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](#)

Emendations of Julian *Misopogon*

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 01 / February 2004, pp 21 - 22

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209098, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209098

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1904). Emendations of Julian *Misopogon*. The Classical Review, 18, pp 21-22
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209098

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

from the *Iliad*) a reference to Sophocles, and probably some example taken from his plays has fallen out at this point,—some parallel hyperbole to Homer's

οὐρανῷ ἐστῆριξε κάρη καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει,

which immediately precedes. In extant rhetoricians, quotations from Sophocles are much rarer than those from the more rhetorical Euripides. The lines of the *Phoenix* are often quoted by late rhetoricians, who may have found them in some early manual such as that of Tisias.

On the whole we may feel entitled to conclude that the new fragment has been considerably influenced by Tisias' τέχνη, whatever its exact relation to that may be. Hence, among other things, the use of the Doric dialect: δωρίσδεν δ' ἔξῃστι δοκῶ τοῖς

Δωριέεσσιν. The dialect is, indeed, of a decidedly mixed character in the text as we have it, which exhibits such forms as διηγῆσαι, πρῶτον, φεύγειν, and πιθανότητα, side by side with distinctively Doric forms. This fact, and the fact that no attempt is made to give the quotations in Doric, may possibly suggest an Attic adaptation of a Doric work, since we hear elsewhere of works current both in Doric and in Attic. Or we may be disposed to conjecture, doubtfully, that we have before us a fragment of that part of Aristotle's συναγωγή τεχνῶν which dealt with the productions of Tisias and his school. Whether Aristotle, however, preserved the original Doric dialect in these cases, we have (so far as I am aware) no evidence to show.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

EMENDATIONS OF JULIAN MISOPOGON.

341 C. ἐθάλπετο δὲ τὸ δωμάτιον οὐδαμῶς, οὐπερ ἐκάθενδον, ὅνπερ εἰώθει τρόπον ὑπὸ ταῖς καμίνοις τὰ πολλὰ τῶν οἰκημάτων ἐκεῖ θερμαίνεσθαι.

The use of ὑπό with the instrumental dative may be paralleled in Julian, but is displeasing; and the article is meaningless. Read then ὑποστέγοις καμίνοις. For εἰώθει one would rather have expected εἶωθε, but the tense may have been attracted to that of ἐθάλπετο by the author himself.

349 A. *ad fin.* καὶ ἐμαντοῦ τὴν σκαίότητα καὶ τὴν ἀμαθίαν καὶ τὴν δυσκολίαν καὶ τὸ μὴ ῥαδίως μαλάττεσθαι μηδὲ [ἐν] τοῖς δεομένοις ἢ τοῖς ἐξαπατῶσι τὰ ἐμαντοῦ ποιείσθαι μηδὲ ταῖς βοαῖς εἴκειν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα στέργῳ ὀνειδῇ.

καὶ ἐμαντοῦ Hertlein, καὶ ἐμαντῷ MSS. [ἐν] is omitted by many MSS. and Cobet altered it to ἐπί, but if we take μαλάττεσθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς δεομένοις together, then ἢ should be μηδέ. The mischief lies in ποιείσθαι, for which, omitting ἐν, we must read προείσθαι (not προσεῖσθαι by reason of the other present tenses). 'I accept all reproaches on the score of the difficulty I find in giving way and in sacrificing my own wishes to those who either ask me straightforwardly or try to deceive me.'

That the last words also do not stand as Julian wrote them is clear from the staring hiatus of στέργῳ ὀνειδῇ and the fact that V and other MSS. omit καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα while some others read τὰ ὀνειδῇ.

350 D. οὐ κρείττον ἦν ὁδωδέναι μύρων, τὴν ἀγορὰν βαδίζοντός μου καὶ 'παῖδας ἡγείσθαι καλοῦς,' εἰς οὓς ἀποβλέψουσιν οἱ πολῖται, καὶ 'χοροὺς γυναικῶν,' ὅποιοι παρ' ὑμῖν ἴστανται καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν; ἐμὲ δὲ 'ὑγρὸν βλέπειν ριπτοῦντα' πανταχοῦ τὰ ὄμματα [κατόπιν], ὅπως ὑμῖν καλός, οὐτὶ τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρόσσωπον ὀφθεῖν, [ὁ τρόπος οὐ συγχωρεῖ].

I have put in quotation marks the words which I think are quotations from some poet. I follow Hertlein in ejecting the last four words, which are absent from some good MSS., and in reading μου for σου and παρ' ὑμῖν for παρ' ἡμῖν. That those four words must go is obvious from the mood of ὀφθεῖν, which is right if it depends on κρείττον ἦν, wrong if on συγχωρεῖ.

Who then is the poet here quoted, and what of the word κατόπιν? This κατόπιν is added by the same MSS. which omit ὁ τρόπος οὐ συγχωρεῖ, and, though it by no means follows that they are superior to the others in both places because they certainly are in one of the two, still there is a presumption in their favour. Besides where should they have got κατόπιν while it is easy enough to tell why the last four words should be added by somebody not seeing the construction. I will be bold enough to suggest that κατόπιν is the mutilated remnant of κατ' Εὐριπίδην.

Similarly in the sixtieth epistle 447 B I suspect the meaningless words ὡς φῆς of being a relic of φησὶ Σοφοκλῆς.

Julian continues ἔστι γάρ, ὡς ὑμεῖς κρίνετε,

ψυχῆς ἀληθινὸν κάλλος ὑγρότης βίου. This phrase ὑγρότης βίου is ridiculed by Croblylus as a neologism, and may well have been invented by Euripides.

