A NEW FRAGMENT OF ARISTOTLE?

In Theocr. 1, 34, where ἔθειράδες occurs, one of the three Scholia on the passage says that ἔθειράδες indicates the hairs of the head. It adds ὅθεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ὀμήρῳ ἔγραψεν (π 176) "καύναι δ’ ἐγένοντο γενειάδες ἁμφὶ γένειον" οὐκ ἔθειράδες. The reading γενειάδες occurs in fact in most mss. of the Odyssey and is to all appearances the correct one. It is, however, curious that this reading should be due to Aristotle, as the Schol. says. Therefore Lehrs offered the conjecture Ἀρισταρχος, while I thought (see Valk, Textual Criticism of the Odyssey, 51) that the Schol. presents a mystification. At present, however, I am convinced that it is in the main trustworthy. As I see it, Aristotle interpreted somewhere the word ἔθειράδες which he explained as indicating the hairs of the head, and not the hairs of the beard. In order to corroborate his view he adduced Homer (π 176), where in fact γενειάδες is used to indicate the hairs of the beard. Aristotle added that ἔθειράδες was not used there. We know that also on another occasion Aristotle adduced a Homeric passage (Κ 457) so as to discuss a biological fact (Arist., De part. anim. 673 a 10). The source of Schol. Theocr. wrongly thought that γενειάδες was introduced in the Homeric text by Aristotle, who should have rejected another reading ἔθειράδες. At the same time we see that by a correct interpretation of Schol. Theocr. we can lay hands on a new fragment of Aristotle.
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TAYTA INDIGNANTIS:
THEOCRITUS 15.8 AND OTHER Passages

Γο. δ’ τὰς ἀλειμάτων ψυχὰς· μόλις ἦμιν ἰσώθην,
Πραξινῶσα, πολλὰ μὲν ὄχλω, πολλὰν δὲ τεθρίππων·
παντὶ κρητίδθες, παντὶ χλαμυδὴφοροὶ ἄνδρες·
ά δ’ ὅδες ἄτρυστοι· τὸ δ’ ἐκαστὲροι αἶνε ἄποικες.
Πρ. ταῦθ’ ὁ πάραρος τῆνος· ἐπ’ ἐσχατα γὰς ἔλαβ’ ἐνθῶν
οἶκον, σὺν οἰκημία, ὅπως μὴ γείτονες ὀμαίς
ἀλλάλαις, ποτ’ ἔριν, φθονερὸν κακόν, αἰὲν ὁμοίος.

Most recent editors of Theocritus follow Meineke in punctuating line 8 of the Adoniazusae after τῆνος. Though giving excellent sense, this text requires advocacy, since editors before Meineke, and some after him (including Gallavotti and Cholmeley), omit the point after τῆνος, thereby obtaining a totally different construction. The modern punctuation has hitherto been defended by somewhat lame and inconclusive arguments; I hope to be able to cite compelling evidence in its favour, and in so doing to identify an idiom which has never to my knowledge been noted or discussed. It will, however, be necessary for me to begin by considering the
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older text, since this conforms to Greek usage no less than does the modern one.

According to the older punctuation we have

\[
\tau\alpha\upsilon\theta' \delta \pi'\acute{a}r\alpha\rho\omega\varsigma \tau'\nu\nu\varsigma \acute{e} \pi' \acute{e}\sigma\chi\acute{a}\tau\acute{a} \gamma\varsigma \acute{e} \acute{E}l\alpha\beta' \\epsilon\nu\theta\acute{a}\nu \\acute{\iota}l\epsilon\acute{e}\\ \nu, \acute{\omega} \iota\acute{x}k\acute{t}\acute{h}\acute{i}n\varsigma, \acute{\delta}\pi\omega\varsigma \mu'\acute{e} \acute{g}e\acute{t}\acute{o}n\varsigma \acute{w}m\acute{e} \\acute{\acute{a}}\\acute{\alpha}l\alpha\acute{a}l\alpha\varsigma, \kappa\varsigma\tau\varsigma.
\]

