

## ***Polyidos, Ixion* — or Both? A Tantalizing Puzzle Between Direct and Indirect Tradition\***

(P. Phil. Nec. 23 ↑ col. ii.19–20 and Euripides, fr. 425)

**Laura Carrara**

There are eight points of contact between the newly discovered papyrus from Egyptian Philadelphia and tragic verses also known from the indirect tradition; 22 verses out of 97—almost one quarter—were already to be found in other sources, in identical form or with variants.<sup>1</sup> One overlap has proven crucial for the identification of the papyrus’ author with Euripides, since the discovery was prompted by the observation that four lines surfacing on the papyrus (col. ii.37–40) are quoted by Plutarch in his *De sera numinis vindicta* (*Moralia* 549A)<sup>2</sup>

---

\* I wish to thank John Gibert and Yvona Trnka-Amrhein for involving me in this exciting discovery through invitation to the conference at the CHS. I am also grateful to Chiara Meccariello for revising my English and my argument, to my pupil Gabriele Chirielli for discussing with me a lot of material derived from his master thesis on the tragic Ixion (currently under revision for publication), and to Tiziano Dorandi for giving advice on Stobaeus and on the related digital resources. I have first presented on (broadly) the same topic at the conference “La letteratura frammentaria greca e latina. Problemi, metodi, interpretazioni”, Merano (Italy), 30<sup>th</sup> May – 1<sup>st</sup> June 2024: my contribution to its forthcoming proceedings (edited by Adelaide Fongoni) is a continuation of the present paper and focuses on the line οὐδὲν φρονεῖ δίκαιον οὐδὲ βούλεται, on the phenomenon of the *versus iterati* and on the Byzantine tradition of fr. 425. Here, I will refer to that article with “Merano proceedings”.

<sup>1</sup> See Gehad et al. 2024, 6 and 30–31 (tellingly, the case in point here occupies alone half of that discussion).

<sup>2</sup> The coincidence is perfect save in one point, μάρπτει papyrus (and Stobaeus) vs μάρψει Plutarch (Gehad et al. 2024, 28). The papyrus testimony provides a strong argument—unless the supposed corruption was older—against the proposal of van Herwerden 1862, 64–65 of considering μὴ τρέσης in fr. 979.1 a replacement for ὠκύπτερος or the like (“no swift justice will seize you”). Parenthetical reassuring μὴ τρέσης is attested in Euripides (*Alcestis* 328 ἔσται τάδ’, ἔσται, μὴ τρέσης· ἐπεὶ σ’ ἐγὼ; *Heraclidae* 715 οἶδ’ οὐ προδώσουσίν σε, μὴ τρέσης, ξένοι, *Phoenissae* 1077 ζῆτι, μὴ τρέσης, τοῦδ’ ὥς σ’ ἀπαλλάξω φόβου with Mastronarde 1994, 449 *ad loc.*): here, the reassurance is bitterly ironic.

as from a play by that playwright (quoted without title;<sup>3</sup> until today, Euripides fr. 979 *incertae fabulae*).<sup>4</sup>

This paper concentrates on one of these coincidences, the sixth (the third in the *Polyidos*’ section), by far the most complicated to assess. It looks at the whole issue afresh, without taking for granted the correctness and truthfulness of the papyrus (as opposed to the indirect tradition) *propter essentiam suam et bonitatem suam*,<sup>5</sup> that is, as if it were ‘metaphysically’ superior evidence because of its ancient age and direct nature.

## 1.

The object at stake is the central couplet of the following pericope, col. ii.18–21:

—

ἦκιστ’ ἄπιστον χρῆμα καὶ μισεῖ δίκην.

ὅστις γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ἔχειν πέφυκ’ ἀνὴρ

20 οὐδὲν φρονεῖ δίκαιον οὐδὲ βούλεται.

—

---

<sup>3</sup> On Plutarch’s omissions of titles and authors’ names in his tragic quotations see Di Gregorio 1979, 12; Di Gregorio 1980, 77. Due to their general character (cf. Tibullus 1.9.4 *sera tamen tacitis Poena venit pedibus*), no one had ever ventured to attribute these verses to a specific play.

<sup>4</sup> The numbering is always that of the *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (TrGF). Quotations from preserved tragedies and from the other works of Greek literature are taken from their modern reference editions (Aeschylus: West, Teubner; Sophocles: Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, OCT; Euripides: Diggle, OCT; fragmentary comedy: Kassel and Austin, PCG; Plato: Burnet, OCT etc.)

<sup>5</sup> Duns Scoto *Lectura* I.35.21.

ἀμαθὴς ἄν εἶην θεῶν ὑπερβαίνων νόμους.

—

The two middle trimeters have turned out to be identical with two lines transmitted in Stobaeus' *Anthologion*; but there they come together with a third verse, absent from the papyrus, and under the title of another Euripidean lost play: not the expected Πολύιδος, but Ἰξίων.<sup>6</sup> *Ixion* is a play even more obscure than *Polyidos* (just five fragments, 424–427, plus three testimonies) and roughly contemporary with it (around 415 BCE).<sup>7</sup> The title character, king of the Thessalian Lapiths, is one of the great sinners of Greek mythology; the first slayer of a relative (his father-in-law), and for venal motives (to avoid the bride payment), Ixion was purified by Zeus from this crime but became then so ungrateful, naughty and mad as to desire to couple with the god's spouse, mighty Hera: he ended up punished by being hung on a wheel.<sup>8</sup>

Stobaeus' parallel testimony deserves a closer look. It appears in the third book of the *Anthologion*, in chapter ten—which bears the manuscript title περὶ ἀδικίας καὶ φιλαργυρίας καὶ

---

<sup>6</sup> It was, in a way, prophetic coincidence that Lesky 1972<sup>3</sup>, 505 lined up *Ixion* and *Polyidos* on the same page as samples of Euripides' late poetry.

<sup>7</sup> Upper limit: the death of Protagoras (ca. 420 BCE?), which Philochorus thought alluded in *Ixion* (FGrHist 328 F 217 = Diogenes Laertius 9.55): even if the allusion was not there, it must have been plausible. For the date, see Davison 1953, 36. See further the introductions to the remnants of the play by Jouan and van Looy 2002<sup>2</sup>, 211–217; Collard and Cropp 2008a, 460–461, with the relevant bibliography.

<sup>8</sup> On Ixion's myth see Gantz 1993, 717–721; on his ungratefulness, see Brillante 1995, 33–34.

πλεονεξίας, “On injustice and love of money and greediness”<sup>9</sup>—as eclogue nr. 7 and offers the following three verses in a row,<sup>10</sup> under the heading Εὐριπίδου Ἰξίονος:<sup>11</sup>

ὅστις γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ [S: ἐπὶ τῷ MA] πλέον ἔχειν πέφυκ’ ἀνὴρ,  
οὐδὲν φρονεῖ δίκαιον οὐδὲ βούλεται,  
φίλοις τ’ ἄμικτός ἐστι καὶ πάσῃ πόλει.

Whichever man is set on possessing more,  
neither thinks nor wants anything just,  
and is unsociable to his friends as well as to the whole city.

Until today, this has been Euripides’ fragment 425, with no doubt concerning its provenance from *Ixion* but with a debated variant in line one (for which see below, § 4) and quite a lot of uncertainty about the pertinence of line two (an issue which cannot be exhausted here: see the Merano proceedings).

---

<sup>9</sup> On this title, quite long and full, see the Merano proceedings.

<sup>10</sup> The text follows the still canonical edition by Hense 1894, 409–410. All readings have been checked against the reproductions of the three main manuscripts with the help of the Teubner editor of the *Anthologion*, Tiziano Dorandi. While codex M is not publicly accessible, consult:

codex S [https://digital.onb.ac.at/RepViewer/viewer.faces?doc=DTL\\_3230906&order=1&view=SINGLE](https://digital.onb.ac.at/RepViewer/viewer.faces?doc=DTL_3230906&order=1&view=SINGLE)

codex A <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b107236138/f32.item>

<sup>11</sup> The genitive Ἰξίονος is read *supra lineam* by S, f. 16<sup>v</sup> [Vindobonensis phil. gr. 67, 10<sup>th</sup> c.], the dative Ἰξίονι by M, f. 70<sup>r</sup> [Escorialensis Σ II 14, 12<sup>th</sup> c.] and A f. 26<sup>r</sup> [Parisinus gr. 1984, 13<sup>th</sup> c.]). Stobaeus can switch from (ἐν +) dative to (ἐκ +) genitive in giving a play’s title: see Carrara 2014, 186n96 after Piccione 1994a, 296–298; Piccione 1999, 144. Modern codicological descriptions: Piccione 1994b, 189–196; Dorandi 2023, 34–35.

Later in Stobaeus' book three, at the beginning of chapter twenty-two—entitled περὶ ὑπεροψίας, 'On haughtiness'—the quotation surfaces again in a similar, though not identical form. At first glance, this doubling might be seen as an Euripidean 'dittography' (= repetition of a quotation already used before), a normal phenomenon in Stobaeus' *Anthologion*.<sup>12</sup> But upon reflection this second quotation reveals a shape of its own, since (a) it lacks the title *Ixion* as well as (b) the middle line of the previous similar one (οὐδὲν – βούλεται), and (c) has a major variant in line one, thus reading as a whole:<sup>13</sup>

ὅστις γὰρ ἀστῶν πλέον ἔχειν πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ,  
φίλοις τ' ἄμικτός ἐστι καὶ πάσῃ πόλει.

Whichever man is set on prevailing over the citizens,  
is unsociable to his friends as well as to the whole city.

The headword here poses an intricate problem: in both Nauck's and Kannicht's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, manuscript S is said to have no lemma for this couplet,<sup>14</sup> and the same has been repeated in the *editio princeps* of the papyrus.<sup>15</sup> However, there is a lemma, written in the right page margin (f. 36<sup>r</sup>) just adjacent to the quotation and on the same level: Εὐριπίδ(ου) Γλαύκῳ, "of Euripides in the *Glaukos*"; but this lemma is commonly connected to the single

---

<sup>12</sup> Piccione 1994b, 178n3 has counted eighty repeated quotations from Euripides in Stobaeus' books 3 and 4.

<sup>13</sup> Text according to Hense 1894, 583.

<sup>14</sup> Nauck 1889<sup>2</sup>, 490: "lemma omisit"; Kannicht 2004, 457: "sine lemmate".

<sup>15</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 30: "no lemma".

verse standing at the beginning of the same manuscript line *before* the couplet ὅστις – πόλει. The association of Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ with this other verse has always seemed inescapable, since the couplet itself was believed to belong to *Ixion* on the grounds of the previous indication in Stobaeus 3.10.<sup>16</sup>

This ‘concurrent’ verse runs in the transmitted form βαρὺ τὸ φρόνημ’ οἷσις ἀνθρώπου κακοῦ; however, φρόνημ’ was persuasively modified to φόρημ’ by the French Renaissance scholar Salmasius, so that the text commonly translates as “heavy load (is) the self-conceit of a bad man”.<sup>17</sup> Due to the seemingly unavoidable association with the neighboring lemma Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ (see above), it traditionally counts as a fragment from Euripides’ *Polyidos* (fr. 643), since Γλαῦκος is an alternative title for Πολύιδος twice in Stobaeus’ work: in Stobaeus 4.4.3 for fr. 644 (τοῦ αὐτοῦ<sup>18</sup> Γλαύκῳ [4.185.4 Hense]) and in Stobaeus 4.50b.33 for fr. 645b (Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ [5.1036.6 Hense]).<sup>19</sup> But now that the new papyrus places at least the first line of the following distich (i.e., ὅστις – ἀνὴρ) in *Polyidos*, one might feel obliged to associate the lemma Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ with this couplet rather than with the other line βαρὺ – κακοῦ; the latter thus remains unlabeled and *adespoton*.<sup>20</sup> A consequence of this reasoning is that the

---

<sup>16</sup> Accordingly, scholars had variously detached Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ from ὅστις – πόλει: Hense 1894, 583 maintained that the real eclogue from *Polyidos* (*Glaukos*) originally located between βαρὺ – κακοῦ (comic) and ὅστις – πόλει (from *Ixion*) had accidentally dropped out; for more details, see Carrara 2014, 360–362.

<sup>17</sup> See Carrara 2014, 315 and 364 *ad loc.*, with further references (add Cobet 1877, 266 = Cobet 1878, 226).

<sup>18</sup> I.e., Εὐριπίδου. The preceding eclogue (Stobaeus 4.4.2) is headed Εὐριπίδου Πενθεΐ and contains *Bacchae* 270–271 (this is another example of approximate title comparable to *Glaukos* for *Polyidos*, see Carrara 2014, 366n128).

<sup>19</sup> For further details on the title(s), see Carrara 2014, 233–235, 360, 366, 380.

<sup>20</sup> This is the position voiced by Gehad et al. 2024, 6, 31: Euripides fr. 643 is a comic ἀδέσποτον (= fr. \*891).

assignment of ὅστις – ἀνὴρ + οὐδὲν – βούλεται (= Euripides fr. 425.1–2) to *Ixion* in Stobaeus 3.10.7 must be “simply mistaken”:<sup>21</sup> the papyrus now agrees with Stobaeus 3.22.2 in giving the first of the two verses, ὅστις – ἀνὴρ (albeit with the major difference ἐπὶ τὸ vs ἀστῶν), to *Glaukos* (i.e., *Polyidos*), and this agreement is considered a better witness to the original state of things.

The one just described is the situation reflected in Stobaeus’ manuscript M: there (f. 98<sup>r</sup>) Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ is absorbed into the running text, in red ink, and prefixed to the distich ὅστις – πόλει, while the verse βαρὺ – κακοῦ is kept separate through the symbol :- and left without introduction at the beginning of the chapter. That this line has nothing to do with tragedy, neither with *Polyidos* (*Glaukos*) nor with another play, had already been suspected by Wilamowitz (who judged fr. 643 “ein Komikervers”)<sup>22</sup> and, before him, by Cobet,<sup>23</sup> mostly because of the untragic ‘split tribrach’ in the first *metron* (βαρὺ τὸ φόρημ’: ~ ~ ~ -).

Manuscript A, for its part (f. 50<sup>r</sup>), also integrates the single available lemma Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ into the main text,<sup>24</sup> putting it in the heading of the chapter after the title περὶ ὑπεροψίας; a geometrical decoration fills the blank space between title and lemma, as well as at the beginning and end of the line. This adjustment results in Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ standing

---

<sup>21</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 31.

