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](#)

Theognidea

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 03 / May 1912, pp 73 - 76
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199664, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199664

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1912). Theognidea. The Classical Review, 26, pp 73-76 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199664

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

MAY, 1912

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THEOGNIDEA.

93. εἴ τις ἐπαινῆσθαι σε τόσον χρόνον
ὅσσον ὀρώης,
νοσφισθεὶς δ' ἄλλη γλῶσσαν ἱῆσι
κακήν.

ὀρώης A, ὀρώης O, ὀρώη cet. Cobet seems to me right in preferring the third person to the second; it corresponds properly to νοσφισθεὶς in the next line, and besides it is awkward to have to supply αὐτόν after ὀρώης. But why do A and O give the second person? And why the change to the optative? I think Theognis said ὀρήσι, and if Cobet is also right in demanding ἐπαινῆσιν, we then have the present subjunctive, as we should expect, all through the sentence.

ὀρήσι was easily changed into ὀρώης, and then lengthened into ὀρώης for the metre.

117. κιβδήλου δ' ἀνδρὸς γινῶναι χαλε-
πώτερον οὐδέν,
Κύρν', οὐδ' εὐλαβίης ἐστὶ περὶ
πλέονος.

This will not construe, but it is clear that the sense required is 'nothing needs greater caution.' Bergk brackets περί, 'quod corrector aliquis adiecit, ut verum suppleret.' So far so good, but his substitution of βροτοῖς is rather feeble. M. Schmidt's δεῖ περί τευ πλέονος gets in the δεῖ which we expect, though Bergk is of course right in saying that εὐλαβίης ἐστὶ is possible, but it knocks the line about more than

is needed, and περί τευ does not look plausible.

What is clear, then, is this. Textually we have to fill up a gap between ἐστὶ and πλέονος, and the sense leads us to expect δεῖ. Read ἐσθ' ὅ τι δεῖ πλέονος. ὅ τι is of course accusative. In Homer the verb used for this construction is χρή, in Aeschylus it is δεῖ, and Theognis is nearer to Aeschylus. Metrically also δεῖ is superior, for Theognis does not like to keep a vowel short before a mute and liquid without necessity.

169. ὅν δὲ θεοὶ τιμῶσιν, ὃ καὶ μωμεύ-
μενος αἰνεῖ.

It is impossible to believe that any poet can have said such a thing as this, nor does τιμῶσ' ὅν, adopted by Bergk from one MS., mend things at all. κοιμεύμενος ἄνει Ahrens, which does give a sort of sense perhaps. Is μωμεύμενος a corruption of μὴ μώμενος? If so, we can end with Schneidewin's ἀγρεῖ or Hartung's αἰρεῖ; but I should rather suspect that ἡῦρεν was changed to αἰνεῖ after μωμεύμενος had displaced μὴ μώμενος. 'He finds even without seeking.' Cf. 415, οὐδέν' ὁμοῖον ἐμοὶ δύναμαι διζήμενος εὐρεῖν.

For deliberate changes of this kind cf. 1053, where A alone preserves μαινομένων πέτεται; all other MSS. have a text in which μαινομένων had been corrupted to μαρναμένων, and πέτεται had been changed in consequence to μάχεται.

And 1162 is given by all MSS. in the form :

αἰτοῦσιν δ' ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι, Κύρνε, δίδου,

This looks well enough in itself, but does not suit the previous line, and luckily the couplet is repeated at 409, where the true reading appears as :

αἰδοῦς ἢ τ' ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι, Κύρν',
ἔπεται.

Here again ἔπεται has been changed to δίδου in order to go with αἰτοῦσιν.

μωμεύμενος is, moreover, a false form for Theognis.

271. ἴσως τοι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα θεοὶ θνητοῖς
ἀνθρώποις

γῆράς τ' οὐλόμενον καὶ νεότητ'
ἔδοσαν.