The \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\theta'\) refers to Gorgo's complaint \& \(\acute{\delta}' \delta\delta\varsigma \kappa\varsigma\tau\varsigma\) expressed in line 7, and the clause \(\acute{\delta}\pi\omega\varsigma \ldots \\acute{\alpha}l\alpha\acute{\alpha}l\alpha\varsigma\) explains \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\theta'\). Cholmeley translates the passage thus: 'That is why that intractable creature came to the ends of the earth and took this rat-hole—house indeed!—to prevent us being neighbours.' This requires \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\theta'\) to be taken as an example of the well-established usage whereby \(\tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma, \tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma, \acute{\delta} \) and \(\acute{o}\) are cognate accusatives expressing the ground of the activity denoted by the verb\(^1\)). This accusative was used with transitive and intransitive verbs, e.g. E. Andr. 212 \(\tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma \tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma \acute{o} \acute{\iota} \acute{\eta}\acute{\theta}b\acute{e}i \tau\acute{o}\sigma\varsigma; \) Soph. O.T. 1005 καὶ μὴ μάλιστα τούτ’ ἄφικομην, ὃπως; Thoc. 14.3 ταύτ’ ἄφρα λεπτάς. Gow asserts\(^2\)) that \(\tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma\), when used in this way, always means 'That accounts for the fact that', and takes this as a reason for rejecting the older punctuation in our passage, according to which \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\theta'\) has to mean 'It was with that intention'. But this is too categorical; in sentences where the \(\tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma\) clause is followed by a final clause, the meaning of \(\tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma\) is as ambivalent as the English 'That's why', which can express cause or purpose. See Soph. loc. cit., and Pl. Prt. 310e \(\alpha\acute{l}l' \acute{\iota} \acute{\upsilon} \acute{\alpha} \tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma \nu\nu \acute{\iota} \acute{k}w \\tau\acute{a}\acute{r}a \acute{\varsigma}, \acute{\iota}n\sigma\). Our passage could be regarded as belonging to this type. Despite making adequate sense and syntax, however, the \(\tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma\) clause obtained by the older punctuation is still not wholly convincing; for, whereas in comparable expressions the \(\tau\acute{\omega}t\varsigma\) clause is invariably crisp and brief, in ours it would be rendered cumbersome by the presence of the \(\epsilon\nu\theta\acute{a}n\) phrase and the distinction \(\acute{\omega} \iota\acute{x}k\acute{t}\acute{h}\acute{i}n\varsigma\).

I pass to the text as punctuated by the majority of modern editors\(^3\)), which is set at the head of this paper. Gow translates 8 ff. as 'That's that lunatic of mine; he comes to the ends of the earth and buys a hovel, not a house, so that we mightn't be neighbours' etc. In the words \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\theta'\) \(\acute{o} \acute{\pi}\acute{a}r\alpha\rho\omega\varsigma \\tau'\nu\nu\varsigma\) he supplies the copula, and paraphrases its translation as 'herein we see, this is a case of'. In support of his interpretation, Gow (following a line of explanation originated by Meineke) cites in the first instance S. Tr. 1279 καύδεν τούτων ὅτι μὴ Ζεύς and Alexis fr. 94 τοῦτ' ἔστιν 'Ἀθανάμεια, τούτο Εξοικράτης; Of these, the latter might serve as a parallel if punctuated as a statement and not (as taken by all editors of Ath. 13.610e, its source) as a question. The former is shaky evidence, however, since the scholiast there understood ἐπράξε, and even if the copula rather than ἐπράξε has to be understood, these words of the chorus are very different in character from Praxinoa's indignant exclamation in Theocritus. As further parallels, Gow quotes a number of negative statements in which something is predicated of \(\tau\acute{a}d\acute{e}\), the copula being expressed in some cases and understood in others: