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](#)

Laertiana

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 07 / October 1904, pp 340 - 346

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990528, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990528

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1904). Laertiana. The Classical Review, 18, pp 340-346 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990528

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

diphthong or long vowel in hiatus is a legacy from Homer, and peculiar to the dactylic foot. The evidence for this view seems to be overwhelming. In Pindar, Bacchylides, and the melic fragments, the correption occurs, in all, 352 times. According to the ordinary scansion 338 of these 352 cases appear in dactyls, divided about equally between 'dactylo-epitritic' and 'logaoedic' verse. Five cases occur in tribrachs, four in cretics, while in disyllabic feet there is scarcely a single certain instance of shortening in hiatus. In Pindar *O.* 14, 1 and *P.* 8, 96, and in Bacchylides 10, 33 and 43, and 16, 20, to be sure, the curtailment of quantity seems to occur in trochees. But in each of the Bacchylidean instances the text and scansion are open to strong suspicion on many grounds. *P.* 8, 96 is corrected in most modern editions, and *O.* 14, 1 is emended by Schroeder himself as it was by Boeckh.

It may appear that we are begging the question when we base the enumeration on the received scansion. But this is not the case. There are thousands of feet in Greek melic poetry which are trochees according to either scansion, but among them all there is not a single undoubted instance of shortening in hiatus. Yet if we accept the scanning proposed by Schroeder, we must believe that in the Pindaric odes which he treats, alone, comprising about one half of Pindar's Aeolic strophes, correption in hiatus occurs, not merely five times in trochees,¹ but actu-

¹ *N.* 2: 1, 3; *N.* 7: 20, 101; *I.* 8: 5.

ally fourteen times in iambs.² It is scarcely necessary to add that in each of these cases, according to the received scansion, the syllable in question forms part of a 'cyclic dactyl.'

I am aware that this objection does not penetrate to the heart of the question between the old and the new metric. I grant, too, that it admits of an obvious answer. It is easy to reply that although shortening in hiatus is, in general, confined to dactyls, yet in cases where a trochee is followed immediately by an iamb, as occurs so often with the new scansion, the same acceleration of movement is brought about as that which justifies the correption in dactyls,—that the succession of two short syllables, and not the nature of the foot or feet in which they occur, is the real excuse for the curtailment of quantity. But in view of the recognized Homeric origin of the practice, and its almost entire absence in Pindar's numerous tribrachs, I question whether this answer can be accepted. Many scholars will, I think, agree with me in believing that the facts to which I have called attention afford some support for the opinion that, after all, the succession of quantities — ∪ ∪ in the Glyconic was felt by the Greek poets as a dactyl, and not as a trochee plus half an iamb.

EDWARD BULL CLAPP.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

² Cf. *N.* 4: 79 πρόπολον ἔμμεναι. εἰ δέ τοι [∪ ∪] — ∪ | ∪ — [∪ —]. So in *P.* 2: 39, 58, 74; *P.* 8: 56, 57B, 93; *N.* 2: 18; *N.* 4: 38, 46, 75, 94; *I.* 7: 32; *I.* 8: 65.

LAERTIANA.

WHEN we are to have a trustworthy text of Diogenes Laertius (who according to some authorities now should be called Laertius Diogenes) does not appear. Cobet's edition with all its improvements was an early, not very congenial, and quite imperfect piece of work; yet none has been published since. A new text founded on real knowledge and sound judgment of the MSS and in other ways brought abreast of present-day scholarship is in every way a desideratum. The man was foolish enough, but the book is of extreme value for the history, especially the literary history, of Greek philosophy. It is also, though little read, full of good things in the way of anecdotes, epigrams, and

pregnant sayings—not the author's own, be it well understood. Montaigne wished there were half a dozen of him. Finally there can be now but few Greek books, whose text is in a more neglected and faulty condition and about the MSS of which we have less reliable material to go upon. In such a state of things textual criticism is very insecure. I have therefore confined myself mainly in the following paper to minutiae with which it seems comparatively safe to deal. No doubt some of the suggestions have been anticipated.

Omissions of a word.

