

CRITIAS, *SISYPHUS* (FR. 19 SNELL, 1 NAUCK)

24-6 τούσδε τοὺς λόγους λέγων
 διδαγμάτων ἥδιστον εἰσηγήσατο
 ψευδεὶ καλύψας τὴν ἀλήθειαν λόγῳ.

The fiction devised by the inventor of religious terror¹ is “the most pleasant of teachings”. This has been called a “pungent paradox” (M. Davies, “BICS” 36, 1989, 22). Others have found ἥδιστον alien to the tone of the passage, and have substituted μέγιστον (Methner, F.W. Schmidt), κράτιστον (Mutschmann), κέρδιστον (Nauck). The latter is commended by W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, 3, Cambridge 1969, 243 n. 4, who compares Eur. *El.* 743-4 φοβεροὶ δὲ βροτοῖσι μῦθοι / κέρδος πρὸς θεῶν θεραπείαν. There the appended πρὸς θεῶν θεραπεία shows precisely where the fictitious tales bring profit. Here “most profitable” lacks focus. I suggest κύδιστον, to be taken ironically. For the construction see Aesch. *Su.* 13 κύδιστ’ ἀχέων. The superlative is applied again to an abstract at Theogn. 904 κυδίστην ἀρετήν. Tragedy twice has the neuter κύδιον (Eur. *Alc.* 960, *Andr.* 639 [v. l. κύδιστον]). For the corruption compare the variant κῦδος for κῆδος at Eur. *Tr.* 399 and *Pi. Ol.* 1.107. In the passage immediately preceding this fragment, the manuscripts of Sext. Emp. have ψύχων for ψήχων (*Adv. math.* 9.51 = Call. fr. 191.11). For further examples of the common phonetic confusion of η and υ see my *Studies on the Text of Euripides*, Oxford 1981, 85, and *Euripidea: Collected Essays*, Oxford 1994, 422 n. 11. I am also reminded of Jackson’s brilliant εὐδίαν for ἡδεῖαν at Eur. *Ph.* 399 (*Marg. scaen.* 158-9).

37-40 τοίους πέριξ ἔστησεν ἀνθρώποις φόβους,
 δι’ οὓς καλῶς τε τῷ λόγῳ κατώκισεν
 τὸν δαίμον’ οὗτος ἐν πρέποντι χωρίῳ,
 τὴν ἀνομίαν τε τοῖς νόμοις κατέσβεσεν.

37 τοίους πέριξ ἔστησεν Meineke: τοιούτους περιέστησεν Sext. Emp.

39 οὗτος Diels: οὐκ Sext.

I give Snell’s text. W. Luppe (“Hermes” 120, 1992, 118-19) deletes 40, because the inventor of religion did not “quell lawlessness with laws” but rather invented religion when earlier lawgivers failed to quell lawlessness.

¹ In 13 θεῶν (Wecklein) δέος (Petit) is a plausible remedy for the transmitted γνῶναι δὲ ὅς (LE: δέωση N). Since this passage has several verbal repetitions, the appearance of δαίμα in 14 is no obstacle to δέος. But N’s reading perhaps implies a variant δέη, and the plural slightly mitigates the repetition. Cf. Lys. 6.20 δέη πολλά καὶ κινδύνους ὁ θεὸς ἐπιπέμπει.

This is true, but it is too logical. The inventor devised gods who could detect crimes which previously went undetected. He did not replace the laws with religion; he invented religion in support of them. To that extent he may be said to have quelled lawlessness with laws. νόμοις "verbo ἀνομίαν per rhetoricum artificium opponitur", as Mutschmann said. See also Davies, *loc. cit.* 23-4. Further, if 40 is deleted, then τε in 38 has no function. To give it one, Luppe adopts Diels' κὰν for ἐν in 39. But καλῶς τε... κὰν πρέποντι χωρίῳ is not a satisfactory pairing. The one weakness of Snell's text is Diels' οὔτος for οὐκ in 39. We do not want the demonstrative in a subordinate clause. Nor is οὐκ the likeliest of corruptions for οὔτος.

καλῶς and τῷ λόγῳ complement each other. "καλός of a speech (and similarly καλῶς or εὖ λέγειν) can either approve its content or recognize its skill" (Barrett on Eur. *Hi.* 487). And a καλὸς λόγος can promote a lie: Eur. *Antiope* fr. 206.1-3 Nauck (32.1-3 Kambitsis) γένοιεντ' ἂν εὖ λελεγμένοι λόγοι / ψευδεῖς, ἐπὼν δὲ κάλλεσιν νικῶεν ἂν / τάληθές (cf. 26 above ψευδεῖ καλύψας τὴν ἀλήθειαν λόγῳ). While καλῶς... τῷ λόγῳ is perfectly acceptable in itself (cf. Thuc. 1.84.3 λόγῳ καλῶς μεμφόμενοι, 3.38.4 τῶν λόγῳ καλῶς ἐπιτιμησάντων), we shall gain a no less acceptable expression, and better account for οὐκ in the next line, if we write καλῶς... τῶν λόγων... οὐ(νε)κ'. "Such were the fears with which he hedged mankind around. By way of these fears he both neatly, for the sake of his fiction, located god in a suitable place and quelled lawlessness with laws". For the placing of τῶν λόγων and οὐνεκα in different lines see Aesch. *Su.* 1006-7 ὦν πολὺς πόνος, / πολὺς δὲ πόντος οὐνεκ', Soph. *El.* 578-9 τοῦτου θανεῖν / χρῆν αὐτὸν οὐνεκ', *OT* 857-8 οὐχὶ μαντείας γ' ἂν... / βλέψαιμ' ἂν οὐνεκ'. The plural τῶν λόγων picks up 24 τούσδε τοὺς λόγους. The corruption of οὐνεκ' ἐν to οὐκ ἐν calls to mind Eur. *Herc.* 64 οὐνεκ' Canter: οὐκ ἐν L.

Compare these Platonic passages: *Crito* 46D πρὶν μὲν ἐμὲ δεῖν ἀποθνήσκειν καλῶς ἐλέγετο (sc. ὁ λόγος), νῦν δὲ κατάδηλος ἄρα ἐγένετο ὅτι ἄλλως ἔνεκα λόγου ἐλέγετο, ἣν δὲ παιδιὰ καὶ φλυαρία ὡς ἀληθῶς; *Lach.* 196C ὁρῶμεν μὴ Νικίας οἶεταί τι λέγειν καὶ οὐ λόγου ἔνεκα ταῦτα λέγει, *Euthyd.* 286D λόγου ἔνεκα... λέγεις τὸν λόγον, ἵνα δὴ ἄτοπον λέγῃς, ἢ ὡς ἀληθῶς δοκεῖ σοι...; *Theaet.* 191C θὲς δὴ μοι λόγου ἔνεκα ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν ἐνὸν κήρινον ἐκμαγεῖον, *Rep.* 612C κὰν εἰ μὴ δυνατόν εἴη ταῦτα λανθάνειν καὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους, ὅμως δοτέον εἶναι τοῦ λόγου ἔνεκα, *Leg.* 781D εἰ δὴ δοκεῖ λόγου γ' ἔνεκα μὴ ἀτυχῇ τὸν περὶ πάσης τῆς πολιτείας γενέσθαι λόγον.