

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 Some Tragic Fragments

W. Headlam

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 09 / December 1904, pp 430 - 431

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990887, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990887

How to cite this article:

W. Headlam (1904). On Some Tragic Fragments. The Classical Review, 18, pp 430-431
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990887

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON SOME TRAGIC FRAGMENTS.

[The numeration is Nauck's (1889).]

p. 780 Astydamas 8. 4 ἔνεκα τῶν ἔστιν εὐρεῖν ἄνδρ' ἕνα—καὶ τοῦτον οἱ ζητοῦντες εἰσὶ μυριοί. Mr. Tucker in last month's number is right, I think, in reading *ἔτεσιν* for *ἔστιν*: but when he supposes that Porson must have written *ἐν δ' ἑκατόν ἔστιν ἔργον ἄνδρ' εὐρεῖν ἕνα*, he is mistaken. Porson's note is 'Malim ἐν δ' ἑκατόν ἔστιν ἔργον—κεῖ—εἰσὶ μυριοί.' At the time he wrote it Porson may not have discovered his own canon, or he may have thought (as Nauck thought) that this was not the sort of verse to which it was applicable. Certainly it sounds like Comedy; but my paper in *C.R.* 1902 p. 252, where I suggested *ἄνδρ' εὐρεῖν ἕνα* as probable (like *Eur. fr.* 411), will show how easily the order might have been changed. 'Though the seekers be μυριοί' would be *κἂν ὦσι* (Grotius): καὶ . . . εἰσὶ would mean 'and yet (καίτοι) the seekers are μυριοί: this would refer to the philosophers, like Diogenes who went about saying *ἄνδρα ζητῶ*: cf. *Bato Com.* 2. 3 καὶ τὸν φρόνιμον ζητοῦντας ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις καὶ ταῖς διατριβαῖς ὥσπερ ἀποδοδρακότα.

p. 790 Chaeremon 36

πλούτος δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὰς ὅλας τιμὰς ἰὼν οὐκ ἔσχεν ὄγκον ὥστε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν ἀλλ' ἔστι σεμνός· ἐν δὲ δώσει (or δώσει) βροτῶν ἧδὺς συνοικεῖν καὶ τιν' εἰληχῶς χάριν.

In *C.R.* 1899 p. 5 I suggested that in the first line we had a corruption of *τάκόλαστα* or *τάκόλαστον*, remarking that the contrary was *σωφροσύνη*, and leaving *σώφροσιν* to be read in *v.* 3 by any one who ventured. Whether this is right or not, Mr. Tucker makes a step by reading now

πλούτος δὲ πρὸς μὲν τάκόλαστα πᾶς ἰὼν οὐκ ἔσχεν ὄγκον ὥστε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἄσεμνος· ἐν δὲ σῶφροσιν βροτῶν ἧδὺς συνοικεῖν καὶ τιν' εἰληχῶς χάριν.

For his *ἄσεμνος* makes a good opposition to *ὄγκον*, which is here used in a good sense, 'dignity,' as in *Alexis* 263. 5 *φέρει δὲ τοῖς μὲν χρωμένους δόξης τιν' ὄγκον*, τοῖς δ' ὀρώσιν *ἡδονήν*, κοσμὸν δὲ τῷ βίῳ.—*ἄσεμνος* is corrupted in *Sannyrion* 1 (I p. 793 Kock) *πέλανον καλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ θεοὶ ἃ καλεῖται ἄσεμνος τάλφιθ' ὑμεῖς οἱ βροτοί*: so *Meineke* and *Cobet*, where the MSS. give *ἃ καλεῖται*

σεμνός.—But I cannot think that this superfluous *πᾶς* is right; I had thought of *πρὸς μὲν τάκόλαστιμ' εἰσιών*, but *ἀκόλαστος* is a somewhat hazardous formation, and though *εἰσιών* could be said of wealth entering a house, one would expect then *πλοῦτος γὰρ εἰς μὲν . . .*

p. 812 Moschion 2

ὦ καὶ θεῶν κρατοῦσα καὶ θνητῶν μόνη μοῖρ', ὦ λιταῖς ἄτρωτε δυστήνων βροτῶν πάντολμ' ἀνάγκη, . . .

