CLEONYMUS’ ANGER: ISAEUS 1. 10

Suddenly Cleonymus becomes at variance (διαφορά, 9), even at enmity (έχθρα, 9) with Deinias, the guardian of his nephews. It is under the influence of his anger against Deinias (οργή, 10) that Cleonymus makes a will leaving his estate to other relatives, and not to his nephews, who are his next-of-kin: „For he found it repulsive to leave his worst enemy (τὸν ἐχθιστὸν, 10) as the guardian of his relatives and in charge of his property...“.

The text shows an old crux. Emperius was willing to delete the whole clause ὡς ύστερον ἔσώθη εἶπεν, while Th. Thalheim (Teubner, 1903; reprint 1963) adopted Schoemann’s conjecture ὡς ύστερον ἔργω ἔδήλωσεν, which is palaeographically indefensible. W. Wyse (Cambridge, 1904), P. Roussel (Budé, 1922), and E. S. Forster (Loeb, 1927) dagger ἔσώθη.

Cleonymus’ anger against, Deinias, however, deserves a closer look. I think Isaeus is trying to prove that, in making his will under the impulse of anger, Cleonymus was not acting in his right mind (not εὖ φρονῶν, repeated three times, 11; 20; 43) and in sound judgement (οὐκ δρθῶς βουλευόμενος, 11 and 43). And the fact that it was anger which forced him to make his will is mentioned no less than nine times in the speech (3; 9; 10; 11; 13; 14; 18; 19; 43). Consider these two chapters: καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν (sc. Κλεώνυμος) ὡς όργιζόμενος ἐκείνω (sc. Δεινία) καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖται τὰς διαθήκας ὡς ἐσώθη εἶπεν, διέθετο μὲν Κλεώνυμος εὖ φρονῶν, διέθετο δὲ ἐνδεικνύει καὶ οὐκ ὡς βουλευόμενος... (43).
Now, with εύ φρονόν three times in the context I think the old (alternative) conjecture suggested by Karl Friedrich Scheibe (Teubner, 1869 = 1889) gains in force. Thus read: ὥς ὑστερον, <δτ'> ἐσω-<φρονίσ>θη, ἔλεγεν, ,,as he subsequently stated, after regaining self-control." This verb is used by Antiphon, Tetralogia A, γ, 3 in the sense of ,,checking somebody's anger" (σωφρονίσας τὸ θυμούμενον τῆς γνώνης), where τὸ θυμούμενον = ὄργη: Thucydides 7.68.1; 2.59.3. And one is at once reminded of Heraclitus' Fr. 70 Marcovich (= Diels-Kranz) θυμῷ μάχεσθαι χαλεπῶν, which Aristotle (and others) understood as ,,It is hard to fight against anger“ (sixteen references, from Plato to Marsilio Ficino, in Marcovich, Heraclitus, 1967, 383—385).
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HELIODORUS AETHIOPICA 7. 12. 6

7.12.6.4. Εἰμί γάρ τοι τῇ δεσποίνη τὰ πάντα, καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ με τι καὶ ὅρας, ἄλλα τι καὶ νοῦς ἐκεῖνη καὶ ὅτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω, τοὺς καλοὺς αὐτῆς κάγαθος γνωρίζονσα ἀει...

It is the merit of M. D. Reeve (Classical Quarterly, N. S. 18 [1968], 268), to have recognized the text as corrupt, with the remark, ,,someone will mend it sooner or later.“ Now the emendation recently suggested by James N. O’Sullivan (in Class. Quarterly, N. S. 27 [1977], 240), ὄμματα, for the transmitted ὅρας ἄλλα, does sheer violence to palaeography.

Read instead: καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ με ἄλλα καὶ ὅρας καὶ νοῦς ἐκεῖνη καὶ ὅτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω... ,,For you see, I am everything to my misterss: I am almost her breath of life. I happen to be her eyes, her mind, her ears, and anything else...“

The old slave-woman Cybele is ,,eyes, mind, and ears“ of her mistress Arsace, for she is in charge of selecting guests of rank (τοὺς καλοὺς κάγαθος) for her mistress.

For ὅρας meaning ,,eyes“ see LSJ, s.v., I.2. Palaeographically, after the σεις of ὅρας had been mistakenly dropped (possibly written supralinear), somebody changed the word-order to make sense out of the sentence. Hence the transmitted order, καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ με καὶ ὅρας, ἄλλα καὶ νοῦς ἐκεῖνη καὶ ὅτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω. The ἄλλα is ,,progressive“ (Denniston, Greek Particles, 2nd ed. 21 f.).
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