

A FRAGMENT OF SIMONIDES?<sup>1</sup>

In Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (*E.N.*), at 1149b15–16, there is a quotation:

ἡ δ' ἐπιθυμία, καθάπερ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην φασίν· 'δολοπλόκου γὰρ κυπρογενούς·'

Aristotle does not tell us who wrote these words, and we now find the quotation as lyric fr. adesp. 949.<sup>2</sup>

What exactly is the quotation? It is possible that the γάρ which I have put in inverted commas is not part of the quotation. Where we place a colon before a quotation, Greek sometimes puts a γάρ in the middle of the quotation. F. Susemihl's edition of ps-Aristotle's *Magna Moralia* (Leipzig, 1883), for example, reads at 1209b34–6 (= fr. 296 Nauck):

καὶ γὰρ οἱ φαῦλοι, ὥς φησιν Εὐριπίδης, αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοῖς ἡδεῖς εἰσίν· 'κακὸς κακῶ' γὰρ συντέτηκεν·

and at *E.N.* 1151a9 some respectable manuscripts (L<sup>b</sup> O<sup>b</sup> and Laur. 81, 18) have an authorial γαρ in a quotation of Demodocus:<sup>3</sup>

οὐ μὲν ἀλλ' ὁμοῖον γε κατὰ τὰς πράξεις, ὥσπερ τὸ Δημοδόκου εἰς Μιλησίους 'Μιλησιοὶ <' γάρ > ἀξύνετοι μὲν οὐκ εἰσίν, δρῶσιν δ' οἵαπερ ἀξύνετοι·

In a fairly early, independent manuscript of *E.N.* there is a plausible attribution of the fragment. The manuscript is Laur. 81, 18 and is the product of an important scriptorium, that of Ioannikios.<sup>4</sup> It was probably written in c. 1175.<sup>5</sup> The manuscript contains many other ascriptions, which are correct, to other quotations in Aristotle's *E.N.* On f. 62<sup>v</sup>, above δολοπλόκου, the quotation is identified by the scribe as from Simonides: *σιμωνίδ.* The fact that the attribution is made in the same ink as the rest of the text (and not in a lighter brown ink, which the scribe uses frequently above the line for exegesis of the text) suggests that the exemplar had the identification. It is, in any case, most unlikely that someone in c. 1175 had a copy of Simonides' lyric poetry.

The identification may be 'old', transcribed (in all likelihood at more than one remove) from a copy of *E.N.* made at the time when Simonides was available,<sup>6</sup> or the ascription may just have been a guess.<sup>7</sup> But if so, it is a pretty good guess: when we

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to N. G. Wilson, L. P. E. Parker and Prof. M. Frede for criticism of an earlier draft, and to the editors of *CQ* and the anonymous referee for further comments.

<sup>2</sup> D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962).

<sup>3</sup> Demodocus fr. 2, M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (Oxford, 1992), vol. 2. For the manuscript readings one has to consult F. Susemihl's edition of *E.N.* (Leipzig, 1912<sup>3</sup>). Cf. also ps-Aristotle, *M.M.* 1208b16, Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1412b15 (after a conjecture by Ross); Menander, *Epileptones* 894; Philo Judaeus, *L.A.* 1.95.4; *Plant.* 85.3; *Aet.* 41.7, for other instances of authorial (i.e. quoter's) γάρ intruding in a quotation. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1035b8 and b11 (ed. D. Ross, 1924) uses intrusive γάρ, but in a definition rather than in a quotation. Cf. also *Met.* 1017a13 and *Rhet.* 1388b4 (where the MSS' γάρ is abandoned by R. Kassel [Berlin, 1976], but see J. E. Sandys, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* [Cambridge, 1877], vol. 2, pp. 134, 222).

<sup>4</sup> See N. G. Wilson, 'A mysterious Byzantine scriptorium: Ioannikios and his colleagues', *Scrittura e Civiltà* 7 (1983), 161–76. It was C. Brockmann, 'Zur Überlieferung der aristotelischen *Magna Moralia*', in F. Berger *et al.* (edd.), *Symbolae Berolinenses für Dieter Harlfinger* (Amsterdam, 1993), pp. 43–80, who first identified Laur. 81, 18 as a product of Ioannikios' scriptorium (p. 46), and who showed that, for the *Magna Moralia*, it is an independent manuscript. The manuscript has not been read by editors of *E.N.*, but I have collated its version of *E.N.*, and hope to publish my findings shortly.

