

## CLEONYMUS' ANGER: ISAEUS 1. 10

<Τ>ότε<sup>1</sup> γοῦν ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ὀργῆς<sup>2</sup> Κλεώνυμος ταύτας ποιεῖται τὰς διαθήκας, οὐχ ἡμῖν ἐγκαλῶν, ὡς ὕστερον † ἐσώθη † ἔλεγεν, ὁρῶν δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐπιτροπευομένους ὑπὸ Δεινίου, καὶ δεδιὼς μὴ τελευτήσειεν αὐτὸς ἔτι παῖδας ἡμᾶς καταλιπὼν καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἡμετέρας οὐσης γένοιτο κύριος Δεινίας· ἤγεῖτο γὰρ δεινὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐχθιστὸν ἰῶν οἰκείων ἐπίτροπον καὶ κύριον τῶν αὐτοῦ καταλιπεῖν . . .

Suddenly Cleonymus becomes at variance (διαφορά, 9), even at enmity (ἔχθρα, 9) with Deinias, the guardian of his nephews. It is under the influence of his anger against Deinias (ὀργή, 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 ὕστερον ἐσώθη ἔλεγεν, while Th. Thalheim (Teubner, 1903; reprint 1963) adopted Schoemann's conjecture ὡς ὕστερον ἔργῳ ἐδήλωσεν, which is palaeographically indefensible. W. Wyse (Cambridge, 1904), P. Roussel (Budé, 1922), and E. S. Forster (Loeb, 1927) dagger ἐσώθη.

Cleonymus' anger against, Deinias, however, deserves a closer look. I think Isaeus is trying to prove that, in making his will under the impluse of anger, Cleonymus was not acting in his *right mind* (not εὖ φρονῶν, repeated three times, 11; 20; 43) and in *sound judgement* (οὐκ ὀρθῶς 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 ὀργιζόμενος ἐκείνω (sc. Δεινία) καὶ οὐκ ὀρθῶς βουλευόμενος ταῦτα διέθετο· πῶς γὰρ ἂν εὖ φρονῶν, ὃ ἄνδρες, κακῶς πρῶς ἡμᾶς ἐβουλήθη, τοὺς μηδὲν αὐτὸν ἡδικηκότας; (11). Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐνθυμήθητε ὅτι αὐτάς (sc. τὰς διαθήκας) ἔλυσε μὲν Κλεώνυμος εὖ φρονῶν, διέθετο δὲ ὀργισθεὶς καὶ οὐκ ὀρθῶς βουλευόμενος· ὥστε πάντων ἂν εἴη δεινότατον, εἰ κυριωτέραν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὀργὴν ἢ τὴν διάνοιαν ποιήσετε (43).

<sup>1</sup> τότε G. F. Schoemann (Gryphiswaldiae, 1831, p. 182): ὅτι A Q

<sup>2</sup> ὀργῆς A: ἀρχῆς Q

Now, with εἰ φρονῶν three times in the context I think the old (alternative) conjecture suggested by Karl Friedrich Scheibe (Teubner, 1869 = 1889) gains in force. Thus read: ὡς ὕστερον, <ὅτ' > ἔσω- <φρονίσι>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“ (σωφρονίσαι τὸ θυμούμενον τῆς γνώμης), where τὸ θυμούμενον = ὀργή: Thucydides 7.68.1; 2.59.3. And one is at once reminded of Heraclitus' Fr. 70 Marcovich (= Diels-Kranz) θυμῷ μάχεσθαι χαλεπόν, 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).

*University of Illinois at Urbana.*

*M. Marcovich.*

### HELIODORUS AETHIOPICA 7. 12. 6

7.12.6.4. Εἶμι γάρ τοι τῇ δεσποίνῃ τὰ πάντα, καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ με † καὶ ὄρα, ἀλλὰ † καὶ νοῦς ἐκείνη καὶ ὄτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω, τοὺς καλοὺς αὐτῇ κάγαθοὺς γνωρίζουσα ἀεὶ...

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), ἔμματα, for the transmitted ὄρα ἀλλὰ, does sheer violence to palaeography.

Read instead: καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἀναπνεῖ με· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὄρα<σεις> καὶ νοῦς ἐκείνη καὶ ὄτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω... „For you see, I am everything to my misters: 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 κάγαθοὺς) for her mistress.

For ὄρασεις meaning „eyes“ see LSJ, s.v., I.2. Palaeographically, after the σεῖς of ὄρασεις 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 ὄρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ νοῦς ἐκείνη καὶ ὄτα καὶ πάντα τυγχάνω. The ἀλλὰ is „progressive“ (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. 21 f.).

*University of Illinois at Urbana.*

*M. Marcovich.*