

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### ON AESCHYLUS' FRAGMENT 429A RADT (= 599A METTE)

Aeschylus' fragment 429a Radt consists of one word only:

κηδεία

The first notice of this fragment was given in 1833 by James A. Cramer,<sup>1</sup> who found it among some grammatical epimerisms<sup>2</sup> preserved on pp. 262–92 of MS Barocci 159,<sup>3</sup> namely within a list of words beginning with κη-:<sup>4</sup>

(p. 265 col. 1 ll. 11–18) κηδεία δέ· και κήδω, τὸ λυπῶ· και κηκάζω, τὸ λοιδορῶ· και κηδεία ἢ ἐπιγάμβρευσις παρ' Αἰσχύλω· και κηψελίς [sic], ὁ ῥύπος· και ἄλλα πολλά.

*kēdeia*; and *kēdō*, “to trouble”; and *kēkazō*, “to revile”; and *kēdeia* is the connexion by marriage in Aeschylus; and *kēpselis*,<sup>5</sup> “earwax”; and many other words.

The same epimerisms, but in a much fuller version than the quoted one, have been found by Peter Egenolff in MS Barocci 68,<sup>6</sup> ff. 46r–66v.<sup>7</sup> I noticed that here the passage reads:

(f. 48v ll. 1–4) κηδεία δέ, ἢ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ταφή· και κήδω, τὸ λυπῶ· και κηκάζω, τὸ λοιδορῶ· και κηδεία ἢ ἐπιγάμβρευσις, ὡς παρὰ τῷ Αἰσχύλω [PV 890] “ὡς τὸ κηδεῦσαι {τινους} καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀριστεύει μακρῶ”· και κηψελίς [sic], ὁ ῥύπος· και ἄλλα πολλά.

My thanks to Ruggiero Lionetti, Glenn W. Most, Filippomaria Pontani, and the anonymous reviewer for their valuable advice. I wish to also thank Joseph Badawi-Crook for his help with English.

1. Cramer 1833, 114 n. 10. See also Nauck 1867, 324.

2. I.e., grammatical exercises. On this anonymous work, which is entitled *Ἀρχὴ σὺν θεῶ τῶν κατὰ ἀλφάβητον ἐπιμεριστῶν* [sic], see Schneider 1999, 677–704.

3. On this MS, copied by the humanist Andreas Donos between the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, see Coxe 1853, coll. 272–74.

4. This transcription (together with the translation) and the following ones are mine.

5. Here I maintain the misspelled form beginning with κη- in order to preserve the alphabetic order of the list, but it must be noticed that the correct form would be *κηψελίς* and that *κηψελίς* is not otherwise attested.

6. Egenolff 1888, 25. On this MS, which was written by numerous different scribes (among whom only Joannes Chortasmenos [ff. 72v l. 2–73r l. 12; RGK I 191 = II 252 = III 315] has been recognized), see Coxe 1853, coll. 101–8. On its folios I detected the following watermarks: (1) arch, similar to Briquet 794 (y. 1437–44); (2) basilisk, similar to Briquet 2666 (y. 1442); (3) tower, similar to Briquet 15887 (y. 1401–8): the codex is to be dated to the first half of the fifteenth century.

7. A full list of the witnesses containing these epimerisms can be found in Schneider 1999, 677–704. But no other manuscript apart from Barocci 68 and 159 transmits the Aeschylean fragment: in fact, these epimerisms have different versions in manuscripts. Barocci 68 and 159 have the same version (on this topic, see Schneider 1999, 684).

*Classical Philology*, volume 117, number 2, April 2022.

For permission to reuse, please contact [journalpermissions@press.uchicago.edu](mailto:journalpermissions@press.uchicago.edu).

*kēdeia*, “human burial”; and *kēdō*, “to trouble”; and *kēkazō*, “to revile”; and *kēdeia* is the connexion by marriage, as in Aeschylus [*PV* 890]: “that it is by far the best to marry according to one’s own condition”; and *kēpselis*, “earwax”; and many other words.

In the light of this reference, there is no reason for frag. 429a to exist, since MS Barocci 68 shows that the epimerisms actually refer to Aesch. *PV* 890,<sup>8</sup> where the verbal form of κηδεία, that is κηδεύω, is used with the meaning of “ally oneself in marriage.”<sup>9</sup> As a matter of fact, the few other poetic quotations carried by these epimerisms come from well-known and widespread literature.<sup>10</sup> All this may suggest that they are a Late Byzantine product. Although indeed possible, it would therefore be quite strange—even if surely possible—to find here an Aeschylean fragment not preserved elsewhere.

