NOTES ON THE FRAGMENTS OF SOPHOCLES*
by the late H. G. Viljoen

Soph. Fr. 149, Pearson; Fr. 153, Nauck, from the "Achilleios" Ερασταί: τέλος δὲ χυμός δοθ’ ὑπὸς ἄφης ἐχει, οὖθ’ ἐν χειροτόν τὸ κτήμα σύμφορον μένειν. This is what I suggest for τέλος δ’ ὑ χυμός οὖθ’ ὑπὸς ἄφη θέλει, ἵ στ’ κτλ. of the codd. Sophocles says lovers are like boys playing with pieces of ice: at first it is a novelty, but (he adds, in the lines quoted above) at length the ice becomes a fluid as it melts to the touch of the warm hands, and what was viewed as a possession becomes irksome to remain in the hands. We find ΔΕ > ΔΩ; ΕΘ’ > ΟΥΘ; ΑΦΙΣΕΧΕΙ > ΑΦΙΘΕΛΕΙ : E > Ο; C > Y; Θ > X > Δ. The wrong transcription οὐθ’ after χυμός brought about the change of οὖθ’ to οὖθ’ in the following line. Gomperz’s πτήμα is wholly unnecessary, as it destroys a fine point. [For ἄφης ἐξει cf. LSJ. εχε Β.Π.2.6.]

Soph. Fr. 371, Pearson; Fr. 342, Nauck: This fragment is quoted by the scholiast on Aristophanes, Ranae, 664 ff. as παρὰ τὸ Σοφοκλέους ἐκ Λαοκόντος. Aristophanes parodies Sophocles, but as the text of the Ranae, too, is corrupt, it is difficult to tell how far Aristophanes quotes Sophocles. I give first the scholiast’s version of Sophocles’ fragment: Πόσειδον, [δς] Αἰγαίου μυχοῦ θηρῶν ἄει γλαυκάς μέδεις εὐανέμου λίμνας ἐφ’ ὀ-ψηλαῖς σπιλάδεσσι σκηνῶν. As restored by me, we have here two iambic trimeters, closing with a paroemia—hence from a choral section. What I offer, is μυχοῦ θηρῶν ἄει for μέδεις πρῶνας ἣ of Aristophanes’ mss.: Y > E, X > Δ, ΟΥΘ > ΕΙΣΙ, EI > CH; and ΚΚΗΝΩΝ > ΧΤΟΜΑΤΩΝ : K > TO, η > μ, Ν > ΑΤ. The metre shows that δς must be deleted. ‘Poseidon, thou rulest the monsters of the Aegean deep, camping, dwelling on the high rocks of the calm blue sea.’ The monsters or wild beasts of the sea are sharks (Herod. VI, 44), κῆτη, etc. The text of the Ranae, 664 ff., reads: Δι. Πόσειδον Ξα. ἡλγησέν τις. Δι. δς Αἰγαίου πρῶνας ἡ γλαυκάς μέδεις ἀλός ἐν βένθεσιν. Aristophanes’ text omits the first μέδεις, but it has πρῶνας, showing that the omission took place after the corruption of Sophocles’ quoted words. Hence I restore:

Δι. Πόσειδον Ξα. ἡλγησέν τις. Δι. [δς] Αἰγαίου μυχοῦ θηρῶν ἄει γλαυκάς μέδεις βένθεσιν ἀλός.

I delete δς that evidently crept in when μυχοῦ was lost and θηρῶν ἄει read as πρῶνας ἣ. In comedy an anapaest in the fourth foot of the iambic

*From an unpublished manuscript dated May 1949. The author, who was Professor of Greek at Pretoria University, died in December 1952.
trimeter would be quite in order—so we need not bar ὀς on metrical grounds. For the unmetrical ἀλὸς ἐν βένθεσιν I restore the locative βένθεσιν ἀλὸς. In the iambic trimeter of comedy a dactyl in the fifth foot is a licence enjoyed by its poets. The joke is that Dionysus, who is in the nether gloom, calls on the god of the sea as dwelling in the depths of the Aegean, as near as possible to the underworld, and not on the high searocks. In Homer the locative βένθεσιν goes with λίμνης, N 21 and 32, and ἐν βένθεσιν with ἀλὸς (A 358, Σ 36): ἡμένῃ ἐν βένθεσιν ἀλὸς παρὰ πατρὶ γέρωντι. For μυχὸς cp. Aristophanes, Thesm., 322 ff.