Diogenes introduces the story of the

tripod which the Delphic oracle ordered to be sent to the wisest living man with the words τὰ δὲ περὶ τὸν τρίποδα φανερά τὸν εὐρεθέντα κ.τ.λ. (1. 27). It is hardly possible to make φανερά mean generally known, but, if not that, what does it mean? It may be noticed that the details of the story varied very greatly according to D. who gives a number of different forms. Perhaps therefore this is one of the many places where a negative has been lost and we should read οὐ φανερά, meaning that the true story is hard to get at.

It is well known how often ἄν is lost, especially before or after letters identical with it or resembling it. There is no need therefore to do more than indicate the following cases: 2. 35 τῆς γυναικὸς εἰπούσης (to Socrates) Ἀδίκως ἀποθνήσκεις, Σὺ δέ, ἔφη, δικαίως <ἄν> ἐβούλου (or σὺ δ' <ἄν>; [In Xen. *Apol.* 28 there is evidence both for and against the ἄν.] 2. 74 πρὸς τὸν αἰτώμενον ὅτι ἑταίρα συνοικεῖ, Ἀρά γε, εἶπε, μή τι διενέγκαι <ἄν> (or <ἄν οἶε>) οἰκίαν λαβεῖν ἐν ᾗ πολλοὶ πάντ' ᾤκησαν ἢ μηδεὶς; 3. 45 (*Anthol. Pal.* 7. 108) in one of D.'s own wretched epigrams

καὶ πῶς, εἰ μὴ Φοῖβος ἄν' Ἑλλάδα φῦσε
Πλάτωνα,
ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων γράμμασιν ἠκέσαστο;

add ἄν at the end. In 1. 48 τοῦ δὴ λοιποῦ προσεῖχον αὐτῷ ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡδῶς καὶ τυραννεῖσθαι ἤθελον παρ' αὐτοῦ the second καὶ should be κἄν, and so in 2. 24 καί, εἰ ὑποδημάτων ἔδει, βύρσαν μοι ἐδίδους ἢ ἑμῶν ὑποδήματα ποιησαίμην; possibly in 5. 31 κἄν (for καί) συμβιώναι, but see below. On the other hand omit ἄν in 2. 76 ἄλλ' ὅρα μή, ὥς οὐδὲν τῶν ἄλλων ζῶν παρὰ τοῦτό τι ἐλαττοῦται, οὕτως οὐδ' ἄν ἄνθρωπος (though we can supply ἐλαττοῦτο) and 6. 50 ἐρωτηθεὶς . . . ποῖος ἄν εἴη ἀμείνων (ἄριστος?) χαλκὸς εἰς ἀνδριάντα ἔφη Ἀφ' οὗ Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων ἐχαλκεύθησαν. In such a passage—and there are several—as 5. 21 ἐρωτηθεὶς πῶς ἄν τοῖς φίλοις προσφερόμεθα ἔφη Ὡς ἄν εὐξάμεθα αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν προσφέρεισθαι it is plain on a moment's reflection that ἄν has no place. The question was πῶς προσφερόμεθα, which in the oblique becomes προσφερόμεθα. Of course it might have been couched in such terms as πῶς ἄν κάλλιστα προσφερόμεθα, and then it would have remained in the oblique unchanged, but this could not be without an adverb like κάλλιστα. Such a question as 9. 113 φασὶ δὲ . . . πυθέσθαι πῶς τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσιν ἀσφαλῶς κτήσεται is possible both with and without an ἄν, but the account of

the optative is not the same without as with it.

