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 Strabo XII. 3, 38: P. 560

J. Arthur R. Munro

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 09 / December 2000, pp 442 - 443

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00081981, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00081981

How to cite this article:

J. Arthur R. Munro (1900). On Strabo XII. 3, 38: P. 560. The Classical Review, 14, pp 442-443 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00081981

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

(c. 3) of his *Ancient Orators* Dionysius has paid a warm tribute to the part played by the governing classes of Rome in that improvement of Greek literary taste which he had himself so much at heart; and it is not difficult to imagine the healthy influence which contact with active public men in a great city must have had upon Greek rhetoricians prone to pedantry. That he had personally been made welcome at Rome, is expressly stated by Dionysius in the passage in which he describes his *History of Ancient Rome* as a thank-offering in return for the manifold kindnesses he had received during his residence in the capital (*Archaeol.* I. 6). In particular, he wished to disabuse the Greek mind of derogatory ideas as to the origin of the Romans and as to the means by which they had gained their ascendancy (I. 4, 5 *ibid.*). In so doing he desires, he protests, not to flatter the victors but to tell the truth (I. 6).

The widening influence to which Dionysius refers was all the more needed that men of his class and nationality do not seem, as far as we can discover, usually to have taken any interest in Latin literature for its own sake. It is true that, in a passage already summarised from the opening of his *Archaeologia*, Dionysius refers to his acquisition of Latin and to the use he made of the language in consulting historical authorities. Again, in the introduction to his *Ancient Orators* he alludes, in general terms, to the 'many fine works' which had been produced, both by Romans and by Greeks, in his own day. But of a genuine literary interest in particular Latin books we find no evidence, whereas there are many indications (of a negative kind) to the opposite effect. It is probable that his own knowledge of Latin was not very deep and thorough. Attempts made by Greek rhetoricians to deliver their lectures in Latin had met with official discouragement, and the provinces of the 'grammaticus Graecus' and the 'grammaticus Latinus' were (as we know from

inscriptions and from other sources) kept carefully apart. The Greeks themselves, without doubt, acquiesced readily in this arrangement when, in course of time, their Roman friends and patrons came to speak Greek fluently, and to converse by preference in that language with their Greek preceptors. These preceptors, feeling a natural pride in their own language and literature, and also feeling on safer ground when writing in the former and about the latter, composed in Greek (as Dionysius has himself done) the literary essays they addressed to their Roman pupils. Caecilius, indeed, had the courage to break with tradition so far as to draw what now appears an obvious comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero. In this he seems to have found but one Greek follower, the author of the *Treatise on the Sublime*, who may also have borrowed from Caecilius his reference to the sublimity of Hebrew literature. For his temerity in hazarding an opinion about a Latin author Caecilius was afterwards criticised by Plutarch, who compares him to a 'fish out of water.' In the attitude of Plutarch—that of prudent abstention—we may perhaps find the clue to the silence observed in regard to Latin literature by Dionysius, who in his essays on the *Ancient Orators* never mentions Cicero, in his *Early Roman History* never mentions Livy, in his treatise on the *Arrangement of Words* never mentions Horace. The absence of any allusion alike in Dionysius to Horace and in Horace to Dionysius seems the strangest thing of all, since the life of the author of the *Ars Poetica* extended to the year 8 B.C., by which time Dionysius (who in that year brought out his *History*) must have been at the height of whatever reputation he enjoyed in the capital as a learned Greek critic. As a matter of fact, the only contemporary reference to Dionysius is to be found in Strabo. It is not till the time of Quintilian that he meets with recognition in Latin literature.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

ON STRABO XII. 3, 38: P. 560.

AFTER describing the castle of Sagyllum in the territory of Phazemon in Pontus (possibly the ruin on a pinnacle of the Tavshan Dagh visible from Vezir Keupru) Strabo continues, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἔαλω καὶ διεφθάρη ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρνάκου τοῦ βασιλέως παίδων Ἀρσάκης,

δυναστεύων καὶ νεωτερίζων, ἐπιτρέψαντος οὐδενὸς τῶν ἡγεμόνων· ἔαλω δὲ οὐ βία τοῦ ἐρέματος ληφθέντος ὑπὸ Πολέμωνος καὶ Λυκομήδους βασιλέων ἀμφοῖν, ἀλλὰ λιμῇ· ἀνέφυγε γὰρ εἰς τὸ ὄρος παρασκευῆς χωρὶς εἰργόμενος τῶν πεδίων κ.τ.λ.