Moving to the comparison between the *versio plenior* of the epimerisms in MS Barocci 68 and the epitomized redaction in MS Barocci 159,<sup>11</sup> a similar abridgment of the text occurs soon after this passage. The definition of the verb κύω in MS Barocci 68 runs as follows (f. 48v ll. 4–5): [ . . . ] καὶ κύω τὸ φιλῶ, ὡς παρ’ Ἀριστοφάνει [*Nub.* 81]: “κύσον με καὶ τὴν χεῖρα δὸς τὴν δεξιάν” ψιλόν. The relevant passage in MS Barocci 159 (p. 265 col. 1 ll. 15) is: [ . . . ] καὶ κύω τὸ φιλῶ, ψιλόν. Here, too, the poetical quotation is missing.

As a consequence of what has been stated above, frag. 429a Radt is surely to be excluded from future editions of Aeschylus’ fragments. No occurrence of the substantive κηδεία is attested in Aeschylus’ corpus.<sup>12</sup>

The deletion of frag. 429a Radt is not without consequences for a textual issue in Aesch. frag. 164 Radt. August Nauck excluded frag. 429a Radt from his *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, for he believed that the word κηδεία occurred in his Aesch. frag. 159 (599 Mette = 164 Radt).<sup>13</sup>

†σοφοῖς \*ἔστι γὰρ πρὸς σοφοῦς ἐπιτήδεια†

This line is taken from the *argumentum* to Philostr. *VA* 4.16, written by Federicus Morellus in his seventeenth-century edition.<sup>14</sup> «*Senarius Iambicus ex Aeschyli Nioba.*

8. As far as I know, there is no evidence elsewhere for the reuse of Aesch. *PV* 890 in grammatical treatises or secondary literature. There are some parallels in the ancient lexicographic tradition for the definition of κηδεία (cf. Hesych. κ 2547 κηδεῖαν· ταφὴν and Phot. κ 645 [= *Suid.* κ 1490] κηδεῖα· ταφή, ἐκφορά), but they are very concise and different from our case.

9. See LSJ, s.v., II. Grammatical and exegetical texts sometimes consider the etymological area of the lemma, and not the lemma itself in the precise morphological form in which it is presented: see, e.g., scholium in *Od.* α 417d Pontani (cf. etiam γ 309h-i) ἐκ Τάφου] τέσσαρα σημαίνει τὸ “τάφος”; [ . . . ] τάφος ἢ ἐκπληξίς, ὡς τὸ “ταφῶν δ’ ἀνόρουσεν Ἀγγλίδης” (I 193).

10. See, e.g., Barocci 68, f. 48v ll. 14–16: ἴσταν ὅτι ἐπὶ μὲν κινήσεως τὸ ποί διὰ τῆς ο καὶ ι διφθόγγου γράφεται, ἐπὶ δὲ στάσεως διὰ τοῦ η, καὶ δὴλον ἐκ τοῦ “πᾶ βῶ, πᾶ σῶ” παρ’ Εὐριπίδῃ (*Hec.* 1057); Barocci 68, f. 50r ll. 20–21: φύσις γὰρ λέγεται ἢ ἐνοῦσά τινι δύναμις, ὡς τὸ φύσις τοῦ πυρός τὸ θερμαίνειν. φύσις ἢ ὠραιότης, ὡς παρ’ Εὐριπίδῃ (*Or.* 126) “ὦ φύσις, ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν”; Barocci 68, f. 50v ll. 19–21: βάρως σημαίνει τέσσαρας [ . . . ] καὶ ὁ ὄγκος, ὡς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς (*Aj.* 130): “οὐ μακροῦ πλοῦτος βάρως [sic].”

11. The fact that MS Barocci 159 was written about half a century later than MS Barocci 68, together with the presence in the two manuscripts of various common errors (see, e.g., ἐπιμεριστῶν instead of ἐπιμερισμῶν in the title), is not enough evidence to state that MS Barocci 159 derives from MS Barocci 68. Only a deeper philological investigation of these epimerisms would decide this matter.

12. If not in frag. 164 Radt (see below). In Attic tragedy κηδεία seems to occur only twice, in Eur. *Supp.* (134, 137). The verb κηδεύω, apart from Aesch. *PV* 890, occurs five times in Sophocles (frag. 683 Radt; *El.* 1141; *OT* 1323; *Trach.* 1227; *OC* 750) and thirteen times in Euripides (frag. 395 Nauck; *Phae.* 241; *Med.* 367, 888; *Hipp.* 634; *Hec.* 1202; *El.* 47; *IT* 1212; *Phoen.* 347; *Or.* 791, 883; *Rhes.* 873, 983).

