

of giving the same word order, with the infinitive following δύναμαι, as similar rhetorical questions.⁹

Ealing, London

NICHOLAS LANE

njglane@yahoo.com

doi:10.1017/S0009838823000010

HERODOTUS 1.51.3*

ABSTRACT

This article presents a new conjecture on Herodotus 1.51.3.

Keywords: Herodotus; textual criticism; anacoluthon; conjecture

καὶ πίθους τε ἀργυρέους τέσσαρας ἀπέπεμψε, οἱ ἐν τῷ Κορινθίων θησαυρῷ ἐστᾶσι, καὶ περιρραντήρια δύο ἀνέθηκε, χρύσεόν τε καὶ ἀργύρεον, τῶν τῷ χρυσεῷ ἐπιγέγραπται Λακεδαιμονίων φαμένων εἶναι ἀνάθημα, οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγοντες· ἔστι γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο Κροίσου, ἐπέγραψε δὲ τῶν τῆς Δελφῶν Λακεδαιμονίοισι βουλόμενος χαρίζεσθαι.

Hdt. 1.51.3

The participles φαμένων and λέγοντες produce a clear syntactical discontinuity, and the phrase φαμένων εἶναι ἀνάθημα is rather abrupt. Solutions so far proposed are as follows. Replacing φαμένων εἶναι with φασὶ μὲν ὧν ἐκείνων (Jackson, *probante* Wilson) resolves both problems and is palaeographically plausible. Nevertheless, the sentence becomes less concise because φασὶ refers to the opinion of a third party, which in this case does not seem necessary. Abicht tried to preserve the transmitted text by adding only the pronoun σφέων after φαμένων, so that the newly resulting possession to the Lacedaemonians becomes clearer. More recently, Madvig's conjecture τῶν τῷ χρυσεῷ ἐπιγέγραπται Λακεδαιμονίων φάμενον εἶναι ἀνάθημα, οὐκ ὀρθῶς

manuscripts have single for double *sigma* at *Pyth.* 4.7, 5.71 and *Nem.* 5.54; one may add *Ol.* 9.8, *Pyth.* 4.227, *Nem.* 10.69 and *Isthm.* 8.39. *CQ's* reader observes that one can easily imagine how φράσσα was corrupted to φράσαι and the infinitive then transposed before δύνατο, either on purpose (to mend the metre) or by accident.

⁹ Isoc. *Paneg.* 114.3 τίς ἂν δύνατο διεξελεῖν; Dem. 36.44.11 τίς ἂν δύνατο ἐφικέσθαι; Anaxil. fr. 22.2 *PCG* τίς ἂν δύνατο ... φράσαι; Philo 2.176.1 τίς ἂν δύνατο ... ἐμφοσαι; Lib. *Or.* 24.39.5 τίς ἂν δύνατο διελθεῖν; *Ep.* 1321.2.1 τίς ἂν δύνατο σιγᾶν κτλ.: The sole exception prior to the fifth century A.D. is at Ath. *Deipn.* 1.18c–d ὅτε “οὐδ’ ἂν κολυμβᾶν εἰς κολυμβήθραν μύρου” [Alexis, fr. 301 *PCG*] ἀρκεῖσθαι τίς ἂν δύνατο, φησὶν Ἀλεξίς, but W.G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary* (Cambridge, 1996), 793 considers that the words after μύρου imply that the citer has ‘either unmetrically transposed the last four words of the fragment ... or so paraphrased or garbled his source that reconstitution of Alexis’ original text is impossible’.

* I dedicate this contribution to my students of the course on Herodotus given at the University of Tübingen in the summer of 2022.

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

λέγον has been well received,¹ providing as it does a text in which the vessel on which the inscription was to be read clearly appears as a ‘speaking object’.²

Herodotus is describing his visit to Delphi, during which time he had the opportunity to see the monuments and read the inscriptions himself, including those that had been rewritten to falsify the ownership of individual artefacts. In this passage, he focusses on the text of a specific inscription, with the genitive plural *Λακεδαιμονίων* referring to the Spartans’ claim that the vessel is their own offering to the temple of Delphi. But immediately afterwards he states that the basin belongs to Croesus and that one of the inhabitants of Delphi was responsible for the inscription, seeking to gain the goodwill of the Lacedaemonians.³ What the genitive plural of the inscription seemed to claim as a property right of the Lacedaemonians (*Λακεδαιμονίων*) becomes meaningful if we add a dative of advantage (*σφι*) after the verb of saying (*φωμένον*), so that the Lacedaemonians are presented as the active claimer of the basin offered to Apollo, even though the operation of falsification was concocted without their knowledge by some Delphian.

In this light, write *φωμένον <σφι> εἶναι ἀνάθημα*. The dative is particularly welcome because, in similar passages where the attribution of a votive offering is specified, the author introduces the dative of the donor.⁴ This pronoun might have been more easily overlooked than Abicht’s *σφέων*, especially since the two consecutive syllables with *-i* and *εῖ-* could be confused owing to itacism. Moreover, in Herodotus *σφι/σφι* (9 + 597x) is much more common than *σφέων/σφεων* (42 + 60x). Nor does this slight emendation risk oversmoothing Herodotus’ prose, which is at times rough, probably owing to a partial revision of the text by the author himself.⁵

Furthermore, it would be sufficient to imply here an *αὐτῶν* immediately after *φωμένον* to grasp the continuity between the Lacedaemonians and those who claim ownership of the offering. In this regard, one could also correct *λέγοντες* to *λεγόντων* since this would avoid the above-mentioned anacoluthon. However, anacoluthon is part of Herodotus’ prose,⁶ and in this case the unexpected nominative plural rhetorically highlights the false character of the inscription *Λακεδαιμονίων* more emphatically.⁷ The transmitted *λέγοντες*, in fact, constitutes an example of a

¹ Thus the translation of H.-G. Nesselrath (*Herodot. Historien* [‘Kröners Taschenausgabe’, vol. 224], 2017) and the text of K. Brodersen (*Herodot. Historien* [‘Reclam-Ausgabe’], 2022).

