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](#)

Varia

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 07 / November 2007, pp 197 - 199

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00165059, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00165059

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (2007). Varia. The Classical Review, 21, pp 197-199 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00165059

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Roman work as being designed *argutius*, whatever precisely that may mean. Hence Nemi is to be interpreted by reference to the south, Pompeii and Paestum, rather than by

northern influence from Rome and Etruria; and we may see in the double bust a product of the expiring Greek tradition.

FRANK GRANGER.

VARIA.

Soph. *O.C.* 266

τά γ' ἔργα μου
πεπονθότ' ἐστὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεδρακότα.

I do not know whether Mr. Housman was the first to call these words in question, but he did so very effectively (in the *American Journal of Philology* 13. 139), and for some years I did not doubt that he had emended them rightly in his

τά γ' ἔργα με
πεπονθότ' ἴστε μᾶλλον ἢ δεδρακότα.

But it occurred to me a little time back that another reading was possible, involving perhaps no more change than his:

τά γ' ἔργα μου
πεπονθότος τι μᾶλλον ἢ δεδρακότος,

in which of course ἐστὶ is to be supplied with πεπονθότος. τι might go either with the participles or with μᾶλλον.

Eur. *Hipp.* 114

ἡμεῖς δέ, τοὺς νέους γὰρ οὐ μιμητέον,
φρονούντες οὕτως ὡς πρέπει δούλοις λέγειν,
προσευξόμεσθα τοῖσι σοῖς ἀγάλασιν,
δέσποινα Κύπρι.

L and P have φρονούντας, corrected in the second hand of L to the nominative in harmony with all other MSS. Great difficulty has been found in making sense of the line, and Wecklein enumerates more than twenty proposed alterations. Among them all I do not find the simple suggestion to alter φρονούντες by one letter and read φρενοῦντες. Hippolytus' servant admonishes his master as far as a slave may.

Eur. *Bacch.* 439

γελῶν δὲ καὶ δαίνεσθαι κάπαγειν ἐφίετο
ἔμενέ τε, τοῦμόν εὐπρεπὲς ποιοῦμενος.

Thus the disguised Dionysus bore himself, when seized by the guards, one of whom is

speaking. εὐπρεπὲς is puzzling and has been turned by conjecture into εὐπρεπὲς and εὐπεπὲς. But εὐ here, as often in compounds, has got confused with α. What Euripides wrote was ἀπρεπὲς, and the feeling expressed is something like that of Marcellus in *Hamlet*,

'We do it wrong, being so majestic,
To offer it the show of violence.'

Shield of Heracles 147

ἐπὶ δὲ βλοσυροῖο μετώπων
δεινὴ Ἔρις πεπότητο κορύσσουσα κλόνον ἀνδρῶν.

There is no propriety here in the pluperfect, for which the imperfect ought rather to have been used. But, when we notice the very proper pluperfect τέτυκτο used several times (154, 208, etc.) to describe what *had been fashioned* on the shield and therefore was *now* to be seen on it, we may perhaps conjecture that the poet wrote πεποίητο. The more prosaic verb is used in 319 (ποίησε σάκος) instead of τεύχω.

In *Phaedrus* 244 c πετομένων should, I think, be written for ποιουμένων.

Theognidea 183

Κριὸς μὲν καὶ ὄνους διζήμεθα, Κύρνε, καὶ
ἵππους
εὐγενέας, καὶ τις βούλεται ἐξ ἀγαθῶν
βήσεσθαι: γῆμαι δὲ κακὴν κακοῦ οὐ μελεδαίνει
ἐσθλὸς ἀνὴρ κ.τ.λ.

For βήσεσθαι, which both in sense and in grammar is very questionable, there are not only the variants βήθεσθαι and βίνεσθαι, but in a passage ascribed in the text of Stobaeus to Xenophon (though it is pretty well agreed that there is some error here) we find the words quoted with κτήσασθαι (Stob. *Flor.* 88. 14). This suggests πάσασθαι, on which it would be a gloss, as the true reading. The

participle occurs in line 146 *χρήματα πασά-μενος*.