There is a certain difficulty here in distributing the parts played by 'the sons of King Pharnaces' and by 'Polemo and Lycomedes, both of them kings.' I think that an unprejudiced reader would naturally suppose that Polemo and Lycomedes were the sons of Pharnaces. But as a matter of history they were not. Who then were these sons of Pharnaces? and who was Arsaces? Strabo gives us not the slightest hint. He thrusts these persons upon us without the scantiest introduction. The date indicated by the mention of Polemo and Lycomedes must lie between 37 or 36 B.C., when the former became king of part of Pontus, and 31 or 30 B.C., when the latter ceased to be high-priest of Comana. No Arsaces seems to be known who could be supposed to have attempted a revolution in Pontus at that time. We learn from Appian (Bell. Civ. V 75) that Dareius, a son of Pharnaces, was made king of Pontus by Antony about 39 B.C. Probably he was the immediate predecessor of Polemo. Pharnaces' daughter Dynamis is an important figure in history, but no other son is named to us. How any sons of Pharnaces came to be fighting in Pontus under Polemo or Lycomedes between 37 and 30 B.C. is not explained.

I would suggest that all difficulty and obscurity may be removed from the passage simply by striking out *ὑπὸ* before *τῶν Φαρνάκων τοῦ βασιλέως παίδων*. Arsaces then becomes one of the children of Pharnaces,

no longer a casual adventurer but properly introduced to the reader. His capture and death are ascribed wholly and without complication to Polemo and Lycomedes, and a plausible interpretation of the incident becomes easy. Arsaces, we may suppose, claimed to succeed his brother Dareius, and attempted to seize or retain his kingdom without authority from any of the heads of the Roman state. Polemo, who held Antony's commission, had to oust him by force with the aid of his neighbour Lycomedes. If this interpretation be accepted, the incident probably took place at, or soon after, Polemo's appointment.

It is true that the offensive *ὑπὸ* is found in all the manuscripts—at all events Falconer, Kramer, and the Didot edition mention no variance here—but the text of Strabo is notoriously corrupt, and *ὑπὸ* might well have been inserted by an early copyist, who did not understand the genitive, and perhaps imagined that Polemo and Lycomedes were sons of Pharnaces. The words *ὑπὸ Πολέμωνος καὶ Λυκομήδους βασιλέων ἀμφοῖν* would certainly tempt an ignorant scribe to interpolate *ὑπὸ* before *τῶν Φαρνάκων τοῦ βασιλέως παίδων*. The reference 'Arsaces ... Pharnacis filius 560' in the index to Meineke's Teubner edition does not appear to be derived from any older text with a different reading, but may be traced back through Kramer to Groskurd's index to his German translation.

J. ARTHUR R. MUNRO.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF PLUTARCH'S *QUAESTIONES CONVIVALES*.

THE references are to the pages of vol. iv. of Bernardakis' edition of the *Moralia*.

P. 26, 2. <κοσμιώτα>τον δέ μοι δοκεῖ τοι<οὗτο>ς ὦν τὸ συμπόσιον <διαφυλ>άζειν. The supplements of the lacunae in the MS. are Bernardakis'. <εὐκρα>τον suits the context better than *κοσμιώτατον*.

P. 27, 23 *κεραμίον στενοῦ κομισθέντος, εἰς τοῦτο τὸν ἀσθενῆ πόδα καθέως ἐξέπιε τὸ ποτήριον*. *στενοῦ* is Amyot's correction of *κενοῦ*; but it is unnecessary. All wine jars (and this could only have been a wine *κεράμιον*) had narrow necks, not large enough to admit an ordinary foot and leg. Large numbers of these (chiefly found in the sea by divers) are preserved, and the width of the neck varies but little. *κενοῦ* is not superfluous. He asked for an empty jar to be brought.

P. 34, 4. When Mithradates was a baby a thunderbolt singed his swaddling-clothes but did not touch his body *πλὴν ὅσον ἵχνος τι τοῦ πυρὸς ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ κρυπτόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς κόμης* <διαμέν>ειν αὐτῷ παι<δί> καὶ> ἀνδρὸς ἤδη πάλιν another thunderbolt fell in the room where he was sleeping, &c. Here *κρυπτόμενον* (for *κρατούμενον*) and *διαμένειν* are Bernardakis' correction and supplement. The supplement of the other lacuna is due to Turnebe. *διαμένειν αὐτῷ παιδί* is obviously wrong; the mark could not have lasted during his boyhood and then have disappeared. We must write *διαμένειν αὐτῷ παι<δός δ' ἤ> ἀνδρὸς ἤδη*. There was, it seems, some doubt as to the date of the second incident.

P. 39, 18. *Λαμπρίας δ' ὁ <ἀδελφός> τὴν Ἱερωνύμου lac. 6 litt. οὐκ ἀνέγκανεν lac. 7 litt.*