<sup>22</sup> Wilamowitz 1907, 173n104, continuing: “wol [sic] der Name des Euripides mit Eubulos zu vertauschen”; the comedian Eubulus wrote a Γλαῦκος (fragments 18–19), see further Hunter 1983, 110–112; Carrara 2014, 361–362.

<sup>23</sup> Cobet 1877, 266: “vix Tragoedia dignus versus est”.

<sup>24</sup> As it usually does (see Piccione 1994b, 195, with further remarks of A’s layout). The analysis of the manuscripts has been conducted in close exchange with Gabriele Chirielli, to whom I owe some of the following parallels.

exactly above the πέφυκ'-line, but this position is arguably not significant: the label seems naturally best understood as an overarching lemma introducing *all* three following verses, including (obviously) the first one.<sup>25</sup> These verses occupy the next line and a half, and they are written as a continuum from βαρὺ to πόλει, with no major break. There is a simple colon (:)<sup>26</sup> between βαρὺ – κακοῦ and ὅστις – πόλει, which does seem to signal neither the beginning of a completely new extract taken from another work and/or author (the symbol for this being a compound one in this manuscript, either : – or : ~) nor a continuous text (the mark for this being a single point; in fact, there is one single point between ἀνὴρ and φίλοις). The layout in A might be read not as an uncritical (con)fusion of disparate items, as it has been done so far, but as a conscious juxtaposition of *two different extracts from the same play* (this is what the separating colon is intended to indicate), *whose author and title, accordingly, need to be stated only once* (Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκωι). Elsewhere in codex A (f. 45<sup>r</sup>), two subsequent Euripidean extracts certainly coming from different sections of the same play are divided by the colon (it is Stobaeus 3.20.34–35 [3.546.9–14 Hense], giving Euripides *Medea* 446–447 and 520–521; admittedly, here the symbol follows the explicit note ἐν ταύτῳ, “in the same [place]”). M and A are twin manuscripts, descending from a common ancestor (χ in Dorandi’s forthcoming edition); it is possible that the relationship between the two quotations at the beginning of the

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. f. 51<sup>v</sup> of the same manuscript, corresponding to Stobaeus 3.27.1 (3.611.3–4 Hense), in the chapter περὶ ὄρκου: the label Χοιρίλου Περσηίδος stands above a trimeter by Aeschylus (fr. 394 *incertae fabulae*) but refers to the hexameter immediately following it (PEG fr. 10).

<sup>26</sup> The dot below is smaller than, and not perfectly in line with, the above one, but is a dot (not an accidental ink stain), cf. the two dots (within the symbol : –) after πρᾶσσόμενα on f. 56<sup>r</sup> (Stobaeus 3.29.83 [3.653.11 Hense]): the above dot is bigger than the below one and is a little further to the left.

chapter περὶ ὑπεροψίας was already unclear in that manuscript: M was unable to grasp and render the contiguity—but not continuity—of the two items, while A got the point.

The ‘unity-with-distinction’ is a possible way to interpret the arrangement on codex S as well, where (as described) Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκωι is in the right page margin, adjacent to the line hosting both βαρὺ – κακοῦ and ὅστις – πόλει. The two extracts are separated by a colon and some blank space,<sup>27</sup> thus were arguably perceived as two different entities. Graphically and structurally, there is no way to conclusively decide to which quotation Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκωι refers: it is certainly spatially closer to ὅστις – πόλει (line end) than to βαρὺ – κακοῦ (line beginning) but it would hardly have been placed otherwise, since the lemmata in the recto pages are written by default—albeit not always<sup>28</sup>—in the right margin, which is much more ample (conversely, the lemmata in the verso pages are on the left). But perhaps there is neither reason nor need to choose between the two, as it has been done so far by connecting the lemma only to the shorter quotation (the farther removed one), while leaving the longer, and closer, one “sine lemmate” (which seemed a necessary step in view of its concurrent attribution to *Ixion*): on the contrary, Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκωι could have been used as a shared lemma. This interpretation would be in line with the general ‘policy of economy’ of

---

<sup>27</sup> For the simple colon (instead of :- or ~) distinguishing two eclogues, see just further on in the same page the colon after πλούσιον (f. 36<sup>r</sup> l. 27), separating Stobaeus 3.22.3 from 3.22.4 (both authors’ names, Σοσιφ[άνους] and Φιλήμ[ονος], are written in the right margin). Other examples: f. 30<sup>v</sup> l. 17 after κακὰ (Stobaeus 3.20.12b–13) and l. 18 after ὀφλισκάνει (Stobaeus 3.20.14–15) [3.541.8–542.3 Hense]; f. 128<sup>r</sup> l. 7 after ἀπώλεσαν between Stobaeus 4.23.27 (*Andromache* 930) and 4.23.25 (fr. 603, from *Peliades*) [4.577–579 Hense].

<sup>28</sup> An exception occurs on f. 20<sup>r</sup>, at the beginning of the chapter περὶ ψεύδους: the left standing Euripides fr. 1035 *incertae fabulae* bears its label on the left (only the author’s name), Sophocles fr. 62 (from *Acrisius*) has it on the right (Stob. 3.12.1–2 [3.444.3–7 Hense]).

manuscript S regarding lemmata: faced with two or more quotations coming from the same literary work, this manuscript does not label them with ἐν ταυτῷ, “in the same place” (as M and A do), but writes the relevant indication just once in the margin.<sup>29</sup> Compare Stobaeus 4.23.21–24 + 27, in the chapter Γαμικὰ παραγγέλματα, ‘Conjugal Precepts’, on f. 128<sup>r</sup>: this score of non-continuous sentences from Euripides’ *Andromache*<sup>30</sup> records the relevant label Ἀνδρομάχη Εὐριπίδου just once, written vertically *a latere* (the title curiously, and almost invisibly, in the left margin, the author more clearly in the right one). The lemma Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ does not need to be vertical, because it encompasses only two brief quotations, accommodated on the same line: it can thus be written horizontally near them. There is an even more similar structure on f. 141<sup>r</sup> (Stobaeus 4.27.1–2 [4.656.3–7Hense]): the two short Menander’s fragments 833 and 834 *incertae fabulae*, standing one next to the other the same manuscript line, are separated by a colon and cumulatively labeled Με(νάνδρου) in the right margin.<sup>31</sup> If Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ applies to both opening passages in the chapter περὶ ὑπεροψίας without implying that they were continuous, it becomes explainable why the trimeter βαρὺ – κακοῦ does not figure on the papyrus albeit pertaining to *Glaukos*, i.e., *Polyidos*: because it belonged to another section of the play than the one selected for transcription there.

---

<sup>29</sup> See Piccione 1994b, 192–193, 196.

<sup>30</sup> See the edition and the critical apparatus of Hense 1909, 576–577: “eclogas 21–25 [25 = eclogue 27 on p. 579] lemmate εὐρ. ἀνδρ. comprehendit S”. See Most 2003, 147–148.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Hense 1909, 656 in app. cr.: “in S ubi una linea scriptae sunt ecl. 1 et 2, iuxta hanc lemma με adpositum est pertinens ad utramque.”

As for its wording, the line βαρὺ – κακοῦ is indeed problematic for tragedy; but this might point to a textual corruption (and not an irreparable one)<sup>32</sup> rather than to another literary genre (i.e., comedy). In his edition of the fourth-century comic poet Eubulus (a putative alternative author for the line, see above n. 22), Richard Hunter has called βαρὺ – κακοῦ “not certainly untragic”;<sup>33</sup> what contributes most to this impression is the meaning ‘grievous’ for βαρύς, an eminently tragic usage.<sup>34</sup> A genuine Euripidean *locus*, *Heraclidae* 4, expresses a related thought with the same adjective: the self-interested man is πόλει τ’ ἄχρηστος καὶ συναλλάσσειν βαρύς, “useless to the city and hard to deal with.”<sup>35</sup> At the same time, the other central term of the sentence, οἷσις, ‘belief, self-conceit’, is not so suspect<sup>36</sup> that it should be replaced by another similar sounding -sis noun.<sup>37</sup> It is true that οἷσις is absent from (preserved) tragedy, but the same applies to comedy; for both genres, this might be an accidental gap in the lexical evidence, since other -sis nouns designating intellectual activities

---

<sup>32</sup> The contrary view of Cobet 1877, 266, according to which “pessime mulcatus hic locus est”, seems exaggerated.

<sup>33</sup> Hunter 1983, 110n1.

<sup>34</sup> See Carrara 2014, 362–363 *ad loc.*, where the possibility of comic paratragedy is also reckoned with: but this would explain *obscura per obscuriora*, requiring the more invasive and otherwise problematic correction of Εὐριπίδου in Εὐβούλου (see above, n. 22).

<sup>35</sup> For this verse, see further below § 3 and the Merano proceedings.

<sup>36</sup> Hense 1894, 583: “vox apud tragicos num recurrat dubito”; Wilamowitz 1905, 134: “ein Wort, das in keine Poesie gehört.”

<sup>37</sup> The proposed ones are: ὄνησις, ‘profit, advantage’, αὔξησις, ‘growth, increase’, and οἰδησις, ‘swelling, puffiness’: see the details in Carrara 2014, 365.

are common there (as generally in post-Homeric Greek poetry and prose):<sup>38</sup> cf. δόκησις attested *inter alia*, with the sense of ‘appearance, reputation’, in a line probably coming from Euripides’ *Ixion* (fr. \*\*426a.1) to be discussed below (§ 3). In Euripides’ fragment 643, it might be enough—besides accepting Salmasius’ necessary and easy conjecture φόρημ’ (see above)—to correct the article τὸ responsible for the initial ‘split tribrach’, for example into τι, ‘quite’, or τοι, ‘surely’.<sup>39</sup> With both corrections, the line conveys a simple but effective thought: a worthless and opinionated person is no fun to cope with.<sup>40</sup> Moreover, such a line is a good companion to Aeschylus’ fragment 392 (from an unknown play) ἧ βαρὺ φόρημ’ ἄνθρωπος εὐτυχῶν ἄφρων, “a fortunate foolish man is surely a grievous load”: this trimeter similarly opens with an emphatic particle<sup>41</sup> and qualifies the burdensome fellow with the same adjective, βαρύς. This Aeschylean verse, whose source is again Stobaeus’ anthology (3.4.18 [3.223.4–5 Hense]), has been suspected too,<sup>42</sup> but without cogent reasons.<sup>43</sup> Rather, the two lines defend each other against expulsion from tragedy.

---

<sup>38</sup> See Carrara 2014, 364–365 *ad loc.*, building on Long 1968, 14–18, 29–35 and Handley 1953.

<sup>39</sup> For further details on these conjectures, see Carrara 2014, 363–364 *ad loc.*

<sup>40</sup> Pace Schmidt 1886, 483, who judged them “unverständliche Worte”.

<sup>41</sup> Cobet 1877, 266 even corrected βαρὺ τὸ in ἧ βαρὺ because of the Aeschylean parallel.

<sup>42</sup> By Gottfried Hermann (cf. Hermann 1852, 412: “non est Aeschyli”), who thought the label Αἰσχύλου prefixed to the line to refer, instead, to the two preceding trimeters (Stobaeus 3.4.16 = fr. trag. adesp. 519; Stobaeus 3.4.17 = Chaeremon *TrGF* 71 F 26): in his opinion (Hermann 1852, 381 on his fr. 282), these constituted a unified whole in the style of Aeschylus (cf. especially the adjective ποδῶκης), and came either from his *Heliades* (Hermann 1828, 140) or from his *Phryges* (Hermann 1834, 159–160). See also Dindorf 1851, 302–303 (on his fr. 258).

<sup>43</sup> This was rightly stated by Crusius 1890, 691, referring to the similar fr. 398 of Aeschylus, κακοὶ γὰρ εὖ πρᾶσσοντες οὐκ ἀνασχετοί, “bad men enjoying fortune are unbearable”.

As for the content, the verse βαρὺ – κακοῦ would fit well into another section of the dialectic exchange between Polyidos and Minos, displaying a similar—tense—tone to the one transmitted on the papyrus. Both contenders showed arrogance and conceit (οἷσις) in each other’s eyes: Polyidos inflexibly refused to fulfil the request of the bereaved Minos, despite potentially being able to do so, while Minos tyrannically insisted on it. In such a context, either could easily have dubbed the other ‘a bad man’ (ἀνθρώπου κακοῦ) and ‘heavy to bear’ (βαρὺ τοι φόρημ’). Scholarship has already detected a certain similarity between fragment 643 and another fragment, 644, coming from Euripides’ *Polyidos* (*Glaukos* in the source, Stobaeus 4.4.3, see above) and containing a further criticism of a ‘bad man’ (κακός τις), this time one puffed up with good success and thus dangerous as a role model for the community.<sup>44</sup> It might be that both fragments, 643 and 644, were originally located in another round of the confrontation between the seer and the king than the one copied, or excerpted, on the papyrus (which is more centered on other themes and terms, such as σοφία, πλοῦτος, φαυλότης), and are so *pour cause* both missing from it.<sup>45</sup>

To sum up, the first result of the reassessment of the indirect tradition in the light of the new discovery is to save fr. 643 for *Polyidos*, notwithstanding its absence from the papyrus.

---

<sup>44</sup> ὅταν κακός τις ἐν πόλει πράσσει καλῶς, / νοσεῖν τίθησι τῶν ἀμεινόνων φρένας, / παράδειγμ’ ἔχοντας τῶν κακῶν ἐξουσίαν, “when a bad man does well in a city, he corrupts the minds of his betters, who have as their example the power given to bad men” (translation: Collard and Cropp 2008b, 103). For the similarity, see Carrara 2014, 362 (referring to Collard and Cropp 2008b, 91: “F 643 and 644 speak critically of a ‘bad man’”), 365–366 (referring to Welcker 1839, 772: the arrogant bad man is Polyidos), 370.

<sup>45</sup> That fragments 639–642 form a homogeneous group, from which fragments 643–644 are somehow detached, had already been observed by Carrara 2014, 221, 366, 370. The papyrus has confirmed this, reporting fr. 640 (col. i.40–41), fr. 641 (col. ii.23–25), fr. 642 (col. i.44–46) but neither fr. 643 nor fr. 644.