Theognidea 1013

*Α μάκαρ εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὀλβιος ὅστις ἄπειρος
ἀθλων εἰς Ἀΐδεω δῶμα μέλαν κατέβη,
πρίν τ' ἐχθροὺς πτῆξαι καὶ ὑπερβῆναι ποτ'
ἀνάγκη
ἐξετάσαι τε φίλους ὄντιν' ἔχουσι νόον.

The transitive use of *πτῆσσω* is very questionable and, even if admitted, not specially suitable here. In Xen. *Cynegeticus* 9. 5 I have proposed to turn the very odd *πίεσας* ὡς ἐπὶ γῆν (of a hare) into *πτῆξας*, and I would suggest here that the reverse change be made, *πίεσαι* for *πτῆξαι*. I take it that *ἐχθροὺς* is the subject of *πίεσαι* and *ὑπερβῆναι*, and that by one of the rapid changes which occur in Greek the man himself is the subject of *ἐξετάσαι*. So for instance *Od.* 3. 16 ὅπου κύθε γαῖα καὶ ὄντινα πότμον ἐπέσπεν: Herod. 6. 30 οὗτ' ἂν ἔπαθε κακὸν οὐδέν . . ἀπῆκέ τ' ἂν αὐτῷ τὴν αἰτίαν: Thuc. 1. 51 ἔπειτα δὲ ἔγνωσαν (οἱ Κερκυραῖοι) καὶ ὠρμίσαντο (οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι).

Timon *ap.* Diog. L. 3. 7 and Hesych. Miles. 55 of Plato

τῶν πάντων δ' ἡγεῖτο πλατίστατος ἀλλ' ἀγορη-
τὴς

ἡδυεπὴς, τέττιξιν ἰσοκράγος, οἷ θ' Ἑκαδήμου
δένδρει ἐφεζόμενοι ὅσα λειριόεσσιν εἴσι.

According to Brandt (*Poesis Epica Graeca Ludibunda*, p. 102) the MSS. vary between *πλατίστατος*, *πλατίστακος*, *πλατύστακος*, *πλατύσπακος*, and *πλατύστατος*. The forms *-ίστατος*, *-ύστατος* are very unlikely for the superlative of *πλατύς*. Is it possible that *πλατύστομος* is what Timon wrote? The reference would be to the second etymology of *Plato* given by Diogenes, *i.e.* not to Plato's *εὐεξία* or broadness (*πλατύτης*) of build, but to *τὴν πλατύτητα τῆς ἐρμηνείας*, his amplitude, copiousness, of expression. Cf. Olympiod. *Vit. Plat.* διὰ τὸ πλατὺ καὶ κεχυμένον . . τοῦ χαρακτήρος. Timon means to say therefore that his utterance, though plentiful, was pleasant, like that of the cicalas.

Arist. *Met.* 1. 2. 982 b 28 διὸ καὶ δικαίως ἂν οὐκ ἀνθρωπινῇ νομίζοιτο αὐτῆς (the highest *ἐπιστήμη*) ἢ κτήσις· πολλαχῇ γὰρ ἢ φύσις

δούλη τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν, ὥστε κατὰ Σιμωνίδην θεὸς ἂν μόνος τοῦτ' ἔχοι γέρας.

δούλη seems at once inapposite and too strong. It is used much more properly further on, when it is said (996 b 10) ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχικωτάτη καὶ ἡγεμονικωτάτη, καὶ ἡ ὥσπερ δούλας οὐδ' ἀντειπεῖν τὰς ἄλλας ἐπιστήμας δίκαιον, *κ.τ.λ.*, where in antithesis to *ἀρχ.* and *ἡγεμ.* it is much in place. Is it not here an error for *φαύλη*, a much more suitable word? Cf. *De An.* 2. 9. 421 a 10 φαύλως ἀνθρώπος ὁσμάται as compared with many animals.