We have a similar mistake in the scholia of Aristophanes on Aves, 303—
Hermippus, Fr. 72, Kock, ἐν Τοῖς Τετραμέτροις:

καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα τὸν πρᾶν δυστὶ ὅν κεβλη. πυρὶς
tὶς ὄνομάζεται . . . ;

For the variants cp. J. W. White, The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes, p. 74 f. Here we have to read: καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα πονηρῶν δυστὶ ὅν κεβληλυρὶς . . . . | τὶς ὄνομάζεται; The verb that governed Θεμιστοκλέα must have been in the preceding line that was omitted. Here we have ΠΟΝΗΡΩΝ > ΤΟΝΠΙΡΩΝ: Π > T; H > Π. A: ‘and Themistocles, who being cock of the walk of the scoundrels . . . ‘B: ‘What is he called?’

Soph. Fr. 373, Pearson; Fr. 344, Nauck. This is another fragment of the Laocoon:

νῦν δ’ ἐν πύλαισιν Αἴνεας ὃ τῆς θεοῦ
πάρεστ’ ἐπ’ ὅμων πατέρ’ ἔχον κεραυνίου
νότου καταστάζοντα βύσσινον φάρος,
κυκλοῦ δ’ παῖδας οἰκετῶν παμπληθία . . .

This is from a description of Aeneas’ flight to Mt. Ida. My reading is παῖδας for πάσαν in 1.4: ΠΑΙΔΑΣ > ΠΑΣΑΝ: I > C; Δ > A; AC > N. I accept Blaydes’ παμπληθία for παμπληθίαν of codd.—‘and a host of servants encircles the children’.

Fr. 114, Pearson; Fr. 110, Nauck:

οὗ σ’ ἦδρε πελλῆς οἴως ἀγραυλός σκοπός.
οὗ σ’ ἦδρε scripsi: ἐνθ’ οὗτε codd. πελλῆς οἴως Lobeck: πέλλεις οἶ codd. σκοπός scripsi: βῶτος codd. This fragment is from the Amphiaraos, a satyrlic play. Tradition related that Amphiaraos tried to hide in his house so as not to join the fateful expedition to Thebes, that meant his death, as he knew as soothsayer. But the Satyrs in his train would point to his fleeing into the country where he might have been spied by a shepherd tending his flocks: ‘where the shepherd of the dusky ewe in the country found you’. Or we may have ἐνθ’ ἦδρε. There is no context to guide us. σκοπός > βῶτος: κ > β; Π > T. ήδρε is, as a rule, given as ἠδρε in later mss.
While we are about it, we may as well discuss another fragment quoted for the use of πελλῆς: Fr. 509, Pearson; Fr. 468, Nauck, from the Ποιμένες:

κυνὸς πελλῆς τε μηκάδος βοῦς βηνέων.

For this corrupt line I tentatively suggest: ἤρασθε πελλῆν [τε] μηκάδ’ οἶν ἐκ κτηνέων. ‘You (the Shepherds?) took off for yourselves a dusky bleating ewe from the flocks,’ ἤρασθε > κυνὸς: η > κ; P > Y; AC > N; ΘΕ > ΟC. οἶν ἐκ κτηνέων > -ΟC βΟΟC βηνέων : ίν > Cβ; ΕΚΚ > ΟΟC; Τ > P. When μηκάδος arose, πελλῆς followed in the genitive and τε was inserted to join it with the preceding corrupt κυνὸς.

Fr. 126, Pearson; Fr. 122, Nauck:

ἡ δ’ αὖ ‘ζ νέον κουρείον ἤρέθη πόλει·
toῖς βαρβάροις γάρ ἔτιν ἀρχήθην νόμος
γέρας βροτείον τῷ Κρόνῳ θυπολείν.