## 2.

Another line missing in the papyrus is φίλοις τ' ἄμικτός ἐστι καὶ πάσῃ πόλει, the third and final verse of what is currently fragment 425 of Euripides. This line is preserved twice in Stobaeus, under the contrasting headings Εὐριπίδου Ἰξίονος (3.10.7) and, apparently, Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκωι (3.22.2, see above, § 1); for this doubling, the *editores principes* have advanced three explanations:<sup>46</sup>

(a) The line belongs to *Ixion*, building a two-line quotation from there with ὅστις – ἀνὴρ (fr. 425.1), but without οὐδὲν – βούλεται (fr. 425.2), a verse now definitely, and exclusively, assigned to *Polyidos* by the papyrus. The line οὐδὲν – βούλεται was erroneously incorporated into the *Ixion* extract in Stobaeus 3.10.7 “after someone had noted the similarity of the two passages” (i.e., the similarity consisting in the shared initial line ὅστις – ἀνὴρ).

1. (b) The line belongs to *Polyidos* as documented by the two-line quotation in Stobaeus 3.22.2 (ὅστις – ἀνὴρ + φίλοις – πόλει), headed Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκωι; it has been omitted from the papyrus, either accidentally or voluntarily: this omission could have been indicated by the forked *paragraphos* between coll. ii.20 and ii.21.

2. (c) The line is a “later fabrication”, composed after the “inferior variant” and “apparent banalization” ἀστῶν intruded into fr. 425.1, that is: this word could have brought about “a kind of counterpart” expanding on the civic theme (ἀστῶν → πάσῃ πόλει).

---

<sup>46</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 31 [all following quotations are taken from there].

The editors opt for a combination of (c) and (a),<sup>47</sup> in the sense that φίλοις – πόλει is deemed an artificial creation elicited by the intrusion of the inferior variant ἀστῶν (Stobaeus 3.22.2) in place of ἐπὶ τὸ (Stobaeus 3.10.7 and papyrus) into an original couplet from *Ixion*. To clarify the assumptions behind this view:

3. (a) the label Εὐριπίδου Ἰξίονος in Stobaeus 3.10.7 is correct, but the following poetic quotation is marred by textual problems: the middle line οὐδὲν – βούλεται is intrusive, the third line φίλοις – πόλει is spurious, the real second line is lost beyond repair.
4. (b) the label Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ for Stobaeus 3.22.2 must be wrong, because it introduces a couplet from *Ixion* (and a corrupt one);<sup>48</sup> this heading could be the result of a confusion with the *locus similis* from the Πολύϊδος, the one recovered in the papyrus, featuring ὅστις – ἀνὴρ + οὐδὲν – βούλεται, but not φίλοις – πόλει.

However, a fourth solution suggests itself, starting from the same premise as the first explanation above (i.e., φίλοις – πόλει belongs to *Ixion*) but without resorting to the “later

---

<sup>47</sup> Against (b), they observe that φίλοις – πόλει would not work as accusation, or criticism, from Polyidos to Minos: why should the tyrant be accused of being predatory and thus uncongenial to city and friends by the seer? In addition, it remains to be explained why the excerptor would have abruptly interrupted Polyidos’ utterance, leaving out a line which is as gnomic as the preceding two. The real difficulty of the editors with the omission is their conviction that the text on the papyrus is continuous and that the forked *paragraphoi* do not signal omitted lines, see Gehad et al. 2024, 32.

<sup>48</sup> That Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ is not the required indication is inferable from the editors’ formulation “an original couplet belonging to *Ixion* may have been deformed into the version quoted in Stobaeus 3.22.2” (Gehad et al. 2024, 31): this seems to mean that also Stobaeus 3.22.2 originally intended to cite from *Ixion*. If so, this would have been a case of genuine Euripidean dittography (see above n. 12), with the original quotation consisting twice of the couplet ὅστις – ἀνὴρ + φίλοις – πόλει from *Ixion*. Nor can the editors put the heading Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ to good use otherwise, that is as introduction to βαρὺ – κακοῦ: in their view, this other line has nothing to do with *Glaukos*/*Polyidos* but is a comic *adespoton*, see above, § 1 and n. 20.

fabrication” hypothesis. This is an unnecessary and complicating step precipitated by the assumption that *ἄστῶν* is strictly connected with, even unavoidably preliminary to, φίλοις – πόλει, but is, in itself, a secondary and later variant, the only true and legitimate reading being ἐπὶ τὸ (the one recovered on the papyrus, col. ii.19). To state it more simply: since *ἄστῶν* is wrong, the thematically related line φίλοις – πόλει cannot be right. But neither assumption is inescapable: φίλοις – πόλει could reasonably follow ὅστις γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ κτλ. (in fact, this is the wording in Stobaeus 3.10.7; but on ἐπὶ τὸ see further below, § 4); and, more importantly, the papyrus can be deemed a compelling evidence for the *Polyidos* (whether it always is, is another question), but not for *Ixion*: however, *Ixion* is the play the line φίλοις – πόλει would have come from.

Without positing neither that *ἄστῶν* is corrupt (*quod est demonstrandum*, see below, § 4) nor that φίλοις – πόλει could only derive from this corruption, my solution runs as follow:

the absence of the line φίλοις – πόλει from the papyrus is no further surprising, since it belongs to *Ixion*, as stated in Stobaeus 3.10.7, and only to *Ixion*; in Stobaeus 3.22.2, the line has mistakenly entered association with *Glaukos* (i.e., *Polyidos*) because of the occurrence of the preceding trimeter ὅστις – ἀνὴρ in both plays; by intruding in this way, φίλοις – πόλει ousted the real *Polyidos* line οὐδὲν – βούλεται (read on the papyrus, col. ii.20).

That the verse ὅστις – ἀνὴρ featured in both plays is implied also by the papyrus editors invoking “the similarity of the two passages”<sup>49</sup> to explain why in Stobaeus 3.10.7 the newly

---

<sup>49</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 31. To clarify further, since in their opinion οὐδὲν – βούλεται (on the papyrus) belongs only to *Polyidos*, and φίλοις – πόλει (not on the papyrus) only to *Ixion*, or is spurious, the only remaining point of contact between the two *loci* is the exordial line ὅστις – ἀνὴρ: after that, each passage took its own course.

discovered *Polyidos* line οὐδὲν – βούλεται is found sandwiched in the middle of the *Ixion* quotation: because (to put it explicitly) in *Polyidos* it came after the trimeter ὅστις – ἀνὴρ, common to both, and remained wrongly attached to it also in the other context. Leaving for another place the discussion of οὐδὲν – βούλεται (unique or double?),<sup>50</sup> the same mechanism might be posited in the opposite direction, from *Ixion* to *Glaukos/Polyidos*, to elucidate why the verse φίλοις – πόλει features in Stobaeus 3.22.2, declared to be from *Glaukos/Polyidos*, but not on the *Polyidos* papyrus: because it erroneously intruded from the similar *Ixion* passage.

According to this hypothesis, the heading Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ in Stobaeus 3.22.2 (or 1+2, if βαρὺ – κακοῦ is included: see above, § 1) is correct,<sup>51</sup> the following poetic extract is not because it comprehends the *Ixion* line φίλοις – πόλει, while lacking the proper *Polyidos* verse οὐδὲν – βούλεται.

The responsibility for this mixing up could be laid on Stobaeus himself, who had penned the *Ixion* passage just a few pages before and could have confusingly recalled it when coming to the *locus similis* from *Glaukos/Polyidos*. But this theory does not stand closer scrutiny: if Stobaeus was the one responsible for the confusion, it could only have been an intentional one (rather a fusion than a confusion);<sup>52</sup> for only in the expanded form with οὐδὲν φρονεῖ δίκαιον οὐδὲ βούλεται is the *Ixion* extract pertinent to the chapter it appears in, περὶ ἀδικίας; the *Polyidos* extract, for its part, needs the added φίλοις – πόλει to fully comply with the topic περὶ

---

<sup>50</sup> See the Merano proceedings.

<sup>51</sup> Which means: Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ is what Stobaeus (i.e., his source) wanted to indicate.

<sup>52</sup> An active engagement with the material is elsewhere attested in Stobaeus' anthology, see Carrara 2014, 360n114, with references; see also below, n. 82 and the bibliography cited there.

ὑπεροψίας. One wonders why Stobaeus, instead of massively intervening,<sup>53</sup> would not have simply placed the pertinent two-line *Polyidos* extract ὅστις – δίκαιον ... βούλεται in περὶ ἀδικίας, the *Ixion* eclogue ὅστις – πόλει in περὶ ὑπεροψίας. Furthermore, this scenario excludes the possibility of any influence of the later *Polyidos* quotation on the earlier *Ixion* one, which had already been written down by Stobaeus; but the influence seems to be mutual, not unidirectional. It is more likely that the anthologist already knew (only) the conflated texts, perhaps from two different sources (older anthologies). The textual muddle must have originated with someone else, perhaps an earlier and learned reader of Classical drama who annotated a passage (the *Ixion* one) as a parallel to the other (the *Polyidos* one) in the margin of the copy of this play (or excerpt) available to him. This erudite comparison might have gradually evolved into confusion after the two texts first came into contact: the marginal *Ixion* note intruded one of its verses (φίλοις – πόλει) into the principal text, and perhaps also one single reading, ἀστῶν (this would explain why the papyrus reads ἐπὶ τὸ: because this is the reading of the *Polyidos* tradition, the other being from *Ixion*; but on ἐπὶ τὸ vs ἀστῶν see below, § 4).<sup>54</sup> Moreover, the marginal note absorbed from the principal text the line οὐδὲν – βούλεται (unless this was germane to both tragic passages, a possibility which should not be too quickly discarded, but cannot be further dealt with here).<sup>55</sup> The whole process may be visualized as follows:

---

<sup>53</sup> This is the opinion of Wachsmuth 1882, 146–147.

<sup>54</sup> It remains possible that ἀστῶν is the only original reading and ἐπὶ τὸ an ancient corruption. Still, if the prepositional construction is preferred for the *Polyidos*, the correct declension case could have been the dative (ἐπὶ τῷ), see below, § 4.

<sup>55</sup> If οὐδὲν – βούλεται originally belonged also to *Ixion*, there is no need to suppose this further interference, and

Starting situation:

Principal text of *Polyidos* (= papyrus)

ὅστις γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ἔχειν πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ  
οὐδὲν φρονεῖ δίκαιον οὐδὲ βούλεται

Marginal note from *Ixion*

ὅστις γὰρ ἀστῶν πλεόν ἔχειν πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ,  
φίλοις τ' ἄμικτός ἐστι καὶ πάσῃ πόλει

Blurring mechanism:

Principal text of *Polyidos* (= papyrus)

ὅστις γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ἔχειν πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ  
~~οὐδὲν φρονεῖ δίκαιον οὐδὲ βούλεται~~

Marginal note from *Ixion*

ὅστις γὰρ ἀστῶν πλεόν ἔχειν πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ,  
φίλοις τ' ἄμικτός ἐστι καὶ πάσῃ πόλει

Result in Stobaeus, *Anthologion*:

3.22.2 Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ

ὅστις γὰρ ἀστῶν πλεόν ἔχειν πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ  
φίλοις τ' ἄμικτός ἐστι καὶ πάσῃ πόλει

3.10.7 Εὐριπίδου Ἰξίου (ms. S)

ὅστις γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ἔχειν πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ,  
οὐδὲν φρονεῖ δίκαιον οὐδὲ βούλεται  
φίλοις τ' ἄμικτός ἐστι καὶ πάσῃ πόλει

That several interpolated sententious verses in Euripides' preserved tragedies may have been born as *Randparallelen* was already suggested by Eduard Fraenkel;<sup>56</sup> the same might apply to intrusive maxims in fragments. This reconstruction of the error chain— insertion of a whole extraneous line, φίλοις – πόλει, and perhaps also of the single variant ἀστῶν, into the *Polyidos* tradition from the similar *Ixion* text written in a side note; possibly secondary absorption of the

---

line transfer, between the two *loci*: on this matter, see the [Merano proceedings](#).

<sup>56</sup> Fraenkel 1946, 87–89, positing early anthological practice as source of the learned marginal annotations.

line οὐδὲν – βούλεται into the *Ixion* quotation—is the second result of the present reassessment.

As stated above, this hypothesis requires assigning the line φίλοις – πόλει to *Ixion* instead of judging it a secondary addition replacing a genuine verse (now irrecoverable) after the “inept anthological adaptation”<sup>57</sup> ἄστῶν encroached into the preceding trimeter ὅστις – ἀνὴρ: for it was only as *versus Euripideus* (jotted down in an ancient marginal, according to the present reconstruction) that φίλοις – πόλει would have been able to exert unduly influence on the similar *Polyidos* passage. By itself, the line φίλοις – πόλει has nothing suspicious, neither linguistically nor syntactically, as will be shown in § 3. Thematically, the *editores principes* have themselves recognized that it functions as a “kind of counterpart”<sup>58</sup> to ἄστῶν, in that the cumulative mention of “fellow citizens”, “friends” and “the whole city” gives the fragment a marked and coherent civic dimension; but this thought yields no “inferior sense”.<sup>59</sup> The fundamental difficulty for the editors lies in the contradictory status of the line φίλοις – πόλει, absent from the new *Polyidos* papyrus despite its attribution to *Glaukos* (i.e., *Polyidos*) in Stobaeus 3.22.2. But this difficulty can be removed as proposed here: i.e., the disputed verse is not on the papyrus and rightly so, because it pertains to *Ixion*; it is transmitted under the heading Εὐριπίδου Γλαύκῳ in Stobaeus because of an interference with the *locus similis* from *Ixion*, the similarity consisting in the shared exordial line ὅστις – ἀνὴρ.<sup>60</sup> Thus there is no reason to

---

<sup>57</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 26. The same opinion on ἄστῶν had already been voiced by Bernhardt 1862, 467.

<sup>58</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 31.

<sup>59</sup> This is, instead, the opinion of Gehad et al. 2024, 26.

<sup>60</sup> The *editores principes* acknowledge the first part of this explanation as their option (a); but they cannot accept it,

dismiss the sequence ὅστις γὰρ ἀστῶν – ἀνὴρ + φίλοις – πόλει as a series of errors (first the insertion of ἀστῶν, then the addition of φίλοις – πόλει) instead of attributing it to Euripides himself. The following paragraph (§ 3) aims at demonstrating, first, that the combination, at least, of ὅστις γὰρ ἀστῶν πλέον ἔχειν πέφυκ’ ἀνὴρ and φίλοις τ’ ἄμικτός ἐστι καὶ πάσῃ πόλει (the judgment on the ‘sandwiched’ οὐδὲν – βούλεται is reserved for another place, the Merano proceeding) goes back to Euripides, being an unobjectionable and even felicitous formulation;<sup>61</sup> and, second, that it would have featured very aptly just in the play Stobaeus 3.10.7 ascribes it to, *Ixion*.