13. Frag. 164 Radt has been edited among the fragments of Aeschylus’ *Niobe* by Radt (see below), but it has been marked with a question mark by the editor.

14. Morellus 1608, 170v.

σοφοῖς \*ἔστι γὰρ πρὸς σοφοῦς ἐπιτήδεια. Prudentibus affinia inter se pleraque». The source of the line is unknown.<sup>15</sup> Morellus evidently thought that in *VA* 4.16 Philostratus alluded to an Aeschylean line.<sup>16</sup> Many attempts have been made to emend this *locus desperatus*. Most scholars agree with Gottfried Hermann in considering ἐπιτήδεια as a corruption concealing the word κηδεῖα.<sup>17</sup> Although Hermann could not know the *Barocciani* epimerisms—where the usage of κηδεῖα by Aeschylus is reported—, since they were discovered by Cramer sixty years after Hermann’s conjecture, one might have been inclined to accept this emendation due to frag. 429a Radt (that is, to think that frag. 429a Radt refers precisely to this line of the *Niobe*).<sup>18</sup> Naturally, the proposed deletion of frag. 429a Radt does not mean that Hermann’s solution is not appropriate for Aesch. frag. 164 Radt, but it does mean that there is no external evidence for this conjectural emendation.

It is evident that every kind of fragment requires from scholars a special caution.<sup>19</sup> As a matter of fact, this case advises particular prudence in dealing with one-word quotations of unspecified provenance (if not for the author) taken from paraliterary sources.<sup>20</sup> Additionally, since these paraliterary texts are sometimes based on nowadays obsolete editions, it is likely that a fresh study of the manuscript tradition of the sources would prove very helpful in increasing our knowledge about the text of the fragments, if not in emending or restoring them.<sup>21</sup>

MARIA GIOVANNA SANDRI  
*University of Oxford*

15. Maybe from a scholium? See Hermann 1823, 14.

16. Philostr. *VA* 4.16.78–86 (Achilles is deploring Palamedes while talking to Apollonius): καὶ ἐπολοφυράμενος αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς ὡς μεγίστῳ τε καὶ καλλίστῳ νεωτάτῳ τε καὶ πολεμικωτάτῳ σωφροσύνην τε ὑπερβαλομένῳ πάντας καὶ πολλὰ ζυμβλομένῳ ταῖς Μούσαις “ἀλλὰ σύ,” ἔφη “Ἀπολλώνιε, σοφοῖς γὰρ πρὸς σοφοῦς ἐπιτήδεια, τοῦ τε τάφου ἐπιμελήθητι καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Παλαμήδους ἀνάλαβε φαύλως ἐρριμμένον· κείτῃ δὲ ἐν τῇ Αἰολίδι κατὰ Μῆθυμναν τὴν ἐν Λέσβῳ.”

17. ὡς σοφοῖσι πρὸς σοφοῦς / ἔστι κηδεῖα, Hermann 1823, 14; σοφοῖς γὰρ πρὸς σοφοῦς / ἔστι κηδεῖα, Boissonade 1825, 208 (frag. 1’ Νιόβη); σοφοῖς δὲ κηδεῖα ἴστι πρὸς σοφοῦς <ἀεῖ> vel σοφοῖς δὲ κηδεῖα ἴστι πρὸς γ’ ἄνδρας σοφοῦς, Fritzsche 1836, 13; σοφοῖσι κηδεῖα γὰρ ἔστι πρὸς σοφοῦς, Wagner 1852, 80; πρὸς γὰρ σοφοῦς τις ἔστι κηδεῖα σοφοῖς, Blaydes 1894, 10. Other emendations without κηδεῖα have been proposed: τοῖς σοφοῖς γὰρ πρὸς σοφοῦς πάντ’ / ἔστιν ἐπιτήδεια, Blaydes 1894, 258; σοφοῖσι πλεῖστα πρὸς σοφοῦς κηδεύματα, Sidgwick.

18. «Si recte κηδεῖα pro ἐπιτήδεια coniecerunt Hermann al., huc referri potest F 429a» (Radt, app. crit. ad loc.).

19. On this topic, see esp. Radt 1983.

20. A case of this kind is well represented by Soph. frag. 1111 Radt, in the discussion by Lämmle (2019). See also Lämmle 2018, on POxy. 1083 frag. 1.

21. See, e.g., Pontani and Sandri 2021.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Blaydes, Frederick H. M. 1894. *Adversaria in tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Halle.
- Boissonade, Jean F., ed. 1825. *Aeschylus*. Vol. 2. Paris.
- Briquet, Charles M. 1907. *Les filigranes, dictionnaire historique des marques de papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu’en 1600*. Geneva.
- Coxe, Henry O. 1853. *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars prima, recensionem codicum Graecorum continens*. Oxford.
- Cramer, James A. 1833. Anecdota Barocciana. *The Philological Museum* 2: 108–16.
- Egenolff, Peter. 1888. *Die orthographischen Stücke der byzantinischen Litteratur*. Leipzig.
- Fritzsche, Franz V. 1836. *De Aeschyli Niobe commentatio*. Rostock.