This fragment is from the Andromeda. My suggestion is ἡ δ’ αὖ ‘ζ νέον for ἡμίουτον codd. (ΔΑΥC > ΜΙΟ; ν > υ; Ε > Τ); κουρείον Musurus : κόριον codd. ‘And she was chosen to be the new victim for the city (stats).’ For lines 2 and 3 I give Pearson’s arrangement of the words for that of the codd.: νόμος γάρ ἔτι τοῖς βαρβάροις θυπολέειν βροτείον ἀρχήθην γέρος τῷ Κρόνῳ. γέρας Buttman : γέρος codd.

Fr. 156, Pearson; Fr. 160, Nauck:

ἐλθοῦθ’ ὑποίας ἀρράξιν Ἡφαίστου τέχνη.
ἐλθόνθ’ scripsi : ὑ δὲ ἐνθ’ codd. ἀρράξιν Bergk : ἀράξιν vel ἀράξιν codd. τέχνη Dindorf : τεχνίτου codd. ΕΛΘΟΝΘ > ΟΔΕΕΝΘ. The absence of elision of ε in δὲ is a clue to the true reading. This comes from the Ἐχθλέως Ἐρασταί.

Fr. 177, Pearson; Fr. 179, Nauck:

γυναῖκα δ’ ἐξελάντες ἦ θράσσει γένυν,
πτάσσομεν ἐκαλόν τίλσεως ἐνημέμνην;

This is from the Ἐλένης ἄπατης. I propose ἐξελάντες for ἐξελάντες codd.; πτάσσομεν for τε ὡς τοῦ μεν codd.; and τίλσεως ἐνημέμνην or ἐνημέμνης for γραφίος ἐνημέμνοις. Through wrong division πτάσσομεν > τε ὡς τοῦ μεν. Elsewhere Sophocles seems to use only πτήσσω, but this ought not to put πτάσσω out of court. ἐξελάντες becoming ἐξελάντες, when πτάσσομεν was misread, needs no apology. ΤΙΔΕΩΣ > ΓΡΑΦΙΟΙΣ. The corrupt γραφίος attracted the participle into its case, gender, and number. ‘Do we shrink from driving out a woman who worries her face with make-up, withered, with eye-brows depilated?’ These must be the sentiments of the forthright Antenor, leader of the Peace Party in Troy. τίλσεως ἐνημέμνης, genitive absolute, is closer to the codd.
Fr. 272, Pearson; Fr. 250, Nauck:

This is my restoration of ήδε συλήνας Ἄρκαδός κυνή of the codd. The scholiast of Aristophanes, Aves, 1203, quotes this passage. 'Who is this woman? Why, you look like withered in your huge Arcadian hat!' The only change involved is κ > o and κ > v. We can never hope to solve such a problem as συλήνας unless we try out our mixed uncials.

One of the worst examples is to be found in Fr. 511, Pearson; Fr. 469, Nauck:

This passage is quoted to illustrate Eur. Andr., 274 ff. ἡ μεγάλων ἄχεων ἄρ' ὑπήρξεν, δὲ 'Ἰδαίαν ὡς νάπαν ἥλθ' ὁ Μαιάς τε καὶ Δίος τόκος, τρίτωνον ἄρμα δαμόνον || ἄγον τὸ καλλιζυγεῖ. . . The scholiast says: ὁ Μαιάς τε καὶ Δίος τόκος· ὁ Ἐρμής, μέμνηται δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας ἑκείνης ἐνθα σεριν τῷ μῆλῳ ἠλάδον κρυφῆσίμενα "Ἡρα καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ καὶ Ἀφροδίτῃ παρὰ τῷ Πάριδι, τοιαύτα ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν τοῖς Ποιμέσιν. "Ἰδης . . . ἄρμα—hence I restore:

I give διός rather than Διός, for 'of Zeus', as Sophocles does not seem to use the adj. Διός like Euripides, Cp. Jebb on Soph. Tr., 956 ff. Once more, if we do not try out minuscules interspersed with uncial, many a corruption will appear to be an insoluble mystery. As restored, we see that the metre is enoplic, anapaestic. Sophocles' τριολύμπιον is more elevated than Euripides' τρίτωνον. Hence we may conclude that Euripides is the borrower.