### 3.

As for the content, the line ὅστις – πόλει might contain an echo of the theory of πλεονεξία (‘greediness’),<sup>62</sup> better known as part of the ancient philosophical and literary tradition from Plato’s *Republic* (where it is voiced by Thrasymachus and Glaucon)<sup>63</sup> and *Gorgias* (in the mouth of Callicles).<sup>64</sup> In both dialogues, Plato often employs the idiomatic phrase πλέον ἔχειν

---

because they think ἀστῶν corrupt and responsible for the secondary creation of the related line φίλοις – πόλει, which is thus altogether spurious.

<sup>61</sup> One of those that made him the most quoted tragedian in antiquity: see Most 2003.

<sup>62</sup> For this standard English translation of the word see Balot 2001, 3, 28n16, 29n20; Balot 2024, 172.

<sup>63</sup> Boter 1986; Reeve 2013, 53–78; Ortiz de Landázuri 2018–19, 57–58.

<sup>64</sup> More on Plato’s pleonexia in Barney 2017, with further references (also on Callicles, who “may even be Plato’s invention”; *contra* Dodds 1959<sup>2</sup>, 12–15) and in Shaw 2024 (especially Balot 2024). See also O’Sullivan 2005, 125–127 on the difference between Thrasymachus (a moral sophist) and Callicles (an unmoral not-sophist).

constructed with the genitive and in the meaning ‘prevail over’ (cf. LSJ s.v. πλείων II 1). This idiom is clearly attested already in the fifth century, in Herodotus’ *Historiae* 9.70.2:

οἱ δ’ ἡμύνοντο καὶ πολλῶ πλέον εἶχον τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ὥστε οὐκ ἐπισταμένων τειχομαχέειν.

They [the Persians] defended themselves and got much the better of the Lacedaemonians in so far as these did not know to conduct the assault of walls.

To briefly review some eloquent usages of it in book one of the *Republic*,<sup>65</sup> Thrasymachus maintains there that οὐδαμοῦ ἂν εὗροις ἐν τῇ διαλύσει τῆς κοινωνίας πλέον ἔχοντα τὸν δίκαιον τοῦ ἀδίκου, ἀλλ’ ἔλαττον, “you will never find at the dissolution of the partnership that the just man has the advantage over the unjust but always the worst of it” (Plato *Republic* 343d 5–6).<sup>66</sup> Later on Socrates asks Thrasymachus: ὁ δίκαιος τοῦ δικαίου δοκεῖ τί σοι ἂν ἐθέλειν πλέον ἔχειν; “do you think that the just man would want to prevail over the just man?”; then he demands εἰ τοῦ μὲν δικαίου μὴ ἀξιοῖ πλέον ἔχειν μηδὲ βούλεται ὁ δίκαιος, τοῦ δὲ ἀδίκου, “if the just man does neither deem right nor want to outdo the just man but the unjust?” (Plato *Republic* 349b 2–3 and b 11–c 2). In short, Thrasymachus’ unjust man πάντων πλέον ἔχειν ἀξιοῖ,

---

<sup>65</sup> Cf. further in book nine ἄρ’ οὖν, ὥσπερ αἱ ἐν αὐτῷ ἡδοναὶ ἐπιγιγνόμεναι τῶν ἀρχαίων πλέον εἶχον [...], οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἀξιώσει νεώτερος ὢν πατρός τε καὶ μητρὸς πλέον ἔχειν, “and just as the upspringing pleasures in him got the better over the old ones [...], so he himself [the would-be tyrant], though younger, will deem right to get the better over his father and mother” (Plato *Republic* 574a 6–9).

<sup>66</sup> To be sure, here πλέον ἔχειν can alternatively translate as “get more (than)” and ἔλαττον ἔχειν as “get less (than)”, cf. Boter 1986, 269. This quantitative and comparative use of πλέον ἔχειν is found in Plato *Gorgias* 490c 1 τούτων τῶν σιτίων πλέον ἡμῶν ἐκτέον αὐτῷ, 490c 4–5 ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν πλέον, τῶν δ’ ἔλαττον ἐκτέον, 490d 5 ἀλλ’ οὐ τὸν βελτίω πλέον δεῖν ἔχειν, 491a 5 φρονιμώτερος πλέον ἔχων δικαίως πλεονεκτεῖ.

“deems right to overreach everything” (Plato *Republic* 349c 6). This is the same conceptual and lexical framework underlying πλέον ἔχειν plus ἀστῶν in fr. 425.1: “to outdo the citizens”, not “to have more than the citizens”<sup>67</sup> in wealth or the like.<sup>68</sup> ἀστῶν is not a genitive of comparison but a type of partitive genitive, analogous to the one used with other verbs of ruling or excelling (ἄρχω, κρατέω).<sup>69</sup> A certain degree of ambiguity is unavoidable and perhaps even intentional: according to ancient Greek thought, those who are superior to others should also have more than them (and vice versa: those who have more are *per se* superior).<sup>70</sup>

For further clarification of the proper value of πλέον ἔχειν, compare the verb πλεονεκτεῖν in Plato *Republic* 349b 8–9: τοῦ δὲ ἀδίκου πότερον ἀξιοῖ ἂν πλεονεκτεῖν καὶ ἡγοῖτο δίκαιον εἶναι, ἢ οὐκ ἂν ἡγοῖτο; “[the just man] would deem it proper to prevail over the unjust man and think it just, or would he not?”.<sup>71</sup> The synonymity is evident from a slightly later passage where Socrates questions Thrasymachus juxtaposing both expressions: δοκεῖ ἂν οὖν τίς σοι, ὦ ἄριστε, μουσικὸς ἀνὴρ ἀρμοττόμενος λύραν ἐθέλειν μουσικοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐν τῇ ἐπιτάσει καὶ ἀνέσει

---

<sup>67</sup> This is the most recent translation, by Kingsley 2024, 103.

<sup>68</sup> That pleonexia concerns not only nor even primarily wealth and possession but power and authority, is explicitly stated by Callicles in *Gorgias* 490c 1–491b 4 (especially 490d 5–6 ΣΩ. Ἀλλ’ οὐ τὸν βελτίω πλέον δεῖν ἔχειν; ΚΑΛ. Οὐ σιτίων γε οὐδὲ ποτῶν), see Balot 2024, 184.

<sup>69</sup> See Schwyzer 1950, 109–110 (ββ), under ‘Genitiv Partitiv’. For the partitive genitive see also Dodds 1959<sup>2</sup>, 292 on *Gorgias* 491a 4 (but citing the comparative passages quoted above, n. 66).

<sup>70</sup> For this, Gabriele Chirielli aptly recalls Homer *Ilias* 1.165–167, where Achilles reproaches Agamemnon for wanting more albeit being weaker: ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πλεῖον πολυαῖκος πολέμοιο χεῖρες ἐμαὶ διέπουσ’, [...], σοὶ τὸ γέρας πολὺ μέζον, “the most of furious war do my hands undertake [...], your prize is far greater.”

<sup>71</sup> Further occurrences of πλεονεκτεῖν with genitive in Plato’s *Republic* for the superiority of the (un)just man: 349c 4–5, 7–8; 349c 11–d 1; 350b 13–14; 350c 1–2.

τῶν χορδῶν πλεονεκτεῖν ἢ ἀξιοῦν πλέον ἔχειν;; “do you think, my friend, that any musician in the tuning of a lyre would want to overreach another musician in the tightening and relaxing of the strings or think fit to excel him?” (Plato *Republic* 349e 10–13). This passage also shows well that pleonexia is immaterial: the musician does not want to have more than his colleague but to surpass him in artistry.<sup>72</sup> In book two of the *Republic* (362b 5–c 1), Glaucon describes the archetypal unjust man as one who

εἰς ἀγῶνας τοίνυν ἰόντα καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ περιγίγνεσθαι καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν  
τῶν ἐχθρῶν, πλεονεκτοῦντα δὲ πλουτεῖν καὶ τοὺς τε φίλους εὖ ποιεῖν καὶ τοὺς  
ἐχθροὺς βλάπτειν κτλ.

entering lawsuits, private and public alike, triumphs and has the advantage over  
his enemies and, having the advantage, he is rich and benefits his friends and  
harms his enemies etc.

Also this passage, like the previous one, illustrates that *πλεονεξία* is not equal to wealth (albeit including it): it is a global superiority enabling one to behave freely and influentially in his community.

Realizing the correct construction and sense of *πλέον ἔχειν* saves ἀστῶν from another criticism leveled against it by the editors, namely that the expression “one *has* by nature more than the other citizens”—their interpretation of *πλέον ἔχειν* πέφυκ’ + ἀστῶν—is logically weak:

---

<sup>72</sup> Cf. also Plato *Republic* 350a 1–2 τί δὲ ἰατρικός; ἐν τῇ ἐδωδῇ ἢ πόσει ἐθέλειν ἄν τι ιατρικοῦ πλεονεκτεῖν ἢ ἀνδρὸς ἢ πράγματος;; 350a 11–b 1 Τί δὲ ὁ ἀνεπιστήμων; οὐχὶ ὁμοίως μὲν ἐπιστήμονος πλεονεκτῆσειεν ἄν, ὁμοίως δὲ ἀνεπιστήμονος; 350b 7–8 ὁ ἄρα ἀγαθός τε καὶ σοφὸς τοῦ μὲν ὁμοίου οὐκ ἐθέλησει πλεονεκτεῖν, τοῦ δὲ ἀνομοίου τε καὶ ἐναντίου.

one expects “by nature *wants*”, since “*being* rich is not a consequence of one’s nature”<sup>73</sup> (aspiring to richness is). First, this argument is too subtle: wealth can come with privileged birth, therefore it can be, in a sense, intrinsic to a man<sup>74</sup> (in classical Athens, all Callias and Hipponicus from the *Kērykes* family were inherently rich).<sup>75</sup> Secondly, and more importantly, ἀστῶν πλέον ἔχειν does not mean here ‘to be richer than other citizens’ (i.e., ‘to have more’ with comparative genitive), therefore any speculation regarding the connection of richness and φύσις (such is, in the editors’ view, πλέον ἔχειν + πέφυκ’ deprived of ἐπὶ τὸ) is irrelevant.

In Plato’s *Gorgias*, πλέον ἔχειν is a refrain in Callicles’ speech, often governing a genitive referring to the people the πλεονέκτης is confronted with and will eventually triumph over.

---

<sup>73</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 26 [their emphasis].

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Dawe 2006<sup>2</sup>, 71 on *Oedipus Tyrannus* 9 πρέπων ἔφυς, commenting on age as a component of the φύσις of the priest acting as spokesman for the Thebans: the ἱερεὺς has not been old all his life long, but he is ‘definitory’ old in that moment (he has just been addressed as ὦ γεραίε); by then, age has become his οὐσία.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Lysias 19.48 Καλλίας τοίνυν ὁ Ἱππονίκου [...] ὃς πλεῖστα τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐδόκει κεκτηῖσθαι, κτλ., “Callias son of Hipponicus [...] seemed to have owned the most among the Greeks etc.” (Callias III, the profligate); Plutarch *Pericles* 24.8 Καλλίαν ἔτεκε τὸν πλούσιον, *Aristides* 25.4 Καλλίας [...] πλουσιώτατος ὢν Ἀθηναίων, *Moralia* 527B (*De cupiditate divitiarum* 8) Καλλίας ὁ πλουσιώτατος Ἀθηναίων (Callias II, the eponym of the Peace). On the family wealth, see Davies 1971, 259–262; Marginesu 2016, 41–66.

This is particularly evident in the dense passage in *Gorgias* 483c 1–d 6,<sup>76</sup> which also features the alternative *πλεονεκτεῖν*<sup>77</sup> and exposes the core of the philosophical theory:<sup>78</sup>

ἐκφοβοῦντες τοὺς ἐρρωμενεστέρους τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ δυνατοὺς ὄντας πλέον  
ἔχει, ἵνα μὴ αὐτῶν πλέον ἔχωσιν, λέγουσιν ὡς αἰσχρὸν καὶ ἄδικον τὸ  
πλεονεκτεῖν, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἀδικεῖν, τὸ πλέον τῶν ἄλλων ζητεῖν ἔχειν. [...] τὸ πλέον  
ζητεῖν ἔχειν τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ ἀδικεῖν αὐτὸ καλοῦσιν. [...] δίκαιόν ἐστιν  
τὸν ἀμείνω τοῦ χείρονος πλέον ἔχειν καὶ τὸν δυνατότερον τοῦ ἀδυνατωτέρου.  
[...] οὕτω τὸ δίκαιον κέκριται, τὸν κρείττω τοῦ ἥττονος ἄρχειν καὶ πλέον ἔχειν.

They [the many weak lawgivers] frighten the stronger among the individuals who are able to get an advantage and, in order to prevent those from getting one over themselves, they say that overpowering is foul and unjust, and that wrongdoing is just this, seeking to get the advantage of others [...]. To aim at getting an advantage over the majority, they call it wrongdoing; [...] it is right that the better has advantage of the worse, and the abler of the feebler. [...]

---

<sup>76</sup> See further Plato *Gorgias* 488b 4–5 *πλέον ἔχειν τὸν ἀμείνω τοῦ φαυλοτέρου*, 490a 3–4 *πλέον ἔχειν τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν ἀρχομένων*, 490a 8 *τὸ βελτίω ὄντα καὶ φρονιμώτερον* [...] *πλέον ἔχειν τῶν φαυλοτέρων*, 491d 2–3 *πλέον ἔχειν τούτους τῶν ἄλλων, τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν ἀρχομένων*.

<sup>77</sup> For *πλεονεκτεῖν* in *Gorgias* cf. also 490e 7 *δεῖ πλεονεκτεῖν τῶν σπέρματων* (a partitive genitive for Dodds 1959<sup>2</sup>, 292) and, without a connected genitive, 490c 3–4 *εἰς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα οὐ πλεονεκτεῖν*, 490d 11–12 *δεῖ πλεονεκτεῖν τὸν φρονιμώτατον*, 491a 5 *φρονιμώτερος πλέον ἔχων δικαίως πλεονεκτεῖ*;

<sup>78</sup> On this passage, see Irwin 2024, 162 and Balot 2024, 177, albeit distinguishing between *πλέον ἔχειν* ‘have more’ than’ and *πλεονεκτεῖν* ‘overreach’; see also O’Sullivan 2005, 122–123.

Right has been established this way, that the stronger dominates and gets advantage over the weaker.