For *ἄτρωτε* Mr. Tucker suggests *ἄπωτε* 'with ears averted from.' Nauck's *ἄτεγκτε* would be normal Greek; but I suspect that here the true word was *ἄτρεπτε*: *Plut. de Stoic. repugn.* p. 1056 c *τὴν δ' εἰμαρμένην αἰτίαν ἀνίκητον καὶ ἀκώλυτον καὶ ἀτρεπτον ἀποφαίνων αὐτὸς Ἀτροπον καλεῖ . . .* from 'Arist.' *de Mundo* p. 401^b 8-19, seemingly: *οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀνάγκην οὐκ ἄλλο τι λέγεσθαι πλὴν τοῦτον, οἷον εἰ ἀνίκητον οὐσίαν ὄντα, εἰμαρμένην δὲ διὰ τὸ εἶραι τε καὶ χωρεῖν ἀκωλύτως, πεπωμένην δὲ διὰ τὸ πεπερατωσθαι πάντα . . . τέτακται δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὸ γεγονὸς μία τῶν Μοιρῶν, Ἀτροπος, ἐπεὶ τὰ παρελθόντα πάντα ἀτρεπτά ἐστιν . . .* If so, the author of that treatise is, as *Osann* reasonably thought, *Chrysippus*.

Kaibel Ep. 507 *μοῖρην ὑπ' ἀτρέπτω*. 727 *μετὰ μοῖραν ἀτρεπτον*. This therefore was an established attribute of *μοῖρα* or *ἀνάγκη*, like the first line and the epithet *πάντολμος* and the *ζυγόν* following.

p. 820 Sosiphanes 2

νῦν σοὶ πρὸς ὄψιν (at the sight) *θυμὸς ἡβάτω, γέρον· νυνὶ δέ γ' ὀργὴν ἡνίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν*.

ὀργὴν λαβεῖν ἡνίκ' ἡδικοῦ 'to grow angry when you were being wronged' might have been preceded by *τότε ἔδει*, but not by *νῦν δέ*: therefore in *C.R.* 1899 p. 5 I gave *νῦν δέ σέ γ' ὀργὴν ἡλίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν*. Mr. Tucker now offers *νῦν δέ σ' ἐς ὀργὴν ἡλίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν*, rendering it 'now might you take in wrath the great injuries you suffered.'

But surely this is no improvement, in the absence of any evidence that Greek ever said *ἐς ὀργὴν λαβεῖν τι*. On the other hand *ὀργὴν λαβεῖν* is good Greek; as *ὀργὴν ἔχειν* is 'to be in a state of anger' like *νόσον ἔχειν*,

so ὀργὴν λαβεῖν is 'to conceive anger' at the moment (νῦν) like νόσον λαβεῖν: e.g. Dem. 743 ταύτην τὴν ὀργὴν νῦν ἐπὶ τουτονὶ λάβετε. But what νῦν δὲ γ' should be there is no means of determining: to the conjectures Nauck records add νῦν δὲ γὰρ by Naeke *Opusc.* I 46. A scribe may have found merely νῦν δὲ ὀργήν, for it was their

common practice to insert γ' to fill up a hiatus between vowels; or it may have been originally νῦν δὴ σὸν ὀργὴν ἡλίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν corrupted to νῦν δὲ σ' . . . as in Soph. *O.C.* 721 νῦν σὸν τὰ λαμπρὰ ταῦτα δὴ φαίνειν ἔπη was corrupted to νῦν σοὶ . . . δὲ . . .

W. HEADLAM.

ADVERSARIA UPON FRAGMENTA TRAGICORUM ADESPOTA.

[*The Numeration is Nauck's (1889).*]

frag. adesp. 115:

τοῦ σώματος γὰρ εἶναι οἱ πολλοὶ πόνοι
τοῦδ' εἶναι οἶκον στέφανον ἐξηγῆκαμεν,
λευκὸν τ' ὀρύσσειν ἄργυρον σπείρειν τε γῆν,
τά τ' ἄλλ' ὅς' ἡμεῖς ὀνόμασιν γινώσκο-
μεν.