Fr. 360, Pearson; Fr. 333, Nauck:

My suggestion is τῷ Δωρικῷ of the obscure τῷς ὡς ἐμφ of the codd.: πικὸ > σεμφ : PI > CE, κ > μ.

Fr. 501, Pearson; Fr. 460, Nauck:

My suggestion is μὴ ἑρίζων αὐτίκ' ἐκ βάθρων ὅλῳ ὁμήρῳ ὁρίου γλυκοῦν ὑππίου ποιδός.

My suggestion is μὴ ἑρίζων for μὴ ὑβρίζων codd.: ν > ν; ε > β.
M. Schmidt reads δλφ for ἐλω of Hesychius. Cp. Apostol., 12, 63: δλφ ποδ. ἐπὶ τῶν τι ποιοίντων, ὡμοία τῇ δλφ ῥυτήρι. I read ἱρονον for κρούων. ‘And when a brawl arose, with full force I straightaway kept pounding his buttocks with swift kicks of my foot as I flung it up.’

Fr. 369, Pearson; Fr. 340, Nauck:

σῦ τε (γε;) παύσει λιγράθων μόχθων τοι
cata δαιστήτα τε καὶ πόλεμον . . . . .

This is my restoration of Herodian’s ἐν ᾗ παύσετ’ ἀμεράθων μόχθων τε καὶ δανοτήτος. The grammarian is at pains to explain the corrupt δανοτής and to determine its accent. Here we have a mistake that goes back to the second century a.D. I offer σῦ τε or σῦ γε for ἐν ᾗ: C > E; v > ν; TE or ΓΕ > ΗΠ; also τοι > τε. When wrong division and miswriting gave καὶ δανοτής, this was changed to καὶ δανοτήτος to go with μόχθων. As for λιγράθων > ἀμεράθων: Λ > Α, v > μ, Γ > E. We do not find παύω, active voice, governing the genitive. Cp. G. Murray, Eur. Hel., 1319 ff. I add, ex. gr., καὶ καὶ πόλεμον . . . . . Cp. Homer, Η, 29: νῦν μὲν παύσωμεν πόλεμον καὶ δηιστήμα. We have no context to show whether we ought to read σῦ τε or σῦ γε. The metre is anapaestic. For the position of τοι, cp. Denniston Greek Particles, pp. 549 ff.

Fr. 388, Pearson; Fr. 356, Nauck:

πάν δ’ αὐτὸ δεῖξει τούργην ὡς ὅρῳ σαφῶς.

I give ΠΑΝ for ΤΑΣΧΥ and ΕΡΩ for ΕΓΩ of the codd.: Π > Τ; N > XY; P > Γ . πάν removes the irregular anapaest in the first foot, ὅρῳ for ἐγὼ is another possibility. The absence of context makes decision difficult.

Fr. 434, Pearson; Fr. 401, Nauck:

tῷ γὰρ κακοῖς πρᾶσσοντι κυρία νέα
νῦξ ἔστιν, εἰ παθὸντι δ’ ὥστερα βανεῖν.

I suggest κυρία νέα for κυρία μία of codd.: κ > μ, v > μ, and παθόντι δ’ ὥστερα for παθόντα ᾗ τερα of S: v > η, C > E, in prodelision after η. ‘For the man who fares badly, the coming (new) night is the appointed time to die, but when he has become prosperous, it is a later night.’

Fr. 508, Pearson; Fr. 467, Nauck:

λόρῳ γὰρ ἔλκιος οὐδὲν οἶδα ποῦ τι δεῖν.

I read ΤΙΔΕΙΝ for ΤΥΧΕΙΝ: ΙΔ > ΥΧ. ‘For I do not know how in any way to bandage a wound with an incantation.’