Two further passages in *Gorgias* sound almost like a prose paraphrase of the disputed couplet from *Ixion*: for ὅστις ... πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ, i.e., for the idea of a naturally gifted man bound to dominate over his *Mitmenschen* compare *Gorgias* 484a 2–6 ἐὰν [...] φύσιν ἱκανὴν γένηται ἔχων ἀνὴρ [...], ἐπαναστὰς ἀνεφάνη δεσπότης ἡμέτερος ὁ δοῦλος, “when a man having a capable nature [...] rises and he, the slave, reveals himself our master”. For φίλοις τ' ἄμικτος κτλ., i.e., for “the negative consequences of egoism for the civic fabric”<sup>79</sup> compare *Gorgias* 507e 3–6 οὔτε γὰρ ἂν ἄλλω ἀνθρώπῳ προσφιλεῖς ἂν εἴη ὁ τοιοῦτος οὔτε θεῷ· κοινωνεῖν γὰρ ἀδύνατος, ὅτω δὲ μὴ ἔνι κοινωνία, φιλία οὐκ ἂν εἴη, “for such a person can neither be dear to another man nor to god, since he cannot commune with anyone, and where there is no communion, there can be no friendship.”<sup>80</sup>

Both the reading ἀστῶν, to be constructed with the periphrastic expression πλεον ἔχειν, and the line φίλοις – πόλει touch on essential points of the πλεονεξία debate in the fifth and especially fourth century BCE:<sup>81</sup> they surely are each other's counterpart, but at the level of

---

<sup>79</sup> To say it with Kingsley 2024, 103.

<sup>80</sup> See Sheffield 2024, 128. On φιλία, and the lack of as a trait of tyrannical life, see O'Sullivan 2005, 142–145.

An interesting reflection on political ἀμειξία, effectively illustrating the ineffectiveness of an 'ego(t)istic' behavior, is to be found in Thucydides' *Archaeology*, 1.3.4: οἱ δ' οὖν ὥς ἕκαστοι Ἕλληνας [...] ὕστερον κληθέντες οὐδὲν πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν δι' ἀσθένειαν καὶ ἀμειξίαν ἀλλήλων ἀθρόοι ἔπραξαν, “Those who were [...] later called ‘Hellenes’ did nothing together before the Trojan war, for weakness and lack of intercourse” (referred to by Jebb 1892, 158 on *Trachiniae* 1095).

<sup>81</sup> On which see further van Velthoven 2022–23.

intellectual speculation, not of anthological trivialization.<sup>82</sup> It is perfectly possible that Euripides transposed such thoughts into one of his (late) plays, as he did in *Cyclops* with Polyphemus dismissing the artificial laws (338–340 οἱ δὲ τοὺς νόμους ἔθεντο ποικίλλοντες ἀνθρώπων βίον, κλαίειν ἄνωγα, “those who have established laws and complicated human life, can go to hell”) in a way consistent with Callicles demystifying them (*Gorgias* 483b 4–6 ἀλλ’ οἶμαι οἱ τιθέμενοι τοὺς νόμους οἱ ἀσθενεῖς ἀνθρωποὶ εἰσιν καὶ οἱ πολλοί, “but I believe that the ones who establish the laws are the weak individuals and the more numerous”).<sup>83</sup>

Within this background, it is more than an interesting coincidence that two other fragments from Euripides’ *Ixion* speak a similar sophistic language, fr. 426 and \*\*426a: both extol boldness (τόλμ’ fr. 426.2; τοῦ πᾶν δρῶντος fr. \*\*426a.2) in aiming at one’s own gain (ὥστε νικᾶν fr. 426.2; ἔνθα κερδανεῖς fr. \*\*426a.2).<sup>84</sup> Fr. \*\*426a.1 adds an exhortation to feign justice

---

<sup>82</sup> The latter is the opinion of Gehad et al. 2024, 31. Obviously, it remains true that such generalizing adjustments are widespread in anthologies, see Kannicht 1969, II, 204, 213 (on *Helena* 711, 811); Preiser 2000, 273 on Euripides fr. 702 (the allocution τόλμα σύ became the maxim τόλμ’ αἰ). The papyrus itself has examples of this practice, one is in col. i.40 ὡς φή<ι>ς τῶνδε ~ fr. 640.1 ἀνθρώπων δὲ (see Gehad et al. 2024, 23).

<sup>83</sup> See Seaford 1984, 169 *ad loc.*; Egli 2003, 155. On Polyphemus’ *rhēsis* (*Cyclops* 316–346) and Callicles’ speech, see Seidensticker 2020, 29, 185, 187, 193 (stressing the parodic vein), 195; Hunter and Laemmle 2020, 20, 168–169, drawing on Hunter 2009, 67–70. For a partly different view (the lawless Polyphemus is no sophist, but a debauched tyrant) see O’Sullivan 2021, 386 (building on O’Sullivan 2005, with rich bibliography and discussion: see there on pp. 121, 130, 138, 148 for Polyphemus’ farewell to νόμοι as a tyrannical, and not sophistic, trait: but the proximity to Callicles’ thought is once admitted, p. 138; for this, see also O’Sullivan and Collard 2013, 173). See also Biehl 1986, 138–139, in whose view Polyphemus’ speech is intended to be provocative, not persuasive.

<sup>84</sup> The elided form τόλμ’ in fr. 426.2 could perhaps be the second person imperative singular of τολμάω (cf. fr. eleg. adesp. 24 West †τόλμ’ αἰεὶ κᾶν τι τρηχὺ νέμωσι θεοί; but this text is very uncertain, see Preiser 2000, 271, 273–274 commenting on the line featuring as fr. 702 from Euripides’ *Telephus* [it is quoted as such in Stobaeus 4.10.10 Εὐριπίδου ἐκ Τηλέφου]) rather than the nominative of the feminine noun ‘boldness’ (this is the standard interpretation: e.g. Collard and Cropp 2008a, 465; Jouan and van Looy 2002<sup>2</sup>, 219); if so, the following ὥστε νικᾶν could be consecutive: “act boldly, so that you may triumph”. The problem with this suggestion (by Gabriele Chirielli) is the long final *alpha* of the imperative form τολμᾶ, difficult to elide (vs noun τόλμᾶ in Attic tragedy, see

(τοῦ μὲν δικαίου τὴν δόκησιν ἄρτυσο, “acquire the appearance of a just man”), which resonates with Glaucon’s portrait of the accomplished unjust man in book two of the *Republic* (ἐσχάτη γὰρ ἀδικία δοκεῖν δίκαιον εἶναι μὴ ὄντα, “the height of injustice is to seem just without being so”, 361a 4–5). The opposition between apparent and real (in)justice in fr.

\*\*426a also recalls Callicles’ distinction between natural and conventional ἀδικία in Plato *Gorgias* 483a 7–8 (φύσει μὲν γὰρ πᾶν αἴσχιόν ἐστιν ὅπερ καὶ κάκιον, <οἷον> τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι, νόμῳ δὲ τὸ ἀδικεῖν, “by nature everything is fouler that is also more evil, such as being wronged, but doing wrong is fouler by convention”).<sup>85</sup>

Thus, reading and restoring the text of fragment 425 against the theory of πλεονεξία is no circular argument, but finds independent confirmation in two extracts coming from the same play the fragment is attributed to by Stobaeus 3.10.7, *Ixion*.<sup>86</sup> Both extracts were certainly (fr. \*\*426a) or very probably (fr. 426) spoken on stage by the unscrupulous title character himself<sup>87</sup>—he was “das Bild der Gewissenlosigkeit im Handeln”<sup>88</sup>—and revealed him an adept of

---

LSJ s.v. τόλμα I 1). The meaning of the adverb ἔνθα in fr. \*\*426a.2 is also dubious (‘there’, ‘where’ or ‘when, then’).

<sup>85</sup> On the slight textual and logical *inconcinnitas* (healed by the insertion of οἷον) see Dodds 1959<sup>2</sup>, 265.

<sup>86</sup> And note, for what is worth, that Stobaeus himself puts the fragment in a chapter having περὶ πλεονεξίας in its title; for this title see above, § 1 and further the Merano proceedings.

<sup>87</sup> That Ixion was the *persona loquens* of fr. \*\*426a is stated by one of its sources, Plutarch (*Moralia* 18D = *De audiendis poetis* 3): the context makes the assignment to Euripides’ *Ixion* very plausible, see Di Gregorio 1980, 60; Hunter and Russell 2011, 104; Feddern 2021, 147–148; Kingsley 2024, 102 (this has always been the *communis opinio*, with the one cautious exception of Nauck 1889<sup>2</sup>, 838: fr. trag. adesp. 4). Fragment 426 is transmitted in Stobaeus, 4.10.14 [4.332.3–6 Hense] under the heading τοῦ αὐτοῦ (scil. Εὐριπίδου) Ἰξίου. For Ixion as speaker of both fragments see Welcker 1839, 750; Séchan 1926, 391n2; Webster 1967, 160; Jouan and van Looy 2002<sup>2</sup>, 214; Collard and Cropp 2008a, 461.

<sup>88</sup> Welcker 1839, 749.

the pleonectic theory.<sup>89</sup> It might be suggested that also fr. 425 with the textual asset proposed here (ἄστῶν πλέον ἔχειν + φίλοις – πόλει) could have been pronounced by Ixion himself,<sup>90</sup> conscious enough of the effect of his life’s credo: total isolation from the common, and communal, way of life (culminating in his punishment on the wheel).<sup>91</sup> Or Ixion could have been the addressee of the admonition, spoken by someone advising him against ambition.<sup>92</sup> The fact that Ixion did not compete with *citizens* (he was a king and had subjects) but with his father-in-law and with Zeus himself is no objection against applying fr. 425 with the reading ἄστῶν to him; on the contrary, this is the kind of ‘actualizing’ reasoning starting from mythical stories and figures which lies at the heart of Attic theatre.

Finally, a lexical observation could be added in favour of φίλοις – πόλει: the adjective ἄμ(ε)ικτος<sup>93</sup> occurring there is no banal or frequent word and is a good tragic one (first in Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 321 βοὴν ἄμικτον,<sup>94</sup> “a cry which does not mingle”). It is most often used

---

<sup>89</sup> See most explicitly Bengl 1929, 66.

<sup>90</sup> Aélion 1983, 274n10; cf. also Duchemin 1968<sup>2</sup>, 95n105.

<sup>91</sup> Euripides’ *Ixion* test. iii = Plutarch *Moralia* 19E (*De audiendis poetis* 4) with Hunter and Russell 2011, 109 *ad loc.*; on Ixion’s punishment on stage and in iconography see most fully Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, 472–480.

<sup>92</sup> Welcker 1839, 750; Hartung 1844, 372; Séchan 1926, 391n2; Bengl 1929, 66; Webster 1967, 160; Jouan and van Looy 2002<sup>2</sup>, 214; now Kingsley 2024, 103. In favor of this possibility, Gabriele Chirielli observes that the similar *Polyidos* couplet has a critical tone, addressed by Polyidos to Minos.

<sup>93</sup> On the variation of the root vowel μ(ε)ι- see Chantraine 1999<sup>2</sup>, 677 s.v. μείγνυμι, who accepts μικτός, whereas LSJ s.v. μικτός and ἄμικτος prefers the ει-form (but the opposite s.v. μείγνυμι). See also the note of Medda 2017, II, 214. For the line φίλοις – πόλει, Nauck 1889<sup>2</sup>, 491 in his critical apparatus prefers ἄμει-.

<sup>94</sup> There is no need to change the adjective in ἄμικτον (Karsten) or πάμικτον (West): consider also the parallel of Lycophron *Alexandra* 263 κλάζων τ’ ἄμικτον [...] βοήν, “screaming a discordant cry”, probably imitating Aeschylus (as noted by Groeneboom 1944, 180; Hurst and Kolde 2008, 140).

by Euripides: for the unsociable Taurian land (*Iphigenia at Tauris* 402 ἄμεικτον αἶαν, lyr.), for a morose father at home (fr. 500.1 ἄμικτον πατέρ', from one *Melanippe*)<sup>95</sup> and, more relevant to the present context,<sup>96</sup> for two mythological outlaws, the murderous giant Cycnus in *Hercules furens* 393 (Ἀμφαναΐας οἰκίτορ' ἄμεικτον, lyr.)<sup>97</sup> and Polyphemus in *Cyclops* (429 ἄμεικτον ἄνδρα).<sup>98</sup> The only (attested) Sophoclean occurrence is in keeping with this last usage,<sup>99</sup> since it concerns the Centaurs, the half-human half-beast creatures victims of Heracles in an incidental exploit of his strength<sup>100</sup> (*Trachiniae* 1095–1096 διφυᾶ τ' ἄμεικτον ἵποβάμονα στρατὸν / θηρῶν, ὕβριστήν, ἄνομον, ὑπέροχον βίαν, “army of beasts with double form, unsociable, going on horses’ feet, violent, lawless, preeminent in force”). Now, the Centaurs were generated by Kentauros, who is Ixion’s son by Nephele (the ‘substitute’ for Hera): in Pindar’s *Pythian II*, Kentauros is described as a “fierce and lonely offspring bearing honor neither among men nor in the laws of the gods” (42–44 γόνον ὑπερφίαλον [...] μόνον οὔτ' ἐν ἀνδράσι γερασφόρον οὔτ' ἐν θεῶν νόμοις), father to the army—it is the same substantive,

---

<sup>95</sup> The transmitted reading is ἀμείλικτον, but the trimeter is one syllable too long: ἄμικτον (proposed by Heath 1762, 172; Nauck 1889<sup>2</sup>, 522 prefers ἄμει-) counts as a *coniectura palmaris*.

<sup>96</sup> Which is hardly “quiet domestic”, as Bond 1981, 185 describes it, comparing fr. 500.1 (for the identification of the father and son spoken of in that fragment see Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995, 277).

<sup>97</sup> ἄμικτον L : corr. Murray, see Bond 1981, 185 *ad loc.* On this Cycnus, son of Ares, see Gantz 1993, 421–422.

<sup>98</sup> See the notes *ad loc.* by O’Sullivan and Collard 2013, 184–185; Hunter and Laemmle 2020, 189 (“‘savage’ [...]. The satyrs may well also hear the resonance ‘unsociable’”); Seidensticker 2020, 223.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Bond 1981, 185; Kyriakou 2006, 148.