The answer of Pittacus to someone who said δεῖν ζητεῖν ἄνθρωπον σπουδαῖον, namely ἄν λιαν ζητῆς, οὐχ εὐρήσεις (1. 77) needs a καί (κἄν λιαν ζητῆς) to give it effect. So in the well-known story of Aristippus (2. 68: Hor. *Ep.* 1. 17. 13) παριόντα ποτὲ αὐτὸν λάχανα πλύνων Διογένης ἔσκωψε καὶ φησιν Εἰ ταῦτα ἔμαθες προσφέρεισθαι (eat), οὐκ ἄν τυράννων αὐλὰς ἐθεράπευες; ὁ δέ, Καὶ σὺ, εἶπεν, εἴπερ ἦδεις ἀνθρώποις ὀμιλεῖν, οὐκ ἄν λάχανα ἔπλυνες we should read ἔσκωψε καὶ <Σὺ> φησιν εἰ ταῦτα ἔμαθες προσφέρεισθαι. This is shown (1) by καὶ σὺ, which without a σὺ preceding would be σὺ δέ; (2) by φησιν, which without a σὺ before it would be a past tense like ἔσκωψε. The statement about Aristippus a little before (2. 66) ἦν δὲ ἱκανὸς ἀρμόσασθαι καὶ τόπῳ καὶ χρόνῳ καὶ προσώπῳ is I think hardly Greek without a παντί added. Ὡς seems lost in 2. 95 ἀνῆρουν τὰς αἰσθήσεις <ὥς> οὐκ ἀκριβούσας τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν: 3. 95 ὅταν δεομένῳ παραποιηθῇ τις <ὥς> εἰς χρημάτων λόγον εὐπορήσῃ: ἐν in 5. 1 Aristotle's father συνεβίω Ἀμύντῳ τῷ Μακεδόνων βασιλεῖ <ἐν> ἱατροῦ καὶ φίλου χρεῖα and 9. 62 ἀκόλουθος δ' ἦν καὶ (read κἄν) τῷ βίῳ. In the words of 4. 62 about Carneades, οὗτος τὰ τῶν Στωικῶν βιβλία ἀναγνούς, ἐπιμελῶς τὰ Χρυσίππου, ἐπιεικῶς αὐτοῖς ἀντέλεγε there seems a gap before or after ἐπιμελῶς, which I should suggest filling up by reading <ἐν οἷς> ἐπιμελῶς. I think too the words of the introduction 6 ἀποφαίνεσθαι τε περί τε οὐσίας θεῶν καὶ γενέσεως οὓς καὶ πῦρ εἶναι καὶ γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ might run <ἐν> οἷς καὶ πῦρ εἶναι, for οὓς cannot well be right. (Cf. 2. 111 εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι διακηκούστες Εὐβουλίδου, ἐν οἷς καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος and ἰδ. 133 πλείῳ συνάγῳ συμπόσια, ἐν οἷς καὶ ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν.) We should add ὦν to 7. 3 ἦκουε τοῦ Κράτητος, ἄλλως μὲν εὐτονος <ὦν> πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν, αἰδήμων δὲ κ.τ.λ.: δεῖν perhaps to 6. 38 ἔφασκε δὲ <δεῖν> ἀντιτιθέναι τύχῃ μὲν θάρσος: μόνον to 9. 6 ἐπιτηδεύσας (Heraclitus) ἀσαφέστερον γράψαι, ὅπως οἱ δυνάμενοι <μόνοι> προσίοιεν αὐτῷ (i.e. τῷ βιβλίῳ), where the loss of μόνον after δυνάμενοι would be especially easy. There is neither sense nor grammar in 8. 66 ὅπου δὲ ἀλαζόνα καὶ φίλαντον ἐν τῇ ποιήσει ἴδοι ἄν τις, until we see that <ἔστιν> ὅπου is what the author wrote. Plato's reputed saying (5. 2) Ἀριστοτέλης ἡμᾶς ἀπελάκτισε, καθαπερὶ τὰ πωλάρια γεννηθέντα τὴν μητέρα can hardly be in its right form. We want something like <μεγάλα> or? <ἀπογάλακτα>? γεννηθέντα. Cf. Aelian *V.H.* 4. 9. 7. 19 ἡρώτησεν εἰ δοκεῖ αὐτῷ ἀρμόττοντα εἶναι ὅψει τοιαύτη ζητήματα

needs a τοιαῦτα after τοιαύτη. 1. 101 οὗτος ἐποίησεν τῶν τε παρὰ τοῖς Σκύθαις νομίμων καὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, εἰς εὐτέλειαν βίου καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον, ἔπη ὀκτακόσια has in the same way no construction until we insert περί after ἐποίησεν, and 6. 23 βακτηρία δὲ ἐπηρείσαστο ἀσθενήσας· ἔπειτα μέντοι καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἐφόρει seems to call for a ποτέ or πρῶτον with ἐπηρείσαστο, if the force of the aorist is not to be very much strained (πρῶτον may have been represented by α' and that lost before the first letter of ἀσθενήσας).

