The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On Diodorus: Books XVI–XVIII

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 09 / December 2006, pp 436 - 438

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00995210, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00995210

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1906). On Diodorus: Books XVI–XVIII. The Classical Review, 20, pp 436–438 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00995210

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

his who being storm-bound on his way from Carthage to Alexandria put in at the *extrema Cyrenorum ora*: he was entertained by a hermit who had not much to offer him in the way of food but *fasciculum herbae intulit, cuius nomen excidit, quae menthae*

similis, exuberans foliis, saporem mellis praestabat. If this be Strabo's *πόα*, might it not be Homer's *λωτός*?

R. M. HENRY.

Queen's College, Belfast.

ON DIODORUS: BOOKS XVI.-XVIII.

IT is well known that Greek MSS. are sometimes corrupted by the substitution for the right word of another word suggested by the context, a mistake which we are all conscious of making from time to time in writing and in speaking. In this *Review* I have many times tried to explain a difficult passage by the hypothesis of such corruption; and I think it worth while now to publish the following notes on the fourth volume of the new Teubner Diodorus, without waiting to put into shape others which I have by me on the earlier volumes, because so many of them turn on the same point. In book 17 especially occur a remarkable number of passages, the text of which may be explained in this way, and which are not uninteresting in themselves.

16. 1. 1 *γενέσθαι* should be *γίγνεσθαι*. A 'gnomic' or 'frequentative' aorist infinitive has—in spite of Goodwin—no existence.

ιβ. 6 ἐπὶ τὸ συνεχές τῆς ἱστορίας πορευσόμεθα, βραχεία τοῖς χρόνοις προαναδραμόντες.

In this and some other passages (see the references to Polybius l. 12. 8, etc. in Liddell and Scott) it seems clear that *προαναδραμόντες* should be written. In all of them the writer gives first a brief account of earlier events and then goes on with *τὸ συνεχές τῆς ἱστορίας*. *πρός* would be unmeaning.

16. 22. 3 Should *καθ' ἑαυτούς* be *καθ' ἑκάστους*? The two words do get confused. But *ἑαυτούς* may very well be right, though the other would be clearer.

16. 35. 4 *πέζῃ βοηθήσαντος μετὰ πεζῶν διασυρίων.*

πέζῃ. Del. Reisk.; fort. scribendum δξέως (Fischer). πέζῃ is obviously due to πεζῶν. I suggest σπουδῇ as the original.

16. 44. 1 *τὴν φιλίαν ἔφασαν τὴν πρὸς Πέρσας τηρεῖν, συμμαχίαν δὲ ἀποστέλλειν ἀντίπαν.*

ἀντίπαν cannot be used thus with an infinitive in the sense of *refused*. It means

probably *answered*. It would be possible to read *οὐκ ἀποστέλλειν ἀντίπαν*, but I incline to think that *οὐκ ἐθέλειν* has been lost. This would help *τηρεῖν* too.

16. 45. 1 *τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τῶν πολιτῶν ἑκατὸν ὡς συμβούλους.*

Perhaps <εἰς> ἑκατόν. ΕΙC and ΕΚ are very like one another.

16. 59. 2 *καὶ <ὀλίγον> τὸ τῶν μισθοφόρων ἔχοντα πλῆθος?* Or some such word.

16. 92. 3 *ὁ μὲν τεχνίτης κρίνας οἰκεῖον ὑποληφθήσεσθαι τὸ ποίημα, τῇ διαβάσει τοῦ Φιλίππου καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἐπιπλῆξαι βουλόμενος τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως, καίπερ οὖσαν μεγάλην καὶ περιβόητον, ὅπως μεταπέσοιτ' ἂν κ.τ.λ.*