Lucian *Somn.* 9 οὐδὲν γὰρ ὅτι μὴ ἐργάτης ἔσει τῷ σώματι πονῶν κὰν τούτῳ τὴν ἅπασαν ἐλπίδα τοῦ βίου τεθειμένος, ἀφανὴς μὲν αὐτὸς ὢν, ὀλίγα καὶ ἀγεννῆ λαμβάνων, *κ.τ.λ.*

For *λαμβάνων* read *μανθάνων*. The word *λαμβάνω* is used but little of mental acquisitions; chiefly of material gain, on which so much stress ought not to be laid at this point. Nor would *ἀγεννῆ λαμβάνων* be a proper phrase in that sense: a man *λαμβάνει* ἐξ ἀγεννῶν, not *ἀγεννῆ λαμβάνει*. With *ὀλίγα καὶ ἀγεννῆ μανθάνων* is contrasted in 10 especially καὶ ὅλως ἅπαντα ὅποσα ἐστὶ τά τε θεία τά τ' ἀνθρώπινα οὐκ ἐς μακράν σε διδάξομαι.

Luc. *Vit. Auct.* 14. ΩΝ. τί γὰρ ὁ αἰὼν ἐστι; ΗΡΑΚ. παῖς παίζων, πεσσεύων, διαφερόμενος.

In the words *παῖς παίζων πεσσεύων* Heraclitus is of course quoting himself: *fragm.* 52 Diels (79 Bywater) αἰὼν παῖς ἐστι παίζων πεσσεύων. When we notice how in the context both before and after he is made to use terms in pairs, usually antithetic (*τέρψις ἀτερψίη*, *γνώσις ἀγνωσίη*, etc., and again *θεοὶ θνητοί*, *ἄνθρωποι ἀθάνατοι*), and when we call to mind *fragm.* 10 (Byw. 59) ὅλα καὶ οὐχ ὅλα, *συμφερόμενον διαφερόμενον*, *συνᾶδον διᾶδον*, does it not seem likely that we should read here in Lucian <*συμφερόμενος*> *διαφερόμενος*? The MS. which Sommerbrodt calls ψ seems actually to have *συμφερόμενος* written above *διαφερόμενος*.

In a similar way I suspect an omission in § 5, καὶ σεωντῶν ἕνα δοκέοντα καὶ ἄλλον ὁρέομενον ἄλλον εὐντα εἶσαι. The words *ἄλλον . . . εὐντα* are complete in themselves and *ἕνα δοκέοντα* only confuses them. Did not Lucian write something like *ἕνα δοκέοντα <πολλοὺς εὐντα>*? So just below *ἀλλαττό-*

μενον ἐς μορφὰς πλείονας. Cf. *Theaet.* 166 B (do you think he will admit) τὸν εἶναί τινα ἄλλ' οὐχὶ τοὺς ;

Luc. *Vera Hist.* 1. 29 (end) μαλακῶς ἐνδιδόντος τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ συνιζάνοντος ἐπὶ τὴν θάλατταν κατετέθημεν.

'Let down' is what we want, not 'laid down.' Read *καθείθημεν* from *καθίημι*, a form corrupted in consequence of its rarity: indeed parts of *ἱημι* (especially *καθίημι*, *μεθίημι*) are often altered to parts of *τίθημι*. Cf. § 9 *καθῆκεν* εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, where there is the *v. l.* *κατέθηκεν*, and *Vera Hist.* 2. 2. τὸ πλοῖον . . *καθήκαμεν ἐς τὴν θάλατταν*, which has escaped corruption: *ib.* 43 Cobet has already corrected *καταθέντες τὴν ναῦν* to *καθέντες*. (In Luc. *Pisc.* 47 and 51 I suspect that the aorists *καθῆκεν* and *καθήκα* are a mistake for the perfects *καθεῖκεν* and *καθεῖκα*, due again to comparative rarity of form.)

Luc. *Gallus* 1. The cock says to its owner ᾗμην τι χαριεῖσθαί σοι προλαμβάνων τῆς νυκτὸς ὅποσον ἂν δυναίμην φθονῶν.