353 B. Εἰεν ἀλλὰ τί παθὼν αἰτὸς ἐπιχειρεῖς ἀκροᾶσθαι περὶ τῶν συμβολαίων καὶ δικάζειν; οὐ γὰρ δὴ καὶ τοῦτό σε ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ἐδίδασκεν, ὃς οὐδ' εἰ ἄρξεις ἡπίστατο. Δεινὸς δὲ ἀνέπεισε γέρων

MSS. are divided between τί παθὼν and τί μαθὼν, nor is it easy to choose between them. But it seems probable that μαθὼν is here preferable, if you consider the play upon τί μαθὼν and ἐδίδασκεν. Julian is not in the habit of expanding τί by the addition of either one participle or the other, and if he does it here it is for the sake of a mild jest.

After the question put by an imaginary opponent, it is intolerable to proceed with δεινὸς δὲ ἀνέπεισεν as the answer. A few MSS. omit δέ, and either we must follow them or read δή.

356 D. ἄποποί τε ἂν εἴμεν ἡμεῖς

'You are a free people indeed; *it would be strange conduct* for me to object when the gods suffer you.' Julian does not use τε in such connexions; read ἄποποί γε.

361 C. τὸ πῦρ ἐνείσαν ἐκείνο, τοῖς μὲν ἐπιδημοῦσι τῶν ξένων φρικῶδες, ὑμῶν δὲ τῷ δήμῳ μὲν ἡδονὴν προσχόν, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς βουλῆς ἀμεληθὲν καὶ εἰσέτι ἀμελούμενον.

ἐνείσαν Hertlein, ἔδειξαν MSS. ἡδονὴν προέχειν could only, I conceive, mean 'to promise pleasure'; now the sense here required is *giving* pleasure, παρασχόν.

365 A. οὐδ' ἐπέισαμεν τὸν δῆμον εἰς παρασκευὰς δείπνων ἢ θεάτρων. πείθειν τινα εἰς δείπνον is an incredible expression; read ἐκαλέσαμεν. There is some reason for thinking that ἐπέισαμεν may be corrupt apart from the sense, as V leaves a gap between οὐδ' and τὸν δῆμον, but such gaps are common in that MS.

366 C. ἡ τοῦ μὲν ποιεῖν τι χαλεπὸν εἰς ὑμᾶς ἀπεσχόμεν, τοῦ λέγειν δὲ ὑμᾶς κακῶς οὐκ ἀπεσχόμεν, ἵνα με καὶ ὑμεῖς [ἐξεβιάσθητε] διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἰόντες ἀμύνησθε;

'But it may be that while not committing any overt act against you I yet did not refrain from reviling you, so that you were compelled to repay upon me in the same coin,' *i.e.* in those lampoons wherewith the flies of Antioch so galled the sensitive

philosopher. ἐξεβιάσθητε is absent from V and two other MSS. Reiske observes: 'Sententia postulat ὅθεν unde. ἐξεβιάσθητε bene habet; sed ἀμύνησθε cum ἀμύνασθαι est mutandum.' He is right in proposing to read ἐξεβιάσθητε ἀμύνασθαι, but wrong in meddling with ἵνα. For τοῦ λέγειν οὐκ ἀπεσχόμεν ἵνα ἐξεβιάσθητε is an instance of ἵνα with indicative after an unfulfilled condition, if condition it can be called. It is certainly no stranger than Plato *Theaet.* 161 C τεθαύμακα, ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν . . . ἵνα ἤρξατο.

369 B. εἰ δὲ τοσαῦτα μέτρα θέρους ἦν παρ' ὑμῖν τοῦ νομίσματος, τί προσδοκᾶν ἔδει τῇν-καῦτα ἡνίκα, φησὶν ὁ Βουώτιος ποιητής, χαλεπὸν γενέσθαι τὸν λιμὸν ἐπὶ δώματι;

Such is the vulgate, wherein Reiske explains ἐπὶ δώματι to mean the time of year when you sit at home because of the cold and can't go out to get food! This beautiful interpretation commends itself the better that the best MS. (V) reads ἐπὶ τῷ δράγματι, and others ἐπὶ τῷ δράχματι, ἐπὶ δράγματι and ἐπὶ δράματι.

Bergk supposes Hesiod to have ended a line with χαλεπὸς δ' ἐπὶ δράγματι λιμός. The meaning of this is no better. ἐπὶ δράγματι ῥίγος might mean 'shivering over a handful of corn' and would suit the context, but ἐπὶ δράγματι λιμός can only mean 'hunger with but a handful of corn to satisfy it,' and though that may be some sense in itself, it does not bring out that sense which Julian's antithesis imperatively demands: 'If that was the price of corn in the summer, what can you expect in the winter?'

If we consider the letters of τωδράγματι together with the sense we want, we seem irresistibly driven to ῥιγώματι. ῥιγώματι might become *e.g.* ωριγμάτι, then τω ριγμάτι, and then be patched to τῷ δράγματι, preserved by V and corrupted further in other MSS.

But then ῥιγώμα occurs neither in Hesiod nor anywhere else; no more does πείνημα or δίψημα. Yet these forms in -ωμα were widely extended at an early date; already in Aeschylus we find πέπλωμα, and in Empedocles κρούνωμα, τράνωμα and the like. On the whole with much doubt I incline to believe that the original ran

χαλεπὸς δὲ ἐπὶ ῥιγώματι λιμός.

And that very possibly the line is really later than Hesiod.

ARTHUR PLATT.