<sup>5</sup> The dating is Wilson's: *op. cit.*, p. 168.

<sup>6</sup> Our sources for the fragments of Simonides, besides papyri, begin with Herodotus, Plato, and Aristotle, but Stephanus of Byzantium (sixth century), Choeroboscus (sixth century), Priscian

consult modern commentators on *E.N.* (Grant, Stewart, Burnet, Gauthier-Jolif<sup>8</sup>) we are told that the line is from an unknown lyric poet.<sup>9</sup>

Aristotle knew Simonides' poetry, as we see from the number of citations, attributed and not, in the corpus.<sup>10</sup> It is possible that Aristotle misquoted (or that the attribution was prompted by memory of) Simonides fr. 541 (Page):

ἦ γὰρ ἀέκοντά νιν βιάται  
κέρ]δος ἀμάχητον ἢ δολοπλ[όκου  
με]γασθενῆς οἴστρος Ἀφροδίτ[ας  
..(-)θαλοί τε φιλονικίαι.

But Page has treated the fragments as separate,<sup>11</sup> and with the famous background of Sappho fr. 1

ποικιλόθρον' ἀθάνατ' Ἀφροδίτα  
παῖ Διὸς δολόπλοκε, λίσσομαί σε . . .

it is perfectly feasible that Simonides should twice have used the adjective δολοπλόκος of Aphrodite.

Gauthier-Jolif (loc. cit.) raise the possibility that Aristotle is thinking of ('songe à') Theognis, *Elegies* 1386-7:

Κυπρογενὲς Κυθέρεια δολόπλοκε, σοί τι περισσὸν  
Ζεὺς τόδε τιμήσας δῶρον ἔδωκεν ἔχειν.

But this would not explain why Aristotle should have used the genitive. It is at least as likely that Simonides should twice have used the epithet δολοπλόκος of Aphrodite,

(sixth century), *Etymologicum Genuinum* (late ninth century), Photius (c. 810-893), *Etymologicum Magnum* (before 1175), and Tzetzes (twelfth century) are much later sources. None of these quote so extensively as to suggest that they had anything like Simonides' *Opera* in their library. It is significant, and a sign of the age the ascription would have to be, if it is an informed ascription, that the early commentators—even Aspasius in the second century A.D.—could not identify the quotation in *E.N.* (see n. 9 below). For an account of the authorities for Simonides' epigrams see J. H. Molyneux, *Simonides: A Historical Study* (Illinois, 1992) pp. 6-8.

<sup>7</sup> So far as we know, none of the reference books available in c. 1175 (Hesychius, *Suda*, *Etymologicum Magnum*, *Etymologicum Gudianum* etc.) could have led a scribe to attribute the quotation to Simonides.

<sup>8</sup> Sir A. Grant, *The Ethics of Aristotle* (London, 1866) p. 217; J. A. Stewart, *Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics* (Oxford, 1892), Vol. II, p. 200; J. Burnet, *The Ethics of Aristotle* (London, 1900), p. 315; A. Gauthier and J. Y. Jolif, *L'Éthique à Nicomaque, introduction, traduction et commentaire* (Louvain, 1959), vol. 2 (2), p. 633.

<sup>9</sup> Another modern commentator, F. Dirlmeier, *Aristoteles Nikomachische Ethik* (Berlin, 1969<sup>2</sup>), p. 487, says 'Meist der Sappho zugewiesen', but the basis for this attribution is the highly risky joining of this fragment to two others by Bergk and Wilamowitz. (See n. 11 below.) One can add, following Gauthier-Jolif (loc. cit., n. 8), that earlier commentators on *E.N.* (the anonymous commentary on Book 7 and the paraphrast) had wrongly ascribed the quotation to Homer. The earliest commentator on *E.N.*, Aspasius, refers to the fragment we are discussing and the next quotation at *E.N.* 1149b17—an explicit quotation of Homer—as τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν λεγθέντα (128, 31, Heylbut), from which one can infer that he did not know who wrote the fragment we are looking at. I do not know why E. Cardwell, *Aristotelis Ethicorum Nicomacheorum Libri Decem* (Oxford, 1830), vol. 2, p. 204 says that Aspasius attributes the fragment to Homer.