² On this notion, see M. Burzachechi, ‘Oggetti parlanti nelle epigrafi greche’, *Epigraphica* 24 (1962), 3–54; R. Wachter, ‘The origin of epigrams on speaking objects’, in M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (edd.), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge, 2010), 250–60.

³ Hdt. 1.51.4 ἔστι γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο Κροίσου, ἐπέγραψε δὲ τῶν τις Δελφῶν **Λακεδαιμονίοισι** βουλόμενος χαρίζεσθαι, τοῦ ἐπιστάμενος τὸ οὐνομα οὐκ ἐπιμνήσομαι.

⁴ Cf. Hdt. 1.92.1 Κροίσω δὲ ἐστὶ ἄλλα ἀναθήματα ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι πολλὰ καὶ οὐ τὰ εἰρημένα μούνα; 1.92.2 τὰ δ’ ἐν Βραγχιδίῃσι τῆσι Μιλησίων ἀναθήματα Κροίσω, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, ἴσα τε σταθμὸν καὶ ὅμοια τοῖσι ἐν Δελφοῖσι. But see also 8.35.2 τὰ Κροίσου τοῦ Ἀλυάττειω ἀναθήματα.

⁵ N.G. Wilson, *Herodoti Historiae*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2015), 1.VII–VIII.

⁶ H.W. Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York / Cincinnati / Chicago / Boston / Atlanta, 1959), §§3006–7 (‘Anacoluthon usually produces the effect of naturalness and liveliness, sometimes of greater clearness ... Natural anacoluthon is seen in the loose and discursive style of Herodotus’).

⁷ Already G.F. Creuzer and J.C.F. Baehr (*Herodoti Halicarnassensis Musae* [Leipzig, 1856], 106) had noted that ‘in seqq. verbis sensum magis quam grammaticam structuram Noster respexit’, while W.W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary to Herodotus, Volume I (Books I–IV)* (Oxford, 1912), 75 considered this anacoluthon to be ‘very harsh’.

hanging nominative,⁸ which points to a certain deviation in the regularity of the syntactic-grammatical links, without affecting the sense of the sentence.⁹

These emendations result in the following text and translation:

τῶν τῷ χρυσέῳ ἐπιγέγραπται Λακεδαιμονίων φαρμένων <σφι> εἶναι ἀνάθημα, οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγοντες ...

On the golden basin has been inscribed ‘of the Spartans’, who claim that it is their votive offering, although they say something false ...

Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen

MICHELE SOLITARIO
michele.solitario@uni-tuebingen.de
 doi:10.1017/S0009838823000046

SOPHOCLES, *THYESTES* FR. 260A RADT*

ABSTRACT

Two conjectures are proposed on Sophocles’ Thyestes (fr. 260a Radt) which restore Sophoclean language and metre.

Keywords: Sophocles; *Thyestes*; Stobaeus; Herodian; tragedy; textual criticism; indirect tradition

A palimpsest *codex* in Vienna (Cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) presents, as *scriptura superior*, a twelfth-century copy of Symeon Metaphrastes’s biography of John Chrysostom, copied over the erased pages of a tenth-century copy of an abridged version of Herodian’s *De prosodia catholica* and of an eleventh-century book of the *Basilika*.¹ Technological advances have allowed scholars to increase the number of readable sections of the *scriptura inferior*.²

⁸ On this grammatical issue, see R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hannover and Leipzig, 1898–1904), §493; E. Schwyzler and A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik* (Munich, 1950), 403 and 705.

⁹ See Hdt. 4.132.1 Δαρείου μὲν νυν ἡ γνώμη ἦν Σκύθας ἐσωτῶ διδόναι σφέας τε αὐτοὺς καὶ γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ, **εἰκόζων** τῆδε; 3.16.3 τὸ ὄν κατακαίειν γε τοὺς νεκροὺς οὐδαμῶς ἐν νόμῳ οὐδετέροισι ἐστὶ, Πέρσῃσι μὲν δι’ ὃ περ εἴρηται, θεῶ οὐ δίκαιον εἶναι **λέγοντες** νέμειν νεκρὸν ἀνθρώπου· Αἰγυπτίοισι δὲ νενόμισται πύρ θηρίον εἶναι ἔμψυχον; and 8.49.2 αἱ γνώμαι δὲ τῶν λεγόντων αἱ πλεῖστα συνεξέπιπτον πρὸς τὸν Ἴσθμὸν πλώσαντας ναυμαχεῖν πρὸ τῆς Πελοποννήσου, **ἐπιλέγοντες** τὸν λόγον τόνδε. See also 7.157.2 ἀλλῆς μὲν γὰρ **γενομένη** πάσα ἡ Ἑλλὰς χεῖρ μεγάλη συνάγεται.

* Editions used and referred to only by the editor’s name: H. Hunger, ‘Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians Καθολικὴ προσῳδία Buch 5–7’, *JöByz* 16 (1967), 1–33; H. Lloyd-Jones (ed.), *Sophocles: Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2003²); S. Radt (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (TrGF)* vol. 4, (Göttingen, 1999²).

¹ The dating is suggested by E. Gamillscheg, ‘Der Codex des Herodian in der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek zur Anwendung neuer Technologien in der Handschriftenforschung’, in V. Somers (ed.), *Palimpsestes et éditions de textes: les textes littéraires* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2009), 101–10.

² Hunger; Gamillscheg (n. 1).