Fr. 894, Pearson; Fr. 808, Nauck:

δρῆτ’ γέροντος ἰδίῳ μαλακὴ κοπίς
ἐν χειρὶ θητὸς, ἐν τάχει δ’ ἀμβλύνεται.
This fragment is preserved in the scholia, Eur. Or., 490, where it is stated: ... συνελάθοσα τῷ γήρῳ σου ἡ ὄργη ἀπαίδευτον σε ποιεῖ. ὡς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ὀργή ... ἀμβλύνεται. The adjective ἀπαίδευτος points to θῆς, the uncouth and unskilled day-labourer who cannot handle a knife with a fine blade. So I read θητός for θήγει of codd.: TOC > ΓΕΓΕ; θήγει was called forth by ἀμβλύνεται.

Frag. 906, Pearson; Fr. 820 Nauck:

μέλπεις, σοφιστ', ἱήλεμον . . . . . .

This is my suggestion for μὲν' εἰς σοφιστὴν ἐμὸν, cited by the scholiast, Pind, I V.36. N > ΔΠ; ΗΝ from ΗΛ. Another possibility is μέλπ', ὁ σοφιστ', ἱήλεμον.

This takes us to Aesch., Fr. 314, Nauck, where σοφιστῆς, musician, is cited: εἴτ' οὖν σοφιστῆς πολλὰ παραπαίων χέλων. Here I restore sense and metre by reading πολλὰ for καλὰ of codd.: ΠΟ > Κ; Λ > Α. 'either . . . or (whether . . . or) a musician striking many a wrong note on the lyre.' In the absence of context we cannot tell how εἴτ' οὖν is to be rendered.

Fr. 935, Pearson; Fr. 849, Nauck:

μὴ μοι κρυφαῖν μηδὲν εξείπης ἐπος-
κλήθρον γὰρ οὔδεν. ὁ δ' ἄν εὐπετές λάκης
γλώσσης κρυφαίν, οὐδ' ἐκεῖνος ἃρ' ἔδ.'

I suggest φ. . . λάκης for ὃς . . . λάβοις codd. Here I > C; κ > β; ΗΗ > ΟI by itacism, are all easy transcriptional errors. And οὐδ' ἐκεῖνος ἃρ' ἔδ' is what I give for οὔδεν οὐ διέρχεται codd.: κ > ν, ΕΙ > ΟΥ, Ν > ΔI, ΟC > EP, ΑPΕ > ΧΕΤ. After the imperative of the first line, we expect a reference to the results when secrets are freely communicated—hence my reading: 'That man to whom you glibly blurt out a secret of the tongue, as we know (ἀρ'), does not let it be.' We have ἃρα = ἄρα. Cp. Jebb on Soph. El. 1179: οὐμοι ταλαίνης ἅρα τῆς συμφορᾶς. For οὔδε emphasizing a person, cp. Jebb on Soph. Tr. 127. In translation this may be brought out by printing such a stressed word in italics.

Fr. 938, Pearson; Fr. 852, Nauck:

πολλῶν μαχῶν δεῖ τῷ καλῶν τι μοιμένῳ.
μικρὸθ' ἄγωνος οὐ μέγ' ἐρχεται κλέος.

I suggest μαχῶν for καλῶν codd.: μ > κ; Χ > Λ.

Fr. 956, Pearson; Fr. 870, Nauck:

ὑπέρ τε πάντον πάντ' ἐπ' ἐσχάτα χθονός
νυκτός τε πηγάς οὐρανοῦ τ' ἀναπτυχ' Δ
Φοίβου τε ταμίου κήπον . . . . . .

27
My suggestion is ταμίου for παλαιόν of codd. I do not accept παλαιόν as scanning ἄ. Pearson refers to Eur. El. 497 in support of ατ as a short syllable: παλαιόν τε θησαύρισμα Διονύσου τόδε. But here, too, I would suggest ταμίου for παλαιόν in apposition to Διονύσου: 'This treasure of Dionysus, the steward (or dispenser)’—Τ > Π, Μ > ΛΑ, υ > ν.
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