The article is probably lost in 2. 30 δείξας αὐτῷ <τοὺς> τοῦ κούρεως Μίδου ἀλεκτρονίας: ib. 33 ἔλεγε θαυμάζειν τῶν τὰς λιθίνους εἰκόνας κατασκευαζομένων <τὸ> τοῦ μὲν λίθου προνοεῖν . . . αὐτῶν δ' ἀμελεῖν: ib. 137 ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην συμπνοίας οὐδέν τι διαφερούσης <τῆς> Πυλάδου φιλοστοργίας: 4. 47 ταῦτ' ἐστὶ <τὰ> κατ' ἐμέ: 6. 14 τοῦτον μόνον ἐκ πάντων <τῶν> Σωκρατικῶν Θεόπομπος ἐπαινέει. In 3. 103 on the other hand τῶν should be omitted from ἐὰν μὴ ὄντων τῶν νόμων κατ' ἔθῃ καὶ ἐπιτηδεύματα χρηστῶς πολιτεύονται.

3. 61 καὶ οὗτος μὲν οὕτω διαιρεῖ καὶ τινες calls out for <ἄλλοι> τινές, unless indeed something else has been lost: so 2. 43 καὶ τοὺς μὲν <ἄλλους> ἐφυγάδενσαν, Μελήτρου δὲ θάνατον κατέγνωνσαν. 3. 51 should perhaps be καὶ περὶ μὲν διαλόγου, τί ποτ' ἐστὶ καὶ τίνες αὐτοῦ διαφοραί, ἀπόχρη <τοσαῦτα> λέγειν.

Less obvious additions are 1. 74 καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἀχαιλείτιδος χώρας μαχομένων Ἀθηναίων καὶ Μιτυληναίων ἐστρατήγει <Μιτυληναίων> μὲν αὐτός, Ἀθηναίων δὲ Φρόνων: 2. 34 πρὸς τὸν (for τὸ) οὐκ ἀξιόλογον πλῆθος <αἰδοῦμενον> ἔφασκεν ὅμοιον εἶ τις τετραδραχμον ἐν ἀποδοκιμάζων τὸν ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων σωρὸν ὡς δόκιμον ἀποδέχοιτο (cf. Xen. Mem. 3. 7. 5 foll., who uses αἰδεῖσθαι, φοβεῖσθαι, αἰσχύνεσθαι): and 4. 60 ὁπλὲ δ' αὐτῷ γεωμετροῦντι λέγει τις Εἰτα νῦν καιρός; <καὶ ὅς> Εἰτα μηδὲ νῦν; where a reason for the loss of καὶ ὅς is obvious. 8. 34 perhaps ὅτι ὀλιγαρχικὸν <τὸ ἀπέχεσθαι>, for these words can hardly be understood from the context as it at present stands: perhaps simply <οὐκ> ὀλιγαρχικόν. 5. 31 Aristotle's tenets are stated in a very puzzling way: καὶ ἐρασθήσεσθαι δὲ τὸν σοφὸν καὶ πολιτεύεσθαι, γαμήσειν τε μὴν καὶ βασιλεῖ συμβιώναι. There is no such phrase possible as τε μὴν, and, if it is meant that the philosopher will according to Aristotle marry and frequent a court, we must omit μὴν and write καὶν for καὶ though the change from future to aorist with αἶν is very harsh. Were it not for the facts of Aristotle's life, we might be inclined to read something like γαμήσασθαι γε μὴν καὶ βασιλεῖ συμβιώναι <οὐκ ἐθέλησειν>, and this would

account for the order of the four things mentioned, which is now very strange. Why is γαμήσειν divided off from ἐρασθήσεσθαι? Two pairs of things contrasted we could understand.

Terminations corrupted.