τῶν πάντων δὲ κάκιστον ἐν ἀνθρώ-
ποις, θανάτου τε

καὶ πασέων νούσων ἐστὶ πονη-
ρότερον,

παῖδας ἐπεὶ θρέψαιο καὶ ἄρμενα
πάντα παράσχοις,

χρήματα δ' εἰ καταθῆς, πόλλ'
ἀνιηρὰ παθών,

τὸν πατέρ' ἐχθαίρουσι, καταρῶνται
δ' ἀπολέσθαι,

καὶ στυγέουσ' ὥσπερ πτωχὸν
ἐπερχόμενον.

That there is something wrong about the expression of this is obvious ; hence Schneidewin proposes δ' ὁ κάκιστον in 273. Rather ἐν πάντων δὲ κάκιστον (cf. 841), with a colon after πονηρότερον. Then ἐπεὶ with optative, followed by εἰ δέ with subjunctive, can scarcely be right, but I see no certain way of correcting it ; εἰ καταθῆς is Bergk's conjecture for ἐγκαταθῆς. If it be right, the tone is : ' Suppose you should have brought up children, then if you are to . . . ' But καταθῆς is the wrong voice ; read καταθῇ and compare 409 : οὐδένα θησαυρὸν ποιεῖν καταθήσῃ ἀμείνω. The supposed reference (Bergk) to depositing money in a temple is mere hariolation ; the point is that even if you lay up money for your children painfully, yet they wish you dead ; indeed, they wish it all the more, that they may inherit at once,

' Like an ungrateful son,
Who cries, " My father's damned and all's my
own."

333. μή ποτε φεύγοντ' ἄνδρα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι,
Κύρνε, φιλήσῃς,
οὐδὲ γὰρ οἴκαδε βὰς γίνεταί
αὐτός ἔτι.

Why Bergk should say ' fort. αὐτός ' is more than I know. Homer uses αὐτός for ὁ αὐτός several times ; hence in his description of the Great Bear, ἢ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται should be construed ' turns in the same place.'

But what sort of antithesis to φεύγειν is οἴκαδε βαίνειν ? And οὐδέ is no sense at all. If Theognis had said, ' Don't make friends with an exile, for even when he's in trouble you can't trust him,' then οὐδέ would have been to the point. But obviously we cannot say ' even when he is restored to his city ' in this context. οὐ γὰρ οἴκόν γε βὰς might be some sense, οὐδὲ οἴκαδε βὰς is none at all. We should get the proper antithesis and sense if we read οὐδεὶς γὰρ καταβάς. But I know not of any instance of καταβῆναι = κατελθεῖν.

444. ἀθανάτων δὲ δόσεις
παντοῖαι θνητοῖσιν ἐπέρχοντ'.

O has a variant ἐπέρχεται which looks right ; the schema Pindaricum was not invented by Pindar. Theognis very seldom has a bacchius before the bucolic diaeresis ; at 695 qu. παρασχέμεν for παρασχεῖν ?

475. αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ, μέτρον γὰρ ἔχω μελιηδέος
οἴνου,

ὑπνου λυσικάκου μνήσομαι οἴκαδ'
ἰών.

ἤξω δ' ὥς οἶνος χαριέστατος ἀνδρὶ
πεπόσθαι,

οὔτ' ἔτι νήφων ὦν οὔτε λίην
μεθύων.

The text of the last line is most uncertain, but it is generally agreed that we must have two participles in it. For ἤξω two inferior MSS. have δείξω, which Bergk accepts ; it may be nothing but a bad conjecture, but there is also much probability in the suggestion of Mr. Williams that it is a corruption of εἶξω. Athenaeus quotes the lines with ἤκω, and Mr. Richards defends this ; but could ἤκω ὥς οἶνος κ.τ.λ. really mean ' I have come to that point where wine is most gracious' ?

And Mr. Williams truly remarks that we cannot lay any stress on the reading of Athenaeus, because he begins the quotation with this word and may have altered it to suit his own purpose. But, if we are to suppose the sense to be what Mr. Richards says, we must stick to *ἤκω*, for the future is then impossible, in spite of Messrs. Harrison and Williams. The author is already half seas over and refuses to drink any more; he *has* come to the haven where he would be; therefore he could not say 'I *will* come.'