There seems no reason for Fischer's doubt of *διαβάσει*. It is a perfectly suitable word and occurs again 17. 16. 1 *προῦθκε βουλὴν περὶ τῆς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβάσεως*. On the other hand *ἐπιπλῆξαι*, which he does not question, can hardly be right. (1) It is not a suitable word. *εὐδαιμονία, prosperity, power*, etc. is not a fault to be rebuked. A man may be found fault with for pride, harshness, injustice, and so on, not for being very prosperous. (2) *ὅπως κ.τ.λ.* cannot follow properly on a verb of *rebuking*. If it is wrong, we may safely conclude that D. wrote *ἐπιδείξαι*, which goes perfectly with *ὅπως μεταπέσοιτ' ἂν*, and in which δ is the λ (Δ Λ) of *ἐπιπλῆξαι*. *ἂν* with the future optative is of course doubtful.

17. 7. 5 *ὁρᾶσθαι δὲ τὸν ἥλιον ἔτι νυκτὸς οὐσης ἀνατέλλοντα, τὰς ἀκτῖνας οὐκ ἐν κυκλοτερεῖ σχήματι τετραμμένον, ἀλλὰ τὴν φλόγα κατὰ πολλοὺς τόπους ἔχοντα διεσπαρμένην.*

On *τετραμμένον*, which is clearly impossible, Fischer notes *ita R^X, μένοντα F; συνεστραμμένον vel συνέχοντα conl. Hertl. II. 2 p. 3, πέμποντα Dindl.; fort. τετορνευμένον (cf. Plat. Tim. 33 B)*.

Remembering how easily Γ and Τ get confused, we may, I think, confidently

conjecture περιγεγραμμένον, which gives exactly the right sense. In Aesch. Ag. 1328 I have suggested σκιᾶ τις ἂν γράψειεν for σκιᾶ τις ἀντρέψειεν. μένοντα would seem a remarkable instance of the termination (-μενον) surviving the body of the word and forming a new one.

17. 9. 4 ἡδέως ἂν ὁ βασιλεὺς προσεδέξατο τὰς ἐντεύξεις (petitions) καὶ πάντ' ἂν ἀξιούμενος συνεχώρησεν.

Probably αἰτούμενος should be read for ἀξιούμενος, which hardly admits of the required meaning, *entreated, besought*. For similar confusion of ἀξίος and αἷτιος see this *Review* xiv. 101 and xvii. 10.

17. 38. 6 οἱ πλείστοι γὰρ διὰ τὴν εὐτυχίαν ἐπαίρονται μὲν ταῖς εὐπραξίαις, ὑπερήφανοι δ' ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις γινόμενοι τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης καὶ κοινῆς ἀσθενείας ἐπιλανθάνονται. διὸ καὶ τοὺς πλείστους ὁρᾷν ἔστι τὴν εὐτυχίαν ὥσπερ τι βαρὺ φορτίον φέρειν ἀδυνατοῦντας.

It is pretty plain that the word εὐτυχία must not occur three times in these few lines, and particularly that in the first part of the sentence διὰ τὴν εὐτ. and ἐν ταῖς εὐτ. can never have been meant to stand in one sequence of words. Scholars appear to have generally pitched upon the first (εὐτυχίαν) as wrong, conjecturing such words as εὐθήθειαν and ῥαθυμίαν. I should rather suppose εὐτυχίας to be in fault and would substitute for it ἐξουσίας, a word used in the same phrase (ὁ ἐν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις . . . ἔλεος) in the immediately preceding sentence.

17. 65. 3 πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης ἡγεμονίας ἐπὶ μεγάλας ἐξουσίας ἀναβιβάσας.

Another case, as Fischer points out, of a word repeated or anticipated. μεγάλης is obviously due to the coming μεγάλας. I should suggest μείονος or ἡττονος, or again οὔσης (ὑπαρχούσης).

A very clear case of the same kind occurs in 74. 3, where Cobet has restored ἀπέδωκε for the second ἀπέλυσε: a less obvious one in 76. 4, where ἐπιμένων or ὑπομένων must be due to ὑπέμενον just preceding and has been altered to various words giving the necessary sense of *attack*. Cf. also 82. 3, where ἔχουσιν and ἐχούσας tell the same tale (Fischer).