<sup>10</sup> See H. Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus* (Berlin, 1870) s.v. Σιμωνίδης. We should add a reference to J. Bernays ('Aristoteles und Simonides', *Hermes* 5 [1871], 301-2), who speculatively suggests that *Pol.* 1264a2 alludes to Simonides fr. 193 Bergk (= fr. 645, Page).

<sup>11</sup> See D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), p. 6, where he explains how the fragment which I am discussing 'has suffered much ill-treatment' at the hands of Bergk and Wilamowitz.

alluding to Sappho or Theognis, as that Aristotle misquoted Sappho, Theognis, or Simonides fragment 541.

One objection to the view that Aristotle was thinking of one particular poem is the plural *φασίν* in b16. Was Aristotle thinking, generally, of the phrase used by Sappho, Theognis, and Simonides (and perhaps other authors whose works have not survived<sup>12</sup>)? Quotations are often introduced imprecisely in the *Corpus Aristotelicum*. *Rhet* II 1395b29 cites Euripides' *Hippolytus* with the introduction *ὥσπερ φασιν οἱ ποιηταί*.<sup>13</sup> Quotations of poets, as opposed to proverbial sayings, are frequently introduced impersonally, with *εἴρηται*, *λέγεται*, or *τὸ λέγειν* (e.g. *E.E.* 1235a7, 1235a16, 1238a34, *E.N.* 1113b14). *E.N.* 1129b29 introduces a quotation, possibly of Theognis, with *καὶ παροιμιαζόμενοι φαμέν*. The generality inherent in the plural form (or the impersonal form) of the verb of saying, followed by a precise quotation, reflects the fact that the words quoted have been frequently quoted. Thus, whether the unexpressed subject of *φασίν* in 1149b15–6 is poets or is people (i.e. contemporaries), the balance is in favour of Aristotle thinking of one poem, a poem which had the words in the genitive, and yet showing an awareness that the epithet has been more broadly accepted.

Whoever's the *γάρ* is at *E.N.* 1149b16—we may just have a two-word fragment—we have some reason to rescue the fragment from the *adespota*.

London

HUGH JOHNSTONE

<sup>12</sup> Note fr. adesp. 919, 7 (Page) -π]λόκω Κύ[π]ριδ[, and Simonides fr. 575 (Page) δολομήδεος Ἀφροδίτας. On the latter see M. Davies 'Simonides and Eros', *Prometheus* 10 (1984), 114–16.

<sup>13</sup> Here see J. E. Sandys, op. cit. (n. 3), p. 222: 'οἱ ποιηταί is generalised from one, viz. Euripides . . . The plural sometimes expresses the single individual plus those like him'. *Rhet.* 1409b10 even attributes to Sophocles a quotation from Euripides. For the reliability of Aristotle as a source for the pre-Socratics, a closely related question, see J. G. Stevenson 'Aristotle as historian of philosophy', *JHS* 94 (1974), 138–43 and further bibliography there.

#### 'ATHENS AIDS ERETRIA': A STATE'S JURISDICTION OVER ITS CITIZENS' ACTIONS<sup>1</sup>

In the course of studying ancient Greek diplomatic relations I have come to think that one item of evidence deserves a little more said about it than it has, up to now, received. Tod II.154, entitled 'Athens aids Eretria: 357–6 B.C.',<sup>2</sup> is a document whose significance in Greek diplomatic history has not, I suggest, been fully appreciated. It is a unique epigraphic record of a genre of diplomatic instrument that was available to states which wished to emphasize their non-belligerence. R. Bauslaugh<sup>3</sup> has recently gathered the literary evidence for the use by neutral states of this type of instrument, prohibiting a state's citizens from serving as mercenaries for a foreign power, but he did not consider this decree, in which a state uses the same instrument to demonstrate its goodwill towards its allies. The purpose of this note is to place the

<sup>1</sup> I owe a debt of gratitude to Prof. J. Crook for his kind encouragement and helpful comments in the preparation of this note.

<sup>2</sup> Tod's dating is by far the most likely, although the decree gives no direct internal evidence for it.