1. 48 ἵνα δὲ μὴ δοκοῖη βίᾳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ δίκῃ τὴν Σαλαμίνα κεκτήσθαι, κ.τ.λ. But it was not Solon who owned Salamis: it was the Athenian people. Read therefore δοκοῖεν. So in 4. 8 (λέγεται τὸν στέφανον) ἐξιόντα θείναι πρὸς τὸν ἰδρυμένον Ἑρμῆν, ἐνθαπερ τιθέναι καὶ τοὺς ἀνθινούς εἴωθει. The last word has been corrected to εἴωθει, but should it not be εἴωθεσαν? On the other hand in 3. 56 Θεσπίς ἕνα ὑποκριτὴν ἐξήνυεν . . . καὶ δεύτερον Αἰσχύλος, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σοφοκλῆς, καὶ συνεπλήρωσαν τὴν τραγῳδίαν it is obvious that the last verb should be singular, συνεπλήρωσεν, referring to Sophocles only, just as he goes on to say τρίτον δὲ Πλάτων τὸν διαλεκτικὸν (λόγον προσέθηκε) καὶ ἐτελεσιούργησε τὴν φιλοσοφίαν. In 6. 52 again, ἰδὼν ποτε γυναῖκας ἀπ' ἐλαίας ἀπηγγονισμένας the plural can hardly be right: Why should more than one woman be hanging there? Read γυναῖκ' . . . ἀπηγγονισμένην.

1. 62 ἤκμαζε περὶ τὴν τεσσαρεακοστὴν ἔκτην Ὀλυμπιάδα, ἧς τῷ τρίτῳ ἔτει ἤρξεν Ἀθηναίων καθά φησι Σωσικράτης· ὅτε καὶ τίθησι τοὺς νόμους, ἐτελεύτησε δὲ κ.τ.λ. For the incongruous present τίθησι I would read τιθέναι. Often in Diogenes side by side with finite verbs we find infinitives depending on a λέγεται or something similar understood. In the same way ξυνακολουθῶν in 9. 61 should be ξυνακολουθεῖν. 4. 3 ἀλλ' εἰ μὴ Σπεύσιππον ἐμάνθανον ὧδε θανείσθαι. The future infinitive is absurd, nor does μανθάνω properly take an infinitive at all. Read θανόντα. 7. 17 ὡς δὲ Κυνικός τις οὐ φήσας ἔλαιον ἔχειν ἐν τῇ ληκύθῳ προσήτησεν αὐτόν, οὐκ ἔφη δώσειν ἀπελθόντα μέντοι ἐκέλευε σκέψασθαι ὁπότερος εἴη ἀναδιδέστερος. Read ἀπελθόντος. It was the bystanders, not the Cynic, who were bidden to consider the question. In the well-known story about the disappearance of Empedocles (8. 68) καταβὰς ὁ Πανσανίας ἐπεμψέ τινας ζητήσοντας· ὑστέρων δ' ἐκωλύθη πολυπραγμονεῖν, φάσκων εὐχῆς ἀξία συμβεβηκέναι καὶ θύειν αὐτῷ δεῖν the passive ἐκωλύθη makes no sense, and should be ἐκώλυσε, and in a version (9. 56) of another story even better known, λέγεται δὲ ποτε αὐτὸν (Protagoras) ἀπαιτοῦντα τὸν μισθὸν Εὐαθλον τὸν μαθητὴν, ἐκείνου εἰπόντος Ἄλλ' οὐδέπω νενίκηκα, εἰπεῖν Ἄλλ', ἐγὼ μὲν ἂν νικήσω, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐνίκησα, λαβεῖν με δεῖ· ἂν δὲ

σύ, ὅτι σύ it is plain that *νενίκηκα* should be *νενίκηκας*. But in 6. 96 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔσεσθαι κοινωνός, εἰ μὴ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων γενηθείης, it looks as though we should read *γενηθείη* and *κοινωνόν*. 10. 119 ἀλλὰ καὶ πηρωθεὶς τὰς ὀφείας μεθέξειν αὐτὸν (τὸν σοφόν) τοῦ βίου read *κἂν πηρωθῇ* and *ib.* 126 δοξάζει for *δοξάζεται* which may be due to *φοβεῖται* and *προσίσταται* preceding it; but 6. 99 φέρει seems a mistake for *φέρεται* (as for instance *ib.* 98). In 2. 114 Φρασιδημον . . . προσήγαγε the middle *προσηγάγετο* is probably required, and *ib.* 11 πρώτος δ' Ἀναξαγόρας καὶ βιβλίον ἐξέδωκε συγγραφῆς for the unintelligible *συγγραφῆς* I suggest *συγγράφας*.