We must start from *ἤξω*, I think, and I cannot but believe it to be corrupt, nor do any of the conjectures proposed satisfy me. Perhaps the poet said *στέρξω*, 'I will be content to be neither sober nor drunk, which is the best way for wine to have been taken.' I suppose the first two letters to have been lost, as often at the beginning of a line; *ερξω* was then nonsense and was easily corrupted; perhaps hence came Mr. Williams's *ειξω*, and thence the other readings flowed naturally.

535. οὐ ποτε δουλείη κεφαλὴ ἰθεία
πέφυκεν,
ἀλλ' αἰεὶ σκολιή, καὶ χένα λοξὸν
ἔχει.

Read *κεφαλὴν*, 'slavery is never straight of head, but has her neck twisted.' We thus escape an ugly hiatus, and also we get a much better subject for *ἔχει*.

597. δὴν δὴ, παῖ, φίλοι ὦμεν· ἀτάρ τ'
ἄλλοισιν ὁμίλει.

This line is repeated at 1243 with *ἔπειτ'* for *ἀτάρ τ'*. The MSS. at both places have *καί*, altered by Bergk to *παῖ*, and *καί* is indefensible. But I seek vainly to understand why anyone should say: 'Let us be long friends, but do you associate with others.' If the point is that you may seek other friends if you like but let *us* still be friends, surely we want *ἡμεῖς* in very badly, and it would have been easy to write *ἡμεῖς δὴ φίλοι ὦμεν* or the like. Then, too, at both places the pentameter contains a reproach; 598 tells the boy to look for friends more congenial, 1244 tells him that he is faithless. Plainly it is absurd to begin such

couplets by hoping for long friendships. Again, *δὴν* is odd to my feeling in a wish for the future, and consider the *δὴ*.

'Let us be friends no longer' would give good sense, but the right correction is *ἤμεν*¹ for *ὦμεν*. 'We have been long dear to each other,' says the author with regret and reproach in his voice, 'but now I'm no longer good enough for you; go to your new companions.'

ἀτάρ τ' is manifestly the original, *ἔπειτ'* the corruption.

609. *προσαμαρτῇ*, the reading of A, is the best; it is the Homeric *ἀμαρτεῖν* = *ὀμαρτεῖν*.

667. εἰ μὲν χρήματ' ἔχοιμι, Σιμωνίδη,
οἷά περ ἦδη,
οὐκ ἂν ἀνιόμην τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι
συνών.

ἦδη A, *ἦδειν* cet. Neither *ἦδη* nor *ἦδειν* gives any tolerable meaning, or indeed any decent construction, but the remedy is simple; read *ἦθη*. 'Were my fortune as good as my character.' For the plural of *ἦθος* see 970.

729. φροντίδες ἀνθρώπων ἔλαχον πτερὰ
ποικίλ' ἔχουσαι,
μυρόμεναι ψυχῆς εἵνεκα καὶ
βιότου.

As *ἔλαχον* has nothing to govern, Hartung conjectures *ἀνθρώπους*, but Bergk is justly dissatisfied with such a statement as *φροντίδες ἀνθρώπους ἔλαχον*. A man may receive care for his portion; nobody would say that care received the man. Then *μυρόμεναι* is absurd; a *φροντίς* cannot *μύρεσθαι*. Many MSS. add *δ'* before or after *ἀνθρώπων*; where does this come from? And what is the point of describing the *φροντίδες* as having wings?

The poet wrote:—

φροντίδες ἀνθρώπους ἔδακον πτέρᾳ ποικίλ'
ἔχουσαι,
μυρομένους ψυχῆς εἵνεκα καὶ βιότου.

The cares are like gnats or wasps, winged things that bite or sting. The *δ'* is a correction of *ἔλαχον*, got into the wrong place. *ἀνθρώπων* was written carelessly by someone with the sorrows

¹ The present would here, I think, be inappropriate.

of men in his head; *μυρομένους* was then left stranded and was altered to *μυρόμεναι* that it might have something to agree with; bad emenders seldom scruple about writing what no poet would ever think of.

