

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](#)



Some Suggestions on Diels' *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta*

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 05 / June 1902, pp 269 - 270

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206161, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206161

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1902). Some Suggestions on Diels' *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta*.
The Classical Review, 16, pp 269-270 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206161

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Pindar improves on this (x. 87) :

ἤμισυ μὲν κε πνεοῖς γαίας ὑπένερθεν ἑών,
ἤμισυ δ' οὐρανὸν ἐν χρυσείοις δόμοισιν,

where πνεοῖς and οὐρανοῦ are characteristic innovations upon the τεθνᾶσιν and ζώνου' of his predecessor.

There remains, I think, another indication of the date, not hitherto noticed, of a nature more precise than are any of the arguments advanced above. Theaeus, beside his victory in his native city, had also been successful in the 'Panathenaea' at Athens, where the prize was a jar of olive-oil. (x. 33 ff.) On this passage the schol. has a curious note: οὐκ ἔστι δ' ἐξαγωγή ἐλαίου ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν, εἰ μὴ τοῖσι νικῶσι. I know no other evidence for this exception to the prohibition of the export of oil from Athens, and I suspect that the reference in Pindar's lines is somewhat different. It is well known that about B.C. 550, when the Athenians were defeated by the Argives and Aeginetans, an embargo was laid by Argos on the importation of Athenian produce, especially pottery; cf. *Hdt.* v. 88: Ἀττικὸν μήτε τι ἄλλο προσφέρειν πρὸς τὸ ἱρὸν, μήτε κέραμον κ.τ.λ. In a valuable paper in a previous number of this *Review* (xii. 86) Mr. Hoppin has shown that this embargo must have lasted over seventy years, inasmuch as recent excavations at Argos have discovered scarcely any fragments of Athenian vases of the period B.C. 550-480. When the embargo was removed is unknown. Probably it was gradually relaxed or evaded; but it must have been formally rescinded in 460 B.C. when an Athenian-Argive alliance was formed. (Thuc. 1. 102). Readers of Pindar must have been often struck by the curious emphasis and detail of the lines in question (x. 33 ff.). At first sight they have the air of a pointless conceit :

γαῖα δὲ καυθεῖσα πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαίας
ἔμολεν Ἥρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν ἀγγείων ἔρκεσιν
παμποικίλοις.

'in earth burnt with fire the fruit of the olive came to the gallant host of Hera in richly-flowered enclosures of vases.' This feature will be removed, if we see in these lines a direct allusion by Pindar to the recent alliance between Argos and Athens and the consequent revival of the use of Athenian pottery at Argos. This is the alliance so often referred to in the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus, and such an allusion is entirely characteristic of Pindar, who loses no opportunity of glancing at the great political movements of his time and is indeed the most important contemporary witness for the history of his age that has survived for us. We are thus brought down to the very period which Dissen, arguing on quite different lines, long ago suggested. This was the period when Argos, after her capture of Mycenae (B.C. 464) became once more mistress of her plain and began again to resume her old place in the Peloponnese after the long depression succeeding her defeat by Cleomenes (494 B.C.). At such a time she may well have sent a citizen to compete in the games of her newly-formed ally Athens, and called upon the greatest poet in Greece to celebrate her reviving power by recalling the legends of fair women and brave men (x. 5 ff.) who had glorified her past. The poem must we know have immediately preceded an Olympian festival (x. 32): that, I suggest, was the festival of Ol. 80 = B.C. 460. The tenth Nemean thus follows next after Pyth. iv. (B.C. 462) and marks with it the zenith of Pindar's powers.

W. T. LENDRUM.

SOME SUGGESTIONS ON DIELS' *POETARUM PHILOSOPHORUM FRAGMENTA*.

Parmenides *fr.* 16. 1, 2

ὧς γὰρ ἐκάστοις ἔχει κρᾶσιν μελέων πολυπλάγκ-
των

τῶς νόος ἀνθρώποισι παριστᾶται τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ
ἔστιν ὅπερ φρονέει μελέων φύσις ἀνθρώποισιν.

Diels' παριστᾶται is surely questionable for παρίσταται or παρίστηκε of MSS. There

seems to be a corruption in τὸ, for which I would suggest αὐτὸ. If αὐτάντο is possible, why should not αὐτὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ be admissible? 'is the very thing itself.'

Empedocles *fr.* 4. 9, 10, 11

ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἄθρει πάσῃ παλάμῃ, πῇ δὴλον ἔκαστον,
μήτε τι ὄψιν ἔχων πίστει πλέον ἢ κατ' ἀκοήν
ἢ ἀκοὴν ἐρίδουπον ὑπὲρ τρανώματα γλώσσης.

In 10 Diels mentions a v.l. *τιν'*, which may, I think, be right. But the construction of the words *ὄψιν ἔχων πίστει* is very obscure. Nor can I see how it can find a parallel in the Homeric *σῆσιν ἔχε φρεσί*. Possibly the cases have become inverted *μήτε τιν' ὄψει ἔχων πίστιν πλέον*. If this is so, the accus. *ἀκοήν* in 11 is constructed *κατὰ σύνεσιν* 'not trusting your sight more than if you had heard, or accepting the ears' sounding message beyond the clear indications of the tongue.'

