶ βωμὸς αὐτῆς ἔστ' ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ φύσει.

Perhaps  $\phi \rho \acute{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ .

Fr. 248, 2 sq. :

μισῶ γὰρ ὄντως οἵτινες φρονοῦσι μὲν,  
φρονοῦσι δ' οὐδενός τε χρημάτων ὑπερ.

Perhaps

φρονοῦσι δ' οὐδὲν ὥσπερ  $\chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \tau'$  ἐὺ πο-  
ρεῖν.

Fr. 271 :

πηγὰς διώκει, ὃ τέκνον, τὰς ἐλπίδας.

τοῦχ ἢ τύχη γέτ' τῆς τύχης δ' οὐχ εἰς τρόπος.

Read  $\epsilon \upsilon \chi \eta$   $\tau \acute{\upsilon} \chi \eta$  γ (‘thou boastest in thy fortune, it is true’). [The second pers. mid. for tragedy is -η, not -ει.]

Fr. 437 :

ὁρῶ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐγὼ  
τίκτουσαν ὕβριν τὴν πάροιθ' εὐπραξίαν.

Commentators mostly suspect *πάροιθ'*. Perhaps  $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \acute{o} \theta \epsilon \nu$ , the reference being to a *εὐπραξία* which does not come of personal merit or exertion.

Fr. 528 :

μισῶ ἱγναῖκα, ἐκ πασῶν δὲ σέ.

[al. γυναῖκας]. Perhaps  $\mu \iota \sigma \omega < \gamma' \acute{\alpha} \epsilon \iota >$  γυναῖκας.

Fr. 572 :

ἐν ἐστὶ πάντων πρῶτον εἰδέναι ἱτόδε (al. τουτί)

Read  $\delta \acute{\epsilon} \omicron \nu$  ?

Fr. 578, 3 sqq. :

ἐξηῦρον ἀνθρώποισι γράμματ' εἰδέναι,  
ὥστ' οὐ παρόντα ποντίας ὑπὲρ πλακὸς  
τάκει κατ' οἴκους πάντ' ἐπίστασθαι καλῶς,  
παισὶν ἱτ' ἀποθνήσκοντα γραμμάτων μέτρον  
γράψαντας εἰπεῖν, τὸν λαβόντα δ' εἰδέναιτ'.

The lengthening before *θν* in (the prosaic) *ἀποθνήσκοντα* would be unique for tragedy. Scaliger gave *χρημάτων* for *γραμμάτων*, but

perhaps the claims of  $\pi\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$  may be regarded. Adopting  $\chi\rho\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$  provisionally, I should read

παισίν θ' ἅπαν θνήσκοντα  $\chi\rho\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$  μέτρον  
γράφαντά τ' εἰπεῖν, τὸν λαβόντα τ' εἰδέναι.

Fr. 611:

Hesych. †ἀντεμμάσασθαι· ἀνταποδοῦναι, ἐπι-  
πλήξαι.

Perhaps ἀνταμεύσασθαι (= ἀνταμείψασθαι).

Fr. 643:

βαρὺ τὸ φρόνημ' τοῖσις ἀνθρώπου κακοῦ.

Salmasius gave φόρημ', with which I should suggest

βαρὺ τοι φόρημ' οἷδεσις ἀνθρώπου κακοῦ.  
(i.e. his 'inflation').

Fr. 815:

δμῶσιν δ' ἐμοῖσιν εἶπον ὡς †τρουτηρίαις  
πυρίδες καὶ διυπετῇ κτείναι†

[*Obiter* emend, Erotian. διυπετῆς ὁ γόνος το  
διυπετῆς· ἀγνός].

Valckenaer restored καυτήρια in the first  
line. For the rest read perhaps

<χρ εἰ η> π υ ρ ὡ δ η καὶ διυπετῇ κ τ ῖ σ α ι.

[For κτείνειν and κτίσαι confused see Aesch.  
*Cho.* 440].

Fr. 1046:

πολλοῦ γὰρ χρυσοῦ καὶ πλούτου  
κρείσσων πάτρα σῶφρονι ναίειν.  
τὸ δὲ σύντροφον ἀδύ τι θνητοῖς  
†έν βίῳ χωρεῖ†.

The metre is uncertain. The sense is satis-  
fied with ἐμ βιῶναι κυρεῖ.

T. G. TUCKER.

## ARISTOPHANICA.--I.

### ACHARNIANS.

In the earlier part of the parabasis the poet praises himself, as he so often does, for the courage and true patriotism which he has shown. When the allies bring their money to Athens, they will all be eager to catch sight of the brave and honest poet:

646 οὕτω δ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς τόλμης ἤδη πόρρω  
κλέος ἦκει,  
ὅτε καὶ βασιλεὺς, Λακεδαιμονίων τὴν πρεσ-  
βείαν βασανίζων,  
ἠρώτησεν πρῶτα μὲν κ.τ.λ.

Now, if οὕτω δέ is right, we should expect not ὅτε but ὥστε. Someone has suggested ὡς in the sense of ὥστε. But, though such a ὡς is admissible in poetry and is much affected by Xenophon, it is extremely rare otherwise and is not (I think) ever found in Aristophanes, nor is there any reason apparent why it should have got changed to ὅτε. If, on the other hand, ὅτε is right, οὕτω δέ refuses to harmonise with it. Recognising this and remembering *Eq.* 530 οὕτως ἠνθῆσεν ἐκεῖνος, Elmsley changed οὕτω δέ to οὕτως, and others, e.g. Dr. Blaydes, have followed him. But *Eq.* 530 is not parallel and οὕτως is not suitable, for there the οὕτως clause winds up the sentence, whereas here ὅτε κ.τ.λ. carries it on, so that οὕτως would have to perform the impossible task of looking both backwards and forwards at the same time. If οὕτως refers to the poet's

fame among the Greek allies, the Great King's knowledge of him cannot be brought in to illustrate it.

I have little doubt that Aristophanes wrote οὕτως δέ. *Truly his fame has spread wide.*

In the first place οὕτως and ὄντως are frequently exchanged for one another by copyists. Which word is the right one in this or that passage is immaterial to the argument, but it will be found that the MSS. often vary between them: e.g. Plato *Euthyd.* 305 E: *Theaet.* 198 D: *Laws*, 708 D: *Critias*, 106 A: Xen. *Hell.* 7. 4. 3: [Arist.] *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1422 a 21. In other places the more familiar οὕτως has driven out an original ὄντως altogether, and the latter has only been replaced by modern critics.

In the second place the emphatic ὄντως is quite at home at the beginning of the sentence. Cf. such passages as Plato *Soph.* 236 D ὄντως, ὦ μακάριε, ἐσμὲν ἐν παντάπασι χαλεπῇ σκέψει: *Phil.* 44 B: *Laws*, 708 D.

Finally compare the words of Xenophon *Hipparch.* 5. 9, which resemble our passage as much as if they had been written to illustrate it: ὄντως γὰρ οὐδὲν κερδαλέωτερον ἐν πολέμῳ ἀπάτης, ὅποτε γε καὶ οἱ παῖδες ὅταν παίζωσι ποσίνδα δύνανται ἀπατᾶν κ.τ.λ.

On the use of ὄντως in Aristophanes see Starkie's note to *Wasps* 997.

655. A few lines further on he pretends that the Lacedaemonians will try to appropriate him,