Bergk suggests *τούς* for *τῶν* at 814, and it certainly looks necessary.

819. *ἐς πολυάρητον κακὸν ἤκομεν, ἔνθα μάλιστα,
Κύρνε, συναμφοτέρους μοῖρα λάβοι
θανάτου.*

This has sorely perplexed the commentators, but it is simple enough. The *κακόν* is old age which is much prayed for, but is an evil none the less. Cf. Menander *frag. incert.* 26 (Meineke).

It is astonishing that anyone should refuse Bergk's *μαθεῖν* in the preceding line; the sentiment is repeated by Aeschylus, *P.V.* 651, 2.

923. *οὔτω, Δημόκλεις, κατὰ χρέματ' ἄριστον ἀπάντων.*

Qu. *χρήματα λῶστον*? The weak caesura in the fourth foot is studiously avoided in this collection, unless there be a strong one in the fifth. The only exception is 1171, a passage stamped with the *σφρηγίς*, and therefore to be presumed to be by Theognis himself; it is easy to correct it, however, by transposition to *διδούσι θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν*.

In 928 is the phrase *χρέματ' ἄριστον ἔχειν*, which need not be altered; these poets use *λῶστον* and *ἄριστον* indifferently and promiscuously as suits the scansion; cf. 421.

945. *εἶμι παρὰ στάθμην ὀρθὴν ὁδὸν οὐδετέρωσε
κλινόμενος· χρεὶ γάρ μ' ἄρτια
πάντα νοεῖν.*

πᾶσι makes much better sense, and was easily corrupted by the proximity of *ἄρτια*. Cf. 543:

*χρεὶ με παρὰ στάθμην καὶ γνώμονα τήνδε
δικάσσαι,
Κύρνε, δίκην, ἰσὸν τ' ἀμφοτέροισι
δόμην.*

945 is ascribed with great probability to Solon, at 543 Theognis imitates him. Solon speaks of all classes at Athens, Theognis applies the couplet to a strife between two men, and his *ἀμφοτέροισι* thus corresponds to *πᾶσι*.

1001. *χέρνιβα δ' αἶψα θύραζε φέροι
στεφανώματα δ' εἶσω.*

δ' εἶσω A, Athenaeus, *δήσοι* cet. *εἶσω* is no sense, for why should the girl bring the water *out* and the garlands *in*? Was the original *δ' οἶσοι*, the mixed aorist optative of *φέρω*? The form is so different from *φέροι* that the two words might be used together, I think. The difference is indeed greater than that between *εἰλήφει* and *λαβών* in Isaeus vii. 34, *ἐμοῦ δὲ πείραν εἰλήφει, δοκιμασίαν ἱκανὴν λαβών*.

1193. *ἄσπάλαθοι δὲ τάπησιν ὁμοῖον
στρώμα θανόντι.*

This scansion cannot be paralleled from Theognis. Read *ὁμοῖοι*; either construction is equally good.

ARTHUR PLATT.

A NOTE ON THE EASTERN TRADE-ROUTE IN ASIA MINOR.

THE object of the following paper is to bring together certain facts, which point to an earlier date than has hitherto been supposed, for the great trade-route running across Asia Minor from the lower Maeander valley to the Cilician gates. Although this route is by far the easiest approach from the Aegean to the interior of Asia Minor, its importance in early days, as Sir William Ramsay has pointed out,¹ was over-

shadowed by the 'Royal Road,' which took a more northerly direction to Boghaz Keui. Until the first century B.C. we have no direct literary testimony² as to the importance of the 'trade-route,' although the fragment of Hipponax,³ quoted by Ramsay, points to a regular intercourse between Miletus and the interior, which can only have passed up the Maeander and Lycus

¹ *Historical Geography*, p. 38.

² Artemidorus, ap. Strabo, p. 663.

³ Hipponax, frag. 36.