17. 75. 7 The same phenomenon perhaps presents itself again, when D. speaks of the winged creature ὃ καλεῖται μὲν ἀνθρηδών, λειπόμενον δὲ μεγέθει μελίττης μεγίστην ἔχει τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν. He goes on to mention its points of similarity to the bee and makes

it plain that ἐπιφάνειαν has taken the place of some other word. Reiske conjectured ὁμοιότητα; Fischer follows Dindorf in adopting ὠφέλειαν. From the context I have no doubt Reiske was right in principle, but why did he not think of ἐμφέρειαν? That word (= ὁμοιότητα) is so like ἐπιφάνειαν—φαίνω and φέρω are often confused—that the mistake perhaps requires no further explanation. But ἐπιφάνειαν does as a matter of fact occur four lines before.

17. 82. 8 (invaders in snow). σαφὲς δ' οὐδὲν ἐκ διαστήματος ἦν ἰδεῖν, ἀλλὰ μόνῃ τῷ καπνῷ δηλουμένων τῶν κωμῶν ἐλάμβανον οἱ Μακεδόνες οὐ κατοικοῦσιν ἐφιστάμενοι.

Madvig conjectured ἐλάνθανον for ἐλάμβανον, which seems possible enough, though not necessary, and τοῖς for οὐ. οὐ κ. can not very well be right, but why should τοῖς have been altered to οὐ? οὐ κατοικοῦσιν suggests to me something like οὐ κατιδοῦσιν, οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, οὐ κατακηκοῦσιν. The snow interfered with seeing and hearing.

17. 105. 7 δρομάδης καμήλους καὶ τὰ νωτοφορεῖν εἰωθότα τῶν φορτίων.

The absurd φορτίων looks again due to φορ in νωτοφορεῖν. Besides ζῶων (Wesseling and Madvig) and Wesseling's φοραδίων (not φορταδίων, as it appears in Fischer, who has allowed a good many misprints to pass) we have Fischer's own suggestion of ὀρεϊκῶν <ζευγῶν>. But why anything more than ὀρέων, affected by the -φορεῖν close by?

17. 110. 2 τῇ καινότητι τῆς καινοτομίας is only another instance of the same thing, so common in this book. The first word is due to the second. Many alternatives might be suggested, as of course the last word need not resemble καινότητι very closely. δεινότητι would give fairly the probable sense, but so would many other words.

17. 114. 1 καὶ γὰρ ἡγάπησεν αὐτὸν τῶν (or ταῖς τῶν) ἐν στοργῇ φίλων δοξαζομένων καὶ μετὰ τὴν τελευταίαν ἐτίμησεν αὐτὸν ἀνυπερβλήτως.

‘μάλιστα τῶν Reiske; πλείον αὐτ μᾶλλον Wess.; <ζῶντα μάλιστα> conicio’ Fischer.

I would suggest ἐν τοῖς πρώτων τῶν. Possibly ἐν was lost in -ον preceding it; τοῖς appears as ταῖς by some accident; πρῶτον, expressed perhaps by α', has disappeared, unless αὐτόν (which is weak with another αὐτόν following) represents it, for αὐτός and πρῶτος get confused.

17. 116. 5 ἄλλο σημεῖον περὶ τῆς βασιλείας.

As Fischer says, βασιλείας seems to be a pure blunder for τελευτῆς, *his death*. After the many blunders of repetition or anticipation noticed above, it is curious to find here a mistake for which there is really nothing in the context to account. No cognate word occurs within many lines.

18. 33. 3. Perdicas φονικός ἦν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡγεμόνων περιαιρούμενος τὰς ἐξουσίας καὶ καθόλου πάντων βουλόμενος ἄρχειν βιαίως· ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος τοῦναντίον εὐεργετικός καὶ ἐπιεικής κ.τ.λ.