- Hermann, Gottfried. 1823. *De Aeschyli Niobe dissertatio*. Leipzig.
- Lämmle, Rebecca. 2018. Zur Autor- und Stückzuweisung von P.Oxy. 1083 fr. 1 (S. \*\*F 1130 R.). *ZPE* 208: 44–66.
- . 2019. Atalante *Philandros*: Teasing Out Satyric Innuendo (Sophocles, Fr. 1111 Radt = Hermogenes, *On Ideas* 2.5). *CQ* 69: 846–57.
- Mette, Hans J., ed. 1959. *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos*. Berlin.
- Morellus, Federicus, ed. 1608. *Philostrati Lemnii opera quae exstant*. Paris.
- Nauck, August, ed. 1867. *Lexicon Vindobonense*. Saint Petersburg.
- , ed. 1889. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*<sup>2</sup>. Leipzig.
- Pontani, Filippomaria, and Maria Giovanna Sandri. 2021. New Poetic Fragments from a Neglected Witness of Ps.-Trypho's *De tropis*: Callimachus, Ps.-Hesiod, Ps.-Simonides. *CQ* 71: 240–52.
- Radt, Stefan. 1983. Sophokles in seinen Fragmenten. In *Sophocle: Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, ed. Jacqueline de Romilly, 185–222. Vandœuvres-Geneva.
- , ed. 1985. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 3, *Aeschylus*. Göttingen.
- , ed. 1999. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 4, *Sophocles*. Göttingen.
- Schneider, Jean. 1999. *Les traités orthographiques grecs antiques et byzantins*. Turnhout.
- Sidgwick, Arthur, ed. 1900. *Aeschyli Tragoediae cum fabularum deperditarum fragmentis, poetae vita et operum catalogo*. Oxford.
- Wagner, Fridericus G., ed. 1852. *Aeschyli et Sophoclis perditarum fabularum fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Bratislava.

SOPHOCLES *TRACHINIAE* 1021–22

ΠΡΕΣΒΥΣ	ὃ παῖ τοῦδ' ἀνδρός, τοῦργον τόδε μείζον ἀνήκει ἢ κατ' ἐμᾶν ῥώμαν· σὺ δὲ σύλλαβε. ἴσοι τε γὰρ ὄμμα ἔμπλεον ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ† σώζειν. ΥΛΛΟΣ. ψαύω μὲν ἔγωγε,	1020
	λαθίπτονον δ' ὀδύναν οὐτ' ἐνδοθεν οὔτε θύραθεν	1021
	ἔστι μοι ἐξάνουσαι βίотου· τοιαῦτα νέμει Ζεὺς.	1022

1018 ἀνήκει] ἀνείκει L in linea, Λ: ἀν εἴη Nauck 1019 σοί . . . ὄμμα] σοί γὰρ ἐτοίμα Jebb  
1020 ἔμπλεον] ἐς πλέον J. F. Martin 1021 ὀδύναν] ὀδυνᾶν Musgrave θύραθεν L s.l.:  
θύραζ' vel θύραζε(v) cett. 1022 ἔστι zt: ἔνεστι cett. βίотου] βίотον Musgrave

This is the text and critical apparatus for this passage in H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson's edition.<sup>1</sup> Its general meaning is not in doubt. In response to Heracles'

This article originated in a seminar report by Ludovica Medaglia (LM) and its subsequent discussion by Glenn W. Most (GWM) and the students in a course GWM offered on Sophocles' *Trachiniae* in the academic year 2018–19 at the Scuola Normale Superiore (Pisa). We thank the members of that course for their helpful discussion of this passage, and in particular GWM's doctoral students Marco Catrambone, Stefano Fanucchi, Ruggiero Lionetti, Leyla Ozbek, Luca Ruggeri, and Stefano Vecchiato for their frank and incisive criticisms of an earlier version of this paper; we have done our best to answer their objections, but they should not be held responsible for our conclusions. We are also grateful to Professor Guido Avezzi (Verona) for generously communicating to us the relevant entries from the archive CCTS (Corrections and Conjectures on the Text of Sophocles) at the Università degli Studi di Verona. Finally, we express our gratitude to the anonymous referee for this journal, for exceptionally erudite, patient, and benevolent help with earlier versions. All translations are our own unless otherwise noted.

1. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1992, 282.