<sup>100</sup> On this episode see Gantz 1993, 390–392: the present one is its first literary mention. On the other adjectives see Kamerbeek 1959, 226–227 and Easterling 1982, 211 *ad loc.*

στρατός, as in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*—of the Centaurs after mating with female horses (44–48 ὃς ἵπποισι Μαγνητίδεσσι ἐμίγνυτ' [...] ἐκ δ' ἐγένοντο στρατός θαυμαστός, ἀμφοτέροις ὁμοῖοι τοκεῦσι κτλ.).<sup>101</sup> To suggest a conscious intertextual relationship concerning Ixion's and his descendants' ἀμιξία among Pindar's ode, Heracles' *rhēsis* in the *Trachiniae*, and the Euripidean trimeter φίλοις – πόλει would go too far. But it is only fair to highlight the appropriateness of the adjective ἄμικτος for Ixion, set apart from humans and gods by his impious behavior.

If the iambic verse φίλοις – πόλει were a later fabrication inspired by the intrusive ἀστῶν in line one, its adherence to tragic diction and thought (compare *Heraclidae* 4 πόλει τ' ἄχρηστος καὶ συναλλάσσειν βαρύς) and especially to Euripides' use of ἄμικτος might still count as intentional poetic imitation.<sup>102</sup> But its aptness as a description, or prefiguration, of the destiny of Ixion, who suffered precisely exclusion from human and divine company because of his ambition (πλέον ἔχειν πέφυκ'), should then be seen as a fortuitous and fortunate coincidence. In other words, it would be by pure chance that a spurious verse (φίλοις – πόλει) secondarily written under the influence of another intrusive element (ἀστῶν) could have been plausibly addressed to, or recited by, the title hero of the play it became attached to in the indirect tradition, Ixion. Overall, this coincidence seems to strain credulity. The verse φίλοις – πόλει has enough credentials to be genuinely Euripidean and to come from the play it is assigned to

---

<sup>101</sup> On Kentauros and his offspring see Gantz 1993, 146, 718; Gentili et al. 1995, 382–383 *ad loc.*; Brillante 1995, 34–38.

<sup>102</sup> This is the opinion held on the clausula πέφυκ' ἀνήρ in *Rhesus* 395, 423 by those who believe the play spurious, notwithstanding its frequency in Euripides' genuine *opus* (below, § 4): see Liapis 2012, lxiii, 175, 183; Fries 2014, 268–269. Conversely, Ritchie 1964, 207–208 saw the hand of the same poet at work, Euripides.

by Stobaeus 3.10.7, *Ixion*. The claim of this line for *Ixion* is the third result of the current reappraisal.

#### 4.

The reading ἀστῶν gains further support from the analysis of language and meter. With the concurrent variant ἐπὶ τὸ, the main verb πέφυκ' is connected to the preposition ἐπὶ expressing a purpose and governing the articular infinitive τὸ ἔχειν, with πλέον interposed as direct object: “is set on possessing more”.<sup>103</sup> For this construction, the papyrus' editors refer to Plato *Republic* 507e 1 (book six) γένος τρίτον ἰδίᾳ ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο πεφυκός, “a third kind of thing [the light] specifically and naturally made for this purpose” [i.e., seeing],<sup>104</sup> where, however, the accusative coming after the preposition is a pronoun, not a verb.

Looking at the whole line, πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ is a typical Euripidean fill-in for the last iambic *metron* (9x, including *Rhesus*)<sup>105</sup> and is always preceded by a predicative adjective<sup>106</sup> in the

---

<sup>103</sup> Translation by Gehad et al. 2024, 22. Since before the discovery of the papyrus no one had printed Stobaeus' ἐπὶ τὸ in Euripides fr. 425.1 (cf. Hense 1894, 409: “ἀστῶν rectius”), there has hardly been another attempt at translating it – except for the one based on the text of the *Corpus Parisinum*: “whoever is always for getting more” (Searby 2007, 705; on the CP, see further the Merano proceedings). For a different translation, taking ἐπὶ τὸ πλέον together as an adverbial phrase meaning ‘most(ly)’, see the end of the paragraph.

<sup>104</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 26. Gabriele Chirielli cites Plutarch *Moralia* 995A (*De esu carniū* 5) εἰ δὲ λέγεις πεφυκέναι σεαυτὸν ἐπὶ τοιαύτην ἐδωδήν, “if you say you have been born to such a food” (final ἐπὶ with a simple noun).

<sup>105</sup> The phrase is registered by Prato 1969–71, 362 in his study of Euripidean verse-making. Its ‘formulaic’ nature is stressed by e.g. Wilkins 1993, 47; Fantuzzi 2020, 365.

<sup>106</sup> For πέφυκ' without ἀνὴρ preceded by an adjective, cf. e.g. Euripides *Hecuba* 332 τὸ δοῦλον ὡς κακὸν πέφυκ' ἀεὶ, *Phoenissae* 1612 ἀσύνετος πέφυκ' ἐγώ.

positive or, in one instance, in the comparative degree conveying the *pointe* of the expression (while ἀνὴρ is almost redundant):<sup>107</sup>

*Medea* 294 ἀρτίφρων πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ

*Heraclidae* 2 δίκαιος [...] πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ

*Hippolytos* 1031, 1075, 1191 κακὸς πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ

*Orestes* 540 μακάριος πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ

*Danae* fr. 325.1 κρείσσων [...] πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ

*Rhesus* 395, 423 διπλοῦς πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ

Admittedly, ἀστῶν is no predicative adjective; but, in substituting ἐπὶ τὸ, it at least dissolves the peculiar prepositional construction ἐπὶ τὸ ἔχειν and allows the verb φύω to combine directly, and regularly, with the infinitive ἔχειν: for this construction in tragedy<sup>108</sup> cf. Euripides *Helena* 998 ἐγὼ πέφυκά τ' εὐσεβεῖν καὶ βούλομαι, “it is in my nature to be pious and I want it”<sup>109</sup> (Theonoe speaking); Sophocles *Antigone* 688 πέφυκα [...] προσκοπεῖν, *Philoctetes* 79–80 μὴ πεφυκότα [...] τοιαῦτα φωνεῖν μηδὲ τεχνᾶσθαι κακά, 88 ἔφυν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐκ τέχνης πράσσειν κακῆς.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> This has been stressed by Ritchie 1964, 207 and Prato 1969–71, 362n18. In fr. 325.1, ἀνὴρ is generalizing, almost meaning “no one” (not: “no *man*”) and including a woman, Danae, see Karamanou 2006, 93.

<sup>108</sup> Passages from other literary genres are cited in LSJ s.v. φύω B II 2.

<sup>109</sup> Translation by Allan 2008, 255; see Kannicht 1969, I, 75 and II, 255 *ad loc.*

<sup>110</sup> *Philoctetes* 1052 νικᾶν γε μέντοι πανταχοῦ χρήζων ἔφυν has been analyzed in this manner (‘born to win’) only by Jebb 1890, 20, while Kamerbeek 1980, 147 links ἔφυν to the participle χρήζων and compares *Oedipus Tyrannus* 9 πρέπων ἔφυν πρὸ τῶνδε φωνεῖν, where the infinitive depends not on φύω but on the participle: cf. LSJ s.v. φύω B

As for meter and rhythm, prosody, and word order, ἐπὶ τὸ contributes to a conspicuous series of short syllables distributed among the first and the second *metron* (γὰρ ἐπὶ |<sup>2</sup>τὸ ∶ πλέον ἔ: ~ ~ | ~ ~ ~): ἐπὶ is the second *longum* of the trimeter, resolved; τὸ forms the initial anceps position in the second *metron*; πλέον makes up the third *longum*, again resolved; after τὸ, the penthemimeral caesura is located. Since both *Ixion* and *Polyidos* are probably quite late plays (around 415 BCE, see above, § 1), this metrical shape might be due to Euripides' well-known increasing use of resolutions and substitutions of *longa*.<sup>111</sup> Nonetheless, with ἐπὶ τὸ the line is strange in several respects. First, ἐπὶ τὸ is found only three times in Euripides' iambics<sup>112</sup> (not surprisingly, in very late plays; it is not attested in Aeschylus and Sophocles): there, it governs an inflected accusative of direction or goal<sup>113</sup> (never an articular infinitive) and occupies a resolved *longum* plus the following *brevis* in the same *metron*:<sup>114</sup>

---

II 1 c. part. and *Oedipus Tyrannus* 587 ἰμεῖρων ἔφυν τύραννος εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ τύραννα δρᾶν. See also Finglass 2018, 170 on *Oedipus Tyrannus* 9, citing *Antigone* 501 τᾶμ' ἀφανδάνοντ' ἔφυν. In *Philoctetes* 1052, the ambiguity is perhaps intentional, and the two constructions merge together, cf. Kamerbeek 1967, 33: πρέπων ἔφυν [...] φωνεῖν “combin[es] the notions of πρέπει σοι [...] φωνεῖν and πέφυκας [...] φωνεῖν.”

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Cropp and Fick 1985, 81: “πλέον ἔχειν in fr. 425.1 might tell against Severe Style” (but with no definitive answer).

<sup>112</sup> *Helen* 932 ἐπὶ τὸ σῶφρον in Diggle's OCT is a misprint for ἐς, see Allan 2008, 248. Lyric occurrences (again with a noun, not with a verb): *Helen* 236–237 ἐπὶ τὸ δυστυχέστατον κάλλος (deleted by Diggle but defended by Allan 2008, 177; Kannicht 1969, II, 81–82); fr. 752f.32 (*Hypsipyle*) ἐπὶ τὸ [...] ἔρυμα.

<sup>113</sup> For *Orestes* 617, Biehl 1965, 68 refers to Schwyzer 1950, 472 (“Akk. des Ziels [...] von beabsichtigtem Ziel, bloßer Richtung auf”), while Willink 1986, 184 compares Herodotus 3.71.3 ἐπὶ τὸ σωφρονέστερον αὐτὴν λάμβανε. For *Iphigenia at Aulis* 1270, Stockert 1992, 556 refers to LSJ s.v. ἐπὶ C with Acc. III 1 “of the object or purpose for which one goes.”

<sup>114</sup> *Hippolytos* 32–33 Ἰππολύτῳ δ' ἔπι / τὸ λοιπὸν is not relevant, since the preposition looks back to the proper name (“over Hippolytos”, see Barrett 1964, 160–161 *ad loc.*), not forward to the temporal expression (i.e., it is not ἐπὶ τὸ λοιπὸν, “for the time being”).

*Orestes* 617 πέμπουσα μύθους ἐπὶ τὸ δυσμενέστερον

*Orestes* 1141 ἀλλ' ἀπολιπὼν τοῦτ' ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον πεσῇ

*Iphigenia at Aulis* 1270 οὐδ' ἐπὶ τὸ κείνου βουλόμενον ἐλήλυθα

In this last passage, the participial construction after the preposition comes closest to the articular infinitive ἐπὶ τὸ ... ἔχειν; but the line has been often suspected, among other reasons,<sup>115</sup> precisely because of the neutral participle used as an abstract noun: τὸ ... βουλόμενον, although not unparalleled (cf., in the same play, line 33 τὰ θεῶν βουλόμεν'),<sup>116</sup> contributes its part to the “ill-phrased”<sup>117</sup> verse expressing Menelaus' claim (obedience to the oath of Tyndareus) in an awkward manner.<sup>118</sup> Returning to the metrical aspect, ἐπὶ τὸ + πλέον ἔχειν remains different from these three occurrences, since ἐπὶ τὸ is split between two *metra*.

Second, the tribrach τὸ πλέον occurs two other times in tragedy, both in Euripides' late *Phoenissae*,<sup>119</sup> where it is a fixed phrase (“the more”) in a metrical unit located *after* the

---

<sup>115</sup> Line 1270 causes a break between what precedes and follows, which would function equally well, if not better, without it: οὐ Μενέλεώς με καταδεδούλωται, τέκνον (1269), ἀλλ' Ἑλλάς κτλ. (1271), “not Menelaus has enslaved me, child, but Greece etc.” (Agamemnon speaking). See Hennig 1870, 156 (cf. Diggle 1994, 412); England 1891, 128; Page 1934, 186: “a weak redundant verse [...]. Doubtless [...] 1270 must rest under suspicion”. Among the editions, Günther's Teubner deletes 1270, Diggle's OCT marks it as “fortasse non Euripideum”, Jouan's Budé keeps it.

<sup>116</sup> Referred to by Collard and Morwood 2017, 253, 554; *contra* Stockert 1992, 174. Stockert 1992, 454, 556 and Andò 2021, 394 compare τὸ τέκνων στερόμενον in line 889 (which is, however, a conjecture for -μενην). Both passages were already cited by J. D. Denniston *apud* Page 1934, 150n1 (discussing the suspected τὸ λελογισμένον in line 386). In defense of definite article + neutral participle making up a noun see Denniston 1931.

<sup>117</sup> Definition by Page 1934, 186, comparing the equally unapt τὸ λελογισμένον in line 386 (see previous footnote).

<sup>118</sup> Menelaus' claim is “umständlich formuliert” even for Stockert 1992, 556, who defends the line. In support of it, see also Collard and Morwood 2017, 554 as well as Andò 2021, 463 *ad loc.*

<sup>119</sup> It might be a deliberate echo: the mother, Giocasta, picks up on the obsession of the son, Eteocles, for power

penthemimeral caesura, a position in which “stronger disruptions of rhythm are tolerated”<sup>120</sup> (the disruption being the solution of the third *longum* because of the sequence ο-ε-ο):

*Phoenissae* 509 ἀνανδρία | γάρ, ἰ τὸ πλέον ὅς | τις ἀπολέσας (v. 510 τοῦλασσον ἔλαβε)  
 ~ \_ ~ \_ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

*Phoenissae* 553 βούλη; τί δ' ἔ | στί ἰ τὸ πλέον; ὄνομ' | ἔχει μόνον·  
 \_ \_ ~ \_ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

If ἐπὶ τὸ πλέον in Stobaeus 3.7.10 and now in the papyrus is right, and rightly interpreted as expressing purpose, τὸ and πλέον are separated both syntactically (τὸ goes with the following infinitive) and metrically (by the penthemimeral caesura). James Diggle<sup>121</sup> has pointed out to me three genuine and sound Euripidean lines whose penthemimer falls after the definite article: *Cyclops* 213 καὶ | <sup>2</sup>τὸν ἰ Ὠρίωνα, *Supplices* 1071 καὶ | <sup>2</sup>τῷ ἰ συμπτρουμένωι, and *Orestes* 889 ὑπὸ | <sup>2</sup>τοῖς ἰ δυναμένοισιν; in his opinion, they sufficiently show that the ἐπὶ | <sup>2</sup>τὸ ἰ πλέον is metrically permissible (although the trimeter is doubtful on other grounds). But the closest

---

and possession, see Mastronarde 1994, 293, 303, 310, commenting also on the Calliclean tone of Eteocles' speech (for this, see also Egli 2003, 189; O'Sullivan 2005, 135–136, 138).