For the meaningless *φθονῶν*, omitted by Dindorf and perhaps partly due to *φθονερόν* preceding, read *φωνῶν*. Cf. *δέξυφωνος* above and *ἀφωνότερος* below.

Luc. *Rhet. Praec.* 22 ἦν μὲν τις καλῶς εἴπη . . ἦν δὲ μετρίως ἐνεχθῆναι, κ.τ.λ.

Read *λεχθῆναι* for *ἐνεχθῆναι*.

Appian *Celt.* 8 *προσείσθε* τῷ ἔργῳ.

Neither *προσείσθε* nor *προστίθεσθε*, which is suggested, can mean *apply yourselves to*. Probably *πρόσκεισθε* was the word.

Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5. 3. 17 (654 P) ἀγνοήσας τις ἐζήτησεν καὶ ζητήσας εὕρισκει τὸν διδάσκαλον εὐρών τε ἐπίστευσεν καὶ πιστεύσας ἤλπισεν ἀγαπήσας τε ἐντέθεν ἐξομοιοῦνται τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ.

Stählin in the notes to his recent text does not mention that doubt has ever been thrown upon *ἤλπισεν*, but I can hardly believe that the very obvious *ἡγάπησεν* has not been suggested. The trick of the sentence requires it, and *ἤλπισεν* seems deficient in meaning.

Stob. *Flor.* 4. 107 Ζήνων δὲ ἔφη γέλοιον ἐκάστους (ἐκάστου) μὲν τοῖς πράγμασιν ὥς δεῖ ζῆν μὴ προσέχειν ὥς οὐκ εἰδόντων, τὸν δὲ παρὰ πάντων ἔπαινον θαυμάζειν ὥς ἐχόμενον κρίσεως.

I do not know what sense readers have attached to *πράγμασιν*. Read *προστάγμασιν*, the confusion of *πράττω* and *προστάττω* being well known (e. g. Ar. *Eth.* 5. 2. 1130 b 23: Plat. *Rep.* 407 D: Lys. 14. 20 and 21, etc., 25. 13: Isocr. 2. 34). We must adopt the variant *ἐκάστου* to which *εἰδόντων* refers loosely.

Aspasius in *Eth. Nicom.* 4. 14 (Heylbut p. 125. 24). Expounding the character of Aristotle's *βωμολόχος* as πάντως τοῦ γελοίου στοχαζόμενος, Aspasius says εἰσὶ τινες οἱ τὸ παράπαν οὐκ ἀξιούσι χρῆσθαι τῇ παιδιᾷ καὶ οὐτ' αὐτοὶ ἂν εἴποιεν πλέον τι οὐτ' ἄλλων ἀκούσειαν ἂν ἡδέως.

πλέον τι makes no sense and is probably a mistake for *γελοῖον τι*. γ and π are liable to confusion, as in the familiar case of *πᾶγμα* and *γράμμα*.

Suidas s.v. Σώφρων τοῖς δὲ χρόνοις ἦν κατὰ Ξέρην καὶ Εὐριπίδην.

Not only is Xerxes an odd person to date a Sicilian author by, but he does not at all harmonise with Euripides. The *floruit* of the two would be very different. Sophron too was almost certainly later than Xerxes. Can we find any Greek writer or thinker of about the same date as Euripides, whose name might conceivably get distorted into *Xerxes*? Anaxagoras seems to satisfy these conditions. If *κατ'* 'Αναξαγόραν (a followed by a consonant four times running) became by accident *καταξαγόραν*, it would be a fairly easy step to *κατὰ Ξέρην*.

Vitruv. vii *Praef.* 10. *Ego vero, Caesar, neque alienis indicibus mutatis interposito nomine meo id profero corpus, neque ullius cogitata vituperans institui ex eo me approbare.*

Should we not read *mutuatis* for *mutatis*? Pliny speaks of the moon shining *mutuata luce*.

H. RICHARDS.