The corruption of future tenses to present is abundantly illustrated in the text of Diogenes. To cases already corrected add 2. 103 where *ἔχειν* should be *ἔξειν*: 6. 10 ἀμυνεῖσθαι: 7. 14 λέξειν καὶ γράψειν: 7. 189 εἶξειν (compare *ἔσται* following): and *ἔσται* for *ἐστί* in 7. 7. In 2. 97 the present infinitives *ἀποδέχεσθαι*, etc. may be right, but I do not feel very sure. *Εὐδαιμονήσει* in 2. 96 and *δῶξει* in 6. 35 should be infinitives.

A very common mistake in Greek texts and one to which editors and grammar-writers have a wonderful way of blinding themselves is the confusion of comparative and superlative forms. Several cases have been detected in Diogenes (e.g. 6. 5 and the instructive case of *πρώτον* for *πρότερον* in 2. 43) and the following are equally certain: 1. 104 ἐρωτηθεὶς τίνα τῶν πλοίων εἰσὶν ἀσφαλέστερα ἔφη τὰ νεωκλημένα (read *ἀσφαλέστατα*): 5. 64 διατρίψας ἐν παντὶ λόγων εἶδει καὶ μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ φυσικῷ, ὅπερ εἶδος ἀρχαιότερόν τε καὶ σπουδαιότερον (ότατον in both): 7. 22 πάντων ἔλεγεν ἀπρεπέστερον εἶναι τὸν τύφον καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ τῶν νέων (ἀπρεπέστατον). I have mentioned above the much more curious case of 6. 50, where *ἀμείνων* seems to stand for *ἀριστος* (ποῖος εἴη ἀμείνων χαλκός εἰς ἀνδριάντα).¹ In 4. 48 ἐρωτηθεὶς ποτε τίς μᾶλλον ἀγωνία ἔφη ὁ τὰ μέγιστα βουλόμενος εὐημερεῖν we should certainly read *μάλιστα*: the two words are often interchanged.

I take a number of substantival, adjectival, pronominal cases as they come. 2. 66

¹ In the well-known oracle (*schol. ad Theocr.* 14. 48):

Γαίης μὲν πάσης τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἀμεινον,
Ἴπποι Θρηϊκίαι, Λακεδαιμόνιαι δὲ γυναικες,
Ἄνδρες δ' οἱ πίνουσιν ὕδωρ καλῆς Ἀρεθούσης·
Ἄλλ' ἔτι καὶ τῶνδ' εἰσὶν ἀμεινονες, ὅτε κ.τ.λ.

ἀμεινον would seem to be a mistake for *ἀριστον*, but this may be due to the *ἀμεινονες* of line 4. In Philemon (Kock 203: Meineke *Incert. cix.*) *θανεῖν ἀριστόν ἐστιν ἢ ζῆν ἀθλίως* the opposite error has been made.

ἀπέλανε μὲν γὰρ ἡδονῆς (read *ἡδονῇ*) τῶν παρόντων. *ib.* 134 τῶν δὲ διδασκάλων τῶν περὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Ξενοκράτην, ἔτι τε Παραβίατην τὸν Κυρηναῖον κατεφρόνει. Here the second τῶν is no doubt due to the first and should be *τούς*: the accusative following is enough to show this. In 3. 18 ὀργισθεὶς γὰρ οἱ λόγοι σου φησὶ γεροντιῶσι καὶ δὲ Σοῦ δέ γε τυραννιώσι the second σου cannot be right. We might think of *σοί*, but I hardly think *σοί* could stand here unless we read it for the previous σου too. Perhaps οἱ σοί δέ γε is more likely. *ib.* 107 μεριστὰ δ' ὅσα ἕκ τινος σύγκειται; obviously *ἐκ* τινων. 4. 52 ἦν δὲ θεατρικὸς καὶ πολλὸς ἐν τῷ γελοίῳ διαφορῆσαι; read *γελοίως*. 5. 20 ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἐστι φίλος ἔφη Μία ψυχὴ δύο σώμασιν ἐνοικοῦσα. This is a definition, however, not of a friend but of friendship, which indeed Aristotle was much more likely to be asked to define; and therefore we should read *φιλία*. *ib.* 54 ὅπως δὲ συνείρηται . . . <τὰ> περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν κ.τ.λ., συνεπιμελεῖσθαι καὶ Πόμπυλον τούτων ἐποικοῦντα αὐτόν; read *τούτων* for