<sup>120</sup> Cropp and Fick 1985, 28; for a similar disruption at the beginning of a trimeter (the other more tolerant position according to Cropp and Fick), cf. Euripides *Supplices* 158 τὸ δὲ πλέον, “and what is more” (τὶ L : corr. Musgrave, see Collard 1975, 149 *ad loc.*). Compare the harder disruption in Euripides *Orestes* 632 Μενέλαε, ποῖ | σὸν ἰ πόδ' ἐπὶ συνν | οἶα κυκλεῖς: here, the *longum* is really split (πόδ' ἐ-πὶ; see Biehl 1965, 71 *ad loc.* referring to *Orestes* 2 οὐδὲ πάθος οὐδὲ and his note there, p. 4). In *Phoenissae* 509 and 553 the disruption is acceptable, since the *longum* is not divided by real word-end: τὸ πλέον is a *Wortbild*. See also West 1982, 86.

<sup>121</sup> *Per litteras electronicas* on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2024. As for the other tragedians, Professor Diggle (whom I heartily thank) cites for Aeschylus: *Agamemnon* 1256 οἶον τὸ | <sup>2</sup>πῦρ ἰ (but this is a complicated line, see Medda 2017, III, 248 *ad loc.*); *Prometheus Vinculus* 589 κλύω | <sup>2</sup>τῆς ἰ (an exception to the rule of avoiding single monosyllabic prepositive before caesura: Maas 1962, 86 (§ 136); West 1982, 83) and 797 οὔθ' | <sup>2</sup>ῆ ἰ; for Sophocles: *Ajax* 71 σὲ τὸν | <sup>2</sup>τὰς ἰ and 1228 (see following note); *Antigone* 503 ἦ | <sup>2</sup>τὸν ἰ and 997 τὸ ἰ σὸν (hept.); *Trachiniae* 725 ἐν | <sup>2</sup>τοῖς ἰ; *Philoctetes* 988 ἐκ | <sup>2</sup>τῶν ἰ σῶν (no caesura here according to Webster 1970, 129: ἐκ-τῶν-σῶν is a metrical unit).

example, *Orestes* 889, combining a pyrrhic preposition with a definite article (ὕπὸ τοῖς ~ ἐπὶ τὸ) has been defined by Paul Maas “a particularly harsh instance” for two prepositives before caesura (in itself, a possible phenomenon).<sup>122</sup> Furthermore, τὸ ἰ πλέον is different from Diggle’s three examples to the extent that the two words are not supposed to belong together; but it is open to doubt whether a Greek audience (later, readership) would have been able to distinguish the word sequence in this way, refraining from blending τὸ with πλέον across the caesura.

Conversely, ἄστῶν makes the metrical shape of the verse quite regular: the spondaic word provides the second *longum* of the first *metron* and the initial anceps syllable of the second, according to its preferred position in tragedy,<sup>123</sup> especially in Euripides (11x).<sup>124</sup> The same metrical and verbal pattern is found with θνητῶν, another spondaic genitive plural easily combining, inter alia, with ὅστις: cf. ὅστις δὲ θνητῶν in Euripides fr. 575.1 (*Oenomaus*) = fr. 835.1 (one *Phrixus*); Sophocles fr. 951.1 *incertae fabulae*; TrGF 72 F 8.1 (Teodectes).<sup>125</sup> In all these places,

---

<sup>122</sup> Maas 1962, 86 (§ 136), citing also *Orestes* 577 ἀλλ’|<sup>2</sup>ὥς ἰ μὴ; Sophocles *Ajax* 1228 τὸν ἐκ|<sup>2</sup>τῆς ἰ. Several of the cases listed by Diggle (see previous footnote) include two prepositives *ante caesuram*; see West 1982, 83.

<sup>123</sup> Sophocles (six out of nine occurrences): *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1489 ποίας γὰρ ἄστῶν (note the preceding γὰρ); *Electra* 975 τίς γάρ ποτ’ ἄστῶν; *Trachiniae* 187 καὶ τοῦ τόδ’ ἄστῶν, 423 πολλοῖσιν ἄστῶν; *Oedipus Coloneus* 13 ξένοι πρὸς ἄστῶν, 1528 ὥς οὔτ’ ἄν ἄστῶν. Aeschylus (four out of nine occurrences, but two are in lyrics): *Septem* 7 ὕμνοϊθ’ ὑπ’ ἄστῶν; *Agamemnon* 1413 καὶ μῖσος ἄστῶν; *Eumenides* 487 κρίνασα δ’ ἄστῶν, 807 ἔξειν ὑπ’ ἄστῶν. In this and the following footnote, occurrences of partitive ἄστῶν are underlined.

<sup>124</sup> *Medea* 297 φθόνον πρὸς ἄστῶν; *Heraclidae* 166 κτήσῃ πρὸς ἄστῶν, 335 κἀγὼ μὲν ἄστῶν, 412 οὔτ’ ἄλλον ἄστῶν; *Supplices* 355 ἐς πλῆθος ἄστῶν, 843 νέοισιν ἄστῶν; *Phoenissae* 99 ἀλλ’ οὔτις ἄστῶν; *Orestes* 442 θανεῖν ὑπ’ ἄστῶν [suspected: see Willink 1986, 160 *ad loc.*], 446 πάντων πρὸς ἄστῶν, 536 = 625 ἕα δ’ ὑπ’ ἄστῶν. The genitive plural ἄστῶν takes another position only in *Orestes* 874 ἄστῶν δὲ δὴ τιν’ (at line beginning for emphatic reasons, see Willink 1986, 228 *ad loc.*); *Orestes* 746 θανόνθ’ ὑπ’ ἄστῶν is in trochaic tetrameters.

<sup>125</sup> θνητῶν occupies the same position also in the opposite phrase ‘no one among mortals’: *Alcestis* 783 = *Heraclidae*

θνητῶν is a genitive partitive (‘whoever among mortals’); the same holds true for most (not all) occurrences of ἀστῶν collected in footnotes 123 and 124: not so in the line ὅστις – ἀνὴρ as transmitted by Stobaeus 3.22.2, where ἀστῶν is no usual genitive partitive (‘whoever among the citizens’) but combines idiomatically with πλέον ἔχειν (see above, § 3). Thus, a basic or even banal function cannot be invoked as an argument against the authenticity of ἀστῶν, as if it were a sign of trivial Euripidean imitation.

The recognition of the proper grammatical function of ἀστῶν can further provide an explanation for the concurrent reading ἐπὶ τὸ leading to conclusions opposite to those of the papyrus editors (according to whom ἀστῶν is trivial and wrong, ἐπὶ τὸ right).<sup>126</sup> The starting point for this explanation is the variant ἐπὶ τῷ, with *omega* (to be understood as τῷ, article dative singular neut.-masc.), transmitted in Stobaeus 3.10.7 by the codices M and A instead of ἐπὶ τὸ in S (and now in pap.): answering the basic philological question *utrum in alterum*, it could be argued that ἐπὶ τῷ was born as a scholarly note written between and above ἀστῶν and πλέον ἔχειν with the purpose of stating their connection, which could have escaped less attentive readers. In other words, someone felt the need to specify that ἀστῶν was not to be connected with the preceding pronoun ὅστις as its expected partitive genitive (‘whoever among the citizens’), but with the following πλέον ἔχειν with the idiomatic sense of ‘prevail over’. In this superlinear gloss, the dative τῷ would have been an inflected definite article referring to the infinitive idiom πλέον ἔχειν in the main text; the preposition ἐπὶ would have

---

977 = *Hecuba* 864 (see Prato 1969–71, 353); *Medea* 85; *Hercules furens* 1015, 1314; *Troades* 95; *Ion* 1361. I thank Andrea Rodighiero for sharing these passages, taken from a forthcoming paper of his.

<sup>126</sup> See Gehad et al. 2024, 26, 31.

indicated a hierarchic relationship or connection (cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπὶ B with Dative I 1g in *dependence upon, in the power of*),<sup>127</sup> thus: ἀστῶν ἐπὶ τῷ πλέον ἔχειν, “ἀστῶν (referring to the expression) πλέον ἔχειν”. The eclogue as inherited by Stobaeus’ codices M A included the gloss ἐπὶ τῷ in the main text, perhaps taking it as an instance of ἐπὶ with dative expressing a purpose<sup>128</sup> and the verb φύω (cf. Euripides *Medea* 928 γυνὴ δὲ θῆλυ καπὶ δακρύοις ἔφυ, “a woman is by nature female and inclined to tears”, fr. 322.1, from *Danae*, ἔρω γὰρ ἀργὸν καπὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἔφυ, “love is an idle thing and inclined to similar things”).<sup>129</sup> The version reflected in Stobaeus’ codex S and in the papyrus changed τῷ to τὸ, perhaps under the influence of the comparative expression ἐπὶ τὸ πλέον attested with adverbial function in prose (e.g. Thucydides 3.37.3 ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλέον ἄμεινον οἰκοῦσι τὰς πόλεις, ‘generally’; Aristoteles *Ethica Nicomachea* 1137b 15–16 τὸ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλέον λαμβάνει ὁ νόμος, ‘the most cases’) and as a complement indicating direction in poetry (Euripides *Supplices* 370 ἐπὶ τέρμα καὶ τὸ πλέον ἐμῶν κακῶν ἰκόμενος, lyr., ‘to the limit and beyond’;<sup>130</sup> Theocritus 1.20 καὶ τὰς βουκολικὰς ἐπὶ

---

<sup>127</sup> The standard grammatical expression for ‘applied to’ is ἐπὶ τοῦ; see Dickey 2007, 118 (4.1.31). That the original remark corrupted into ἐπὶ τῷ / ἐπὶ τὸ could have been ἐπὶ τῶν, with genitive plural, is also a possibility: ἐπὶ τῶν would have been written above ἀστῶν, to clarify that this was no genitive partitive but was governed by πλέον ἔχειν, meaning “over the (~ἐπὶ τῶν) citizens”. This hypothesis presupposes a further corruption, the loss of final -v in τῶν; but it would well explain why τῷ lacks the dative-iota: because this had never been written (the article being an original genitive). Gabriele Chirielli will expose *suo loco* the idea that the supposed superlinear gloss ἐπὶ τῷ would have been prefixed to ἀστῶν πλέον ἔχειν, explaining the construction φύω + infinitive (which is, however, not so difficult).

<sup>128</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπὶ B with Dative III 2: with articular infinitive e.g. Thucydides 1.38.2 ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπὸ τούτων ὑβρίζεσθαι, “(not) to be scorned by them.”

<sup>129</sup> See Mastronarde 2002, 321 *ad loc.* respectively Karamanou 2006, 84 *ad loc.*

<sup>130</sup> See Collard 1975, 204 *ad loc.* and Diggle 1994, 64n18.

τὸ πλεόν ἵκεο μοίσας, “came to the <point> in excess <of others>”).<sup>131</sup> The whole line could perhaps have been taken to mean something like “whoever man by nature (πέφυκ’) is at the top, at his best”, with ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν understood as an adverb of manner going with ἔχειν indicating a state, a very common idiom (cf. LSJ s.v. ἔχω B II 2 with many examples: εὖ, καλῶς, κακῶς ἔχειν etc.). But this is hardly good Greek and betrays the corruption.

However, even if this suggestion for the supposed corruption ἀστῶν > ἐπὶ τῶι > τῶ (M A) / τὸ (S pap.) is not accepted—it must have been an old corruption, already affecting the papyrus—and even if, more fundamentally, one remains persuaded that ἐπὶ plus articular infinitive along with an accusative object (πλεόν) depending on πέφυκ’ is neatly formulated: my point is that the new papyrus documents this construction only for *Polyidos*. With regard to this, it could even be argued that the correct case after ἐπί was the dative:<sup>132</sup> ἐπί + dative following φύω is attested twice in Euripides, in the lines from *Medea* and *Danae* quoted above; the articular infinitive ἐπὶ τῶ ἔχειν expressing purpose with πέφυκα is found in Thucydides 1.70.9 αὐτοὺς [...] πεφυκέναι ἐπὶ τῶ μήτε αὐτοὺς ἔχειν ἡσυχίαν, “they [the Athenians] were born never to have tranquility themselves”,<sup>133</sup> and in Plato *Republic* 341d 7–8 οὐ καὶ ἡ τέχνη [...]

---

<sup>131</sup> Translation by Dover 1985, 77. See Cholmeley 1919<sup>2</sup>, 189 *ad loc.* and Gow 1950, 5 *ad loc.*, both referring for the articular comparative adjective to Xenophon *Hellenica* 4.7.5 ὥσπερ πένταθλος πάντῃ ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ὑπερβάλλειν ἐπειράτο, “like an athlete in pentathlon, he [Agesipolis] tried to completely surpass [Agesilaos] for the greater part”, i.e., everywhere he could.

<sup>132</sup> Gehad et al. 2024, 26 cite *Medea* 928 and fragment 322.1 but discard the dative construction because “the object ‘possessing more’ resembles a purpose and is probably better expressed with the accusative.”

<sup>133</sup> See Morris 1887, 175 *ad loc.*: “the infs. with ἐπὶ τῶ after πεφυκέναι represent the constant object of their whole existence.” I owe both this and the following reference to Gabriele Chirielli.

ἐπὶ τούτῳ πέφυκεν, ἐπὶ τῷ τὸ συμφέρον ἑκάστῳ ζητεῖν τε καὶ ἐκπορίζειν, “and does the art not naturally exist for this, to search and provide the advantage for everyone?”. If ἐπὶ τῷ is better than ἐπὶ τὸ, then the two Stobaeon manuscripts M A would have preserved the correct reading, S and the papyrus a corrupted one. But be that as it may: this is a choice concerning *Polyidos*; *Ixion* might have presented the diverging authorial reading ἀστῶν in an otherwise identical verse (ὅστις γὰρ ... πλέον ἔχειν πέφυκ’ ἀνήρ): the substantive ἀστῶν was purposely chosen to focus on the behavior of the πλεονέκτης in a civic perspective. This plaidoyer for ἀστῶν as *lectio Euripidea* is the fourth and, for now, last result of the revision of the indirect transmission prompted by the new evidence from Philadelphia.