φονικός is much too strong here. φορτικός and καταφρονητικός (Madvig) have been conjectured. Is not φθονερός more likely? φ and θ together often go wrong.

18. 41. 7 Antigonus τοῦ χωρίου τὴν ἱκανὴν φυλακὴν ἀπολείπων ὥρμησεν ἐπὶ τοὺς πορευομένους ἡγεμόνας τῶν πολεμίων καὶ δυνάμεις ἔχοντας.

πορευομένους is of course wrong. Fischer adopts the old, obvious, but not at all convincing emendation ἐπιπορευομένους, while citing πλανομένους and ὑπολειπομένους as suggested by Unger. The latter word is supported, as he shows, by οὔτοι γὰρ ὑπελείποντο . . . ἡγεμόνες in 44. I, but in form it has so little in common with πορευομένους that the mistake would be difficult to explain. Can we find a word giving similar sense and nearer in form? περιγενομένους would seem to be such.

18. 55. 3 There is no reason to think Diodorus could be guilty of ἄν with a future infinitive. In οὕτως γὰρ ἂν μάλιστα . . . ταπεινώσειν, we may omit ἄν with Dindorf or read γὰρ δὴ. ταπεινώσαι is improbable from considerations of hiatus.

18. 72. 5 Such a combination as ὑπέλαβε μηκέτι τολμήσειν . . . ναυμαχῆσειν is unlikely in the extreme. Read ναυμαχῆσαι or ναυμαχεῖν.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

PROHIBITION IN GREEK.

IN this discussion it seems to have been fairly shown that μή with aor. subj. forbids some act in the future, but in face of the numerous and striking examples produced by Mr. Naylor it is difficult to maintain that μή with the pres. imperat. necessarily involves a reference to the past as well as to the future. I bring forward another instance from the *Apology* (30 c), μέλλω γὰρ οὖν ἅττα ὑμῖν ἐρεῖν καὶ ἄλλα, ἐφ' οἷς ἴσως βοήσεται· ἀλλὰ μηδαμῶς ποιεῖτε τοῦτο. Clearly ποιεῖτε refers only to the future. Socrates is afraid they will exclaim when he has said something which he is about to say. Perhaps it may be said that here μηδαμῶς ποιεῖτε τοῦτο like μή ἄλλως ποιεῖ is phraseological. I do not know. With a view however to make such cases seem less exceptional may it not be maintained that some of these present imperatives are due to the meaning of the verb used, i.e. is it not natural to use the pres. imperat. when the verb refers to a state or a course of action rather than to a single act? Thus, in some of the passages in Demosthenes quoted by Mr. Naylor, μή πιστεύετε, μή ἐπιτρέπετε, μή εὐορκεῖτε, may not the use of the pres. imperat. be thus explained? Others, I admit, resist this explanation.

With regard to the passage in the *Apology* where μή θορυβήσητε is followed soon by μή

θορυβεῖτε (20 E and 21 A) this is a pretty example *when we have once got the rule* but it does not in itself go far to prove the rule. From the use of the aor. subj. followed by the pres. imperat. we can hardly in the first place infer that θορυβήσητε is said *before* clamour has begun and θορυβεῖτε *after* it has begun and then, in the second place, treating this inference as a fact, use this alleged fact to show the difference of usage between the aor. subj. and pres. imperat. In order to establish a rule by this passage we require some evidence *alivunde* that θορυβήσητε was said *before* the clamour began and θορυβεῖτε afterwards. And this evidence is of course not forthcoming. Taking the passage as it stands the easier inference is, I think, that there is very little, if any, difference here between the aor. subj. and pres. imperat. Indeed if we press the point it comes to this: Socrates says, please do not make a clamour if in what I am about to say you think I say something boastful (τι μέγα). Before however he actually does say anything that could be considered boastful he says again καί, ὅπερ λέγω, μή θορυβεῖτε. The aor. subj. θορυβήσητε appears to be due to the future conditional clause which immediately follows it.

R. C. SEATON.