Emped. fr. 17. 20, 21, 25

καὶ Φιλότης ἐν τοῖσιν, ἴση μῆκός τε πλάτος τε·
τὴν σὺ νόφ δέρκευ, μηδ' ὄμμασιν ἥσο τεθιγώς·
τὴν οὐ τις ἴμετ' ὅσσοισιν ἑλισσομένην δεδάκε
θνητὸς ἀνὴρ.

ὅσσοισιν 'with the eyes' appears indubitably

right: is not *μετ'* simply an expansion of *τ'* trajected from its proper place after *τὴν*?

Emp. fr. 64

τῷ δ' ἐπὶ καὶ Πόθος εἰσι δι' ὄψιος ἄμματα
μίσγων.

So Diels partly after Karsten and Wytténbach: but, unless I am much mistaken, the last words as given by the MSS. of Plutarch *διὰ πέψεως ἀμμίσιων* point rather to δι' ἄψιος αἰμ' ἀναμμίσιων.

Timon fr. 62

ἐνθεν καὶ ὁ Τίμων αἰτιάται τὸν Πλάτωνα ἐπὶ τῷ
οὕτω καλλωπίζειν τὸν Σωκράτην πολλοῖς μαθή-
μασιν. ἡ γὰρ, φησι, τὸν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα ἱμεῖναι
ἡβολόγον.

μαίνευσι οὐ μίνας.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

ON THE MEMORABILIA OF XENOPHON.

1. 3. 14 οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἀφροδισιάζειν τοὺς μὴ
ἀσφαλῶς ἔχοντας πρὸς ἀφροδίσια φέτο χρήναι
πρὸς τοιαῦτα, οἷα μὴ πάνν μὲν δεομένου τοῦ
σώματος οὐκ ἂν προσδέξαιτο ἡ ψυχὴ, δεομένου δὲ
οὐκ ἂν πράγματα παρέχοι. Editors and critics
point out the unusual construction ἀφροδι-
σιάζειν πρὸς τι and also the very strange
use of the neuter τοιαῦτα οἷα, which is not
to be justified by thoughts of παιδικά. None
of them that I know of has suggested that
both difficulties disappear together, if we
take the second πρὸς as an accidental repe-
tion of the first, like ἐπὶ in 2. 1. 23 below,
and write ἀφροδισιάζειν...χρήναι τοιαῦτα οἷα
κ.τ.λ.

1. 6. 13 Ὡ' Ἀντιφῶν, παρ' ἡμῖν νομίζεται τὴν
ᾧραν καὶ τὴν σοφίαν ὁμοίως μὲν καλόν, ὁμοίως
δὲ αἰσχρὸν διατίθεσθαι εἶναι. τὴν τε γὰρ ᾧραν
ἐὰν μὲν κ.τ.λ.· ἐὰν δὲ κ.τ.λ. καὶ τὴν σοφίαν
ὡσαύτως τοὺς μὲν...πωλοῦντας κ.τ.λ.· ὅστις δὲ
κ.τ.λ.

The point is not that it is equally
creditable and discreditable to dispose of the
two things, but that in both cases there is a
creditable as well as a discreditable way of
doing it, two possibilities with regard to
each of them, set forth with correspondence
of μέν and δέ. It follows that in the early
part of the sentence we want adverbs, not
adjectives: ὁμοίως μὲν καλῶς, ὁμοίως δὲ
αἰσχρῶς διατίθεσθαι εἶναι, εἶναι meaning it is

possible. For the double adverb cf. Thuc.
2. 60. 6 οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως τι οἰκείως φράζοι.

2. 1. 23 ὁρῶ σε, ὦ Ἡράκλεις, ἀποροῦντα ποίαν
ὁδὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βίον τράπη· ἐὰν οὖν ἐμὲ φίλην
ποιησάμενος, [ἐπὶ] τὴν ἡδίστην τε καὶ ῥάστην
ὁδὸν ἄξω σε.

The MSS. (including Stobaeus who has
ποιησάμενος) are divided between ποιησάμενος,
ποιήσῃ, ποιήσης, and ποιήσῃ, of which the
last three are much more likely to be
'corrections' of the first than the first to be
a corruption of them. Is then ποιησάμενος
right? The understanding over again of
ἐπὶ τὸν βίον τράπη is so awkward that I
think not. It is more probable that some
word like *βαδίτης* has dropped out. If so,
it is very tempting to insert a word almost
identical with the first syllables of ποιησά-
μενος and hence easily lost, reading ἐὰν οὖν
ἐμὲ φίλην <προίτης> ποιησάμενος.

ib. 26 οἱ μὲν ἐμοὶ φίλοι καλοῦσί με Εὐδαι-
μονίαν, οἱ δὲ μισοῦντές με ὑποκοριζόμενοι ὀνο-
μάζουσι Κακίαν.

It is certain that ὑποκοριζόμενοι cannot be
used of calling by a bad name, as it means
just the opposite. There is therefore a good
deal of plausibility in the proposal to put
the word into the first clause instead of the
second; only then, as Gilbert says, *Vice
videtur tanquam suam causam prodere*. Was