## Bibliography

Aélion, Rachel. 1983. *Euripide héritier d’Eschyle*. Tome I. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Allan, William. 2008. *Euripides. Helen*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Andò, Valeria. 2021. *Euripide, Ifigenia in Aulide*. Appendice metrica a cura di Ester Cerbo. Lexis Supplementi 4. Venezia: Edizioni Ca’ Foscari.

Balot, Ryan K. 2001. *Greed and Injustice in Classical Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Balot, Ryan K. 2024. “Freedom, *Pleonexia*, and Persuasion in Plato’s *Gorgias*”. In Shaw 2024, 172–192.

Barney, Rachel. 2017. “Callicles and Thrasymachus”. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta  
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/callicles-thrasymachus/>>.

Barrett, William S. 1964. *Euripides. Hippolytos*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Bengl, Hans. 1929. *Staatstheoretische Probleme im Rahmen der attischen, vornehmlich euripideischen Tragödie*. Coburg: Tageblatt Haus.
- Bernhardt, Otto. 1862. "Zu Stobäus Florilegium". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 17, 465–469.
- Biehl, Werner. 1965. *Euripides. Orestes*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Biehl, Werner. 1986. *Euripides. Kyklops*. Heidelberg: Winter Verlag.
- Bond, Godfrey W. 1981. *Euripides. Heracles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Boter, Gerhard J. 1986. "Thrasymachus and ΠΛΕΟΝΕΞΙΑ." *Mnemosyne* 39,3/4: 261–281.
- Brillante, Carlo. 1995. "Amore senza χάρις: Pind. Pyth. II 42–48." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 49,1: 33–38.
- Carrara, Laura. 2014. *L'indovino Poliido. Eschilo, Le Cretesi. Sofocle, Manteis. Euripide, Poliido. Pleiadi* 17. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1999<sup>2</sup>. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Nouvelle édition avec supplément. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Cholmeley, Roger J. 1919<sup>2</sup>. *The Idylls of Theocritus*. London: G. Bell & sons.
- Cobet, Gabriel. 1877. "Euripides". *Mnemosyne* 5,3: 249–273.
- . 1878. *Collectanea critica quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos*. Leiden: Brill.
- Collard, Christopher. 1975. *Euripides Supplices*. Volume II Commentary. Groningen: Bouma.
- Collard, Christopher, Martin J. Cropp, and Kevin H. Lee. 1995. *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays*. Volume I. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Collard, Christopher, and Martin Cropp. 2008a. *Euripides: Fragments. Aegeus–Meleager*. LOEB 504. Cambridge, Massachusetts–London: Harvard University Press.
- . 2008b. *Euripides: Fragments. Oedipus–Chrysippus. Other fragments*. LOEB 506. Cambridge, Massachusetts–London: Harvard University Press.

- Collard, Christopher and James Morwood. 2017. *Euripides. Iphigenia at Aulis*. Volume 2, Commentary and Indexes. Liverpool: Aris & Phillips.
- Cropp, Martin and Gordon Fick 1985. *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: The Fragmentary Tragedies*. BICS Supplement 43. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Crusius, Otto. 1890. Review of Nauck 1889<sup>2</sup>. *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 14,2: 687–704.
- Davies, John K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Davison, J. A. 1953. “Protagoras, Democritus, and Anaxagoras.” *Classical Quarterly* 3,1/2: 33–45.
- Dawe, Roger D. 2006<sup>2</sup>. *Sophocles. Oedipus Rex*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Denniston, John D. 1931. “Two Notes.” *The Classical Review* 45,1: 7–8.
- Di Gregorio, Lamberto. 1979. “Lettura diretta e utilizzazione di fonti intermedie nelle citazioni plutarchee dei tre grandi tragici. I.” *Aevum* 53,1: 11–50.
- . 1980. “Lettura diretta e utilizzazione di fonti intermedie nelle citazioni plutarchee dei tre grandi tragici. II.” *Aevum* 54,1: 46–79.
- Dickey, Eleanor. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Classical Resources Series. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- Diggle, James. 1994. *Euripidea. Collected Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm. 1851. *Aeschyli tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta*. Tomus I. Editio secunda emendatio. Oxford: E typographeo academico.
- Dodds, Eric R. 1959<sup>2</sup>. *Plato. Gorgias*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dorandi, Tiziano. 2023. ‘Stobaeana’. *Tradizione manoscritta e storia del testo dei primi due libri dell’ “Antologia” di Giovanni Stobeo*. Diotima. Studies in Greek Philology 9. Baden-Baden: Academia.

- Dover, Kenneth. 1985. *Theocritus. Select poems*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Duchemin, Jacqueline. 1968<sup>2</sup>. *L' AΓΩΝ dans la tragédie grecque*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Easterling, Pat E. 1982. *Sophocles. Trachiniae*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Egli, Franziska. 2003. *Euripides im Kontext zeitgenössischer intellektueller Strömungen. Analyse der Funktion philosophischer Themen in den Tragödien und Fragmenten*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 189. Munich-Leipzig: Saur.
- England, Edwin B. 1891. *The Iphigenia at Aulis of Euripides*. London-New York: Macmillan.
- Fantuzzi, Marco. 2020. *The Rhesus attributed to Euripides*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feddern, Stefan. 2021. *Elemente der antiken Erzähltheorie*. Narratologia 74. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.
- Finglass, Patrick J. 2018. *Sophocles. Oedipus the King*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1946. "A Passage in the *Phoenissae*", *Eranos* 44: 81–89.
- Fries, Almut. 2014. *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 114. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.
- Gantz, Timothy. 1993. *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore-London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Gehad, Basem, John Gibert, and Yvona Trnka-Amrhein. 2024. "P. Phil. Nec. 23 ↑: New Excerpts from Euripides' *Ino* and *Polyidos*." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 230: 1–40.
- Gentili, Bruno et al. 1995. *Pindaro. Le Pitiche*. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla. Milano: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore.

- Gow, Andrew S. F. 1950. *Theocritus*. Volume 2: *Commentary, appendix, indexes, and plates*.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Groeneboom, Peter. 1944. *Aeschylus' Agamemnon met inleiding, critische noten en commentaar*.  
Groningen: Wolters.
- Handley, Eric. 1953. "-sis Nouns in Aristophanes." *Eranos* 51: 129–142.
- Hartung, Johann A. 1844. *Euripides restitutus sive scriptorum Euripidis ingeniique censura*. Volumen alterum. Hamburg: Perthes.
- Heath, Benjamin. 1762. *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschyli, Sophoclis, Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hennig, Hermann. 1870. *De Iphigeniae Aulidensis forma ac condicione*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Hense, Otto. 1894. *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium. Volumen tertium. Anthologii librum tertium*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- . 1909. *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium. Volume quartum. Anthologii libri quarti partem priorem*.  
Berlin: Weidmann.
- Hermann, Gottfried. 1828. *Opuscula*. Volumen tertium. Leipzig: Fleischer (*De Heliadibus dissertatio*).
- . 1834. *Opuscula*. Volumen quintum. Leipzig: Fleischer (*De Myrmidonibus, Nereidibus, Phrygibus dissertatio*).
- . 1852. *Aeschyli tragoediae*. Tomus primus. Leipzig: Weidmann.
- van Herwerden, Hendrik. 1862. *Exercitationes criticae in poeticis et prosaicis quibusdam Atticorum monumentis*. Den Haag: Martin Nijhoff.
- Hunter, Richard. 1983. *Eubulus: the fragments*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 24.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- . 2009. *Critical Moments in Classical Literature. Studies in the Ancient Views of Literature and its Uses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, Richard, and Donald Russell. 2011. *Plutarch. How to study poetry (De audiendis poetis)*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, Richard, and Rebecca Laemmle. 2020. *Euripides. Cyclops*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurst, André, and Antje Kolde. 2008. *Lycophron Alexandra*. CUF. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Irwin, Terence H. 2024. "Cooperation and the Search for Truth: Socrates and Callicles." In Shaw 2024, 146–171.
- Jebb, Richard C. 1890. *Sophocles: the plays and the fragments. Part IV the Philoctetes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1892. *Sophocles: the plays and the fragments. Part V the Trachiniae*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jouan, François and Herman van Looy (2002<sup>2</sup>). *Euripide: Tragédies. Tome VIII, 2.e partie: Fragments. De Bellérophon a Protésilas*. Deuxième tirage. CUF. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Kamerbeek, Jan C. 1959. *The Plays of Sophocles. Commentaries. Part II Trachiniae*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1967. *The Plays of Sophocles. Commentaries. Part IV Oedipus Tyrannus*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1980. *The Plays of Sophocles. Commentaries. Part VI The Philoctetes*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kannicht, Richard. 1969. *Euripides. Helena. Band I Einleitung und Text. Band II Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- . 2004. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 5, *Euripides*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Karamanou, Ioanna. 2006. *Euripides Danae and Dictys. Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 228. Munich-Leipzig: Saur.

- Kingsley, K. Scarlett. 2024. *Herodotus and the Presocratics: Inquiry and Intellectual Culture in the Fifth Century BCE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kyriakou, Poulheria. 2006. *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 80. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter.
- Lesky, Albin. 1972<sup>3</sup>. *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Liapis, Vayos. 2012. *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, Anthony A. 1968. *Language and Thought in Sophocles: a Study of Abstract Nouns and Poetic Technique*. University of London classical studies 6. London: University of London.
- Maas, Paul. 1962. *Greek Metre*. Translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Marginesu, Giovanni. 2016. *Callia l'Ateniese. Metamorfosi di un'élite, 421-371 a.C.* Historia Einzelschriften 247. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Mastronarde, Donald J. 1994. *Euripides. Phoenissae*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. *Euripides. Medea*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Medda, Enrico. 2017. *Eschilo, Agamennone. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento*. 3 vols. Bollettino dei classici. Supplemento (Accademia nazionale dei Lincei) 31. Roma: Bardi Edizioni.
- Morris, Charles D. 1887. *Thucydides Book I*. College series of Greek authors. Boston: Ginn & co.
- Most, Glenn W. 2003. "Euripide O ΓΝΩΜΟΛΟΓΙΚΩΤΑΤΟΣ." In *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico I*, edited by Maria Serena Funghi, 141–166. Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere La Colombaria: Studi 218. Firenze: Olschki.
- Nauck, August. 1889<sup>2</sup>. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner.

- O'Sullivan, Patrick. 2005. "Of Sophists, Tyrants and Polyphemos: the Natur of the Beast in Euripides' *Cyclops*." In *Satyr Drama: Tragedy at Play*, edited by George W. M. Harrison, 119–159. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
- . 2021. "Satyric Friendship in Euripides' *Cyclops*." In *Reconstructing Satyr Drama*, edited by Andreas A. Antonopoulos, Menelaos M. Christopoulos, and George W. M. Harrison, 375–394. MythonEikonPoiesis 12. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.
- O'Sullivan, Patrick and Christopher Collard. 2013. *Euripides Cyclops and Major Fragments of Greek Satyric Dramas*. Oxford: Aris & Phillips.
- Ortiz de Landázuri, Manuel C. 2018–19. "Plato's concept of power in *Republic I*." *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 60/61: 47–64.
- Page, Denys L. 1934. *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy Studied with Special Reference to Euripides' Iphigeneia in Aulis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Piccione, Rosa Maria. 1994a. "Sulle fonti e le metodologie compilative di Stobeo." *Eikasmós* 5: 281–317.
- . 1994b. "Sulle citazioni euripidee in Stobeo e sulla struttura dell'*Anthologion*." *Rivista di Filologia e Istruzione Classica* 122,2: 175–218.
- . 1999. "Caratterizzazione di lemmi nell'*Anthologion* di Giovanni Stobeo. Questioni di metodo." *Rivista di Filologia e Istruzione Classica* 127,2: 139–175.
- Prato, Carlo. 1969–71. "La tecnica versificatoria euripidea." *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia di Lecce* 5: 341–383 [= Carlo Prato. 2009. *Scritti minori*, edited by Pietro Giannini and Saulo Delle Donne, 263–289. Testi e studi 17. Galatina: Congedo].
- Preiser, Claudia. 2000. *Euripides: Telephos. Einleitung, Text, Kommentar*. Spudasmata 78. Hildesheim-Zürich-New York: Olms.

Reeve, C. D. C. 2013. *Blindness and Reorientation: Problems in Plato's Republic*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.

Ritchie, William. 1964. *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, Friedrich W. 1886. *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern. Nebst einem Anhang zur Kritik der Anthologie. Zweiter Band zu Euripides*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Schwyzler, Eduard. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik. Zweiter Band. Syntax und Syntaktische Stilistik* vervollständigt und herausgegeben von Albert Debrunner. Munich: Beck.

Seaford, Richard S. A. 1984. *Cyclops of Euripides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Searby, David M., ed. 2007. *The Corpus Parisinum: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text with Commentary and English Translation. (A Medieval Anthology of Greek Texts from the Pre-Socratics to the Church Fathers, 600 B.C.-700 A.-D.)*. Lewiston-Queenstorn-Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Séchan, Louis. 1926. *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Seidensticker, Bernd. 2020. *Euripides: Kyklops*. Griechische Dramen. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.

Shaw, J. Clerk, ed. 2024. *Plato's Gorgias. A Critical Guide*. Cambridge Critical Guides. Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sheffield, Frisbee. 2024. "Desire and Argument in Plato's *Gorgias*." In Shaw 2024, 124–145.

Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. 2003. *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*. Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches. Lanham et al.: Lexington Books.

Stockert, Walter. 1992. *Euripides. Iphigenie in Aulis. Band 2 Detailkommentar*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

van Velthoven, Bob R. W. 2022–23. “The Many Lovers of Gain. The Pseudo-Platonic *Hipparchus* and the Fourth-century BCE Debate on the Pursuit of Self-interest.” ΠΗΓΗ / FONS 7-8: 71–96.

Wachsmuth, Curt. 1882. *Studien zu den griechischen Florilegien*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Webster, Thomas B. L. 1967. *The tragedies of Euripides*. London: Methuen & co.

———. 1970. *Sophocles. Philoctetes*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Welcker, Friedrich G. 1839. *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet*. Abth. I-II. Bonn: Weber.

West, Martin L. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. 1905. “Lesefrüchte 92-116.” *Hermes* 40,1: 116–153.

———. 1907. *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*. Unveränderter Abdruck aus der ersten Auflage von Euripides Herakles I Kapitel I-IV. Berlin: Weidmann.

Wilkins, John. 1993. *Euripides: Heraclidae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Willink, Charles W. 1986. *Euripides. Orestes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.