Read τά τ' ἄλλ' ἃ σεμνοῖς κ.τ.λ.

frag. adesp. 118:

τίς ὧδε μῶρος καὶ λίαν ἀναιμένος
εὐπιστος ἀνδρῶν ὅστις ἐλπίζει θεοὺς
ὅστων ἀσάρκων καὶ χολῆς πυρουνένης,
ἃ καὶ κυσὶν πεινῶσιν οὐχὶ βρώσιμα,
χαίρειν ἀπαρχαῖς καὶ γέρας ἔλαχεῖν τόδε;

Read καλεῖν. [In the first line the ἀναιμένως of Grotius is surely an improvement.]

frag. adesp. 124:

σοφὴ μὲν ἤμην, ἀλλὰ πάντ' οὐκ εὐτυχής.

The order is bad and ἤμην will not do. Another version gives ἀλλὰ οὐ πάντα εὐτυχής. I suggest

σοφὴ μὲν ἦν, ἀλλ' οὐ τι πάντα γ' εὐτυχής.

frag. adesp. 126:

ὦ κακοὶ
κἀνάξιοι τῆς ἐμῆς σποράς,
Αἰτωλίδος ἀγάλματα μητρός.

This may possibly be right, since in Eur. *fr.* 386 there occurs ἀνόνητον ἀγάμ', ὦ πάτερ, οἴκοισι τεκόν. But the context there is unknown, whereas in the present place Heracles is reproaching his children ὡς μαλακοὺς. I suspect that the true word was ἀτάλαματα, i.e. '(petted) nurselings.' They were παῖδες μητέρων τετραμμένοι (*Aesch.* *S. c. T.* 777).

frag. adesp. 270:

Hesychius has ἔτραπεζίτην Πάριν τὸν παρα-

βάνα τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ ἀτιμάσαντα τὸν Μενέλαον.

Read τραπέζα τῆς τῆς (i.e. τὸν ἀτίζοντα τὴν τράπεζαν). This is nearer to the explanation than an otherwise possible τραπέζα πάτην.

frag. adesp. 310:

ἐχθροῖς ἀπιστῶν οὐ ποτ' ἂν ἑπάθοις βλάβην

is surely dubious Greek, but might be quoted by commentators on Xen. *An.* 6. 6. 25 (βίαν χρῆναι πάσχειν αὐτόν). There Stephanus read βία (IA for N), although Cobet (*N.L.* p. 526) seems to think that he himself is the first to make the correction. Here I should read λάβοις.

frag. adesp. 457:

ἔν τῳ λαλεῖν δὲ μὴδὲ μηχανεῖν λόγον.

The schol. on Soph. *El.* 1437 quotes this by way of illustration along with his interpretation δι' ὧτος ἂν παῖρά γε μὴ ἀνατεταμένως φθέγγεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐλαφρῶς. The equivalent of ἐλαφρῶς and the opposite of ἀνατεταμένως is ἀνετῶς, of which ἐν τῳ is an easy corruption.

[Here, by the way, emend Hesych. ἀνετῶς ἀνατεταμένως = Soph. *fr.* 583. This being directly opposite to the truth, we must emend with ἀνετῶς.]

frag. adesp. 458:

In the schol. on Soph. *O.C.* 1375 (quoting this fragment) a variant story is given of the cause of the curse of Oedipus upon his sons. The schol. proceeds καὶ ἔοικεν τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἡκεῖν ἐπὶ πολλοῦς, ὡς καὶ παρὰ τινι αὐτὰ ἔκκετῆσθαι πρὸς τὸ γελοϊότερον κ.τ.λ.

Read ἐκκεῖσθαι. The story is 'set forth.'

frag. adesp. 484:

ἔφθειρε γὰρ ἡ πρόνοια τὴν ἀβουλίαν.

The sense, if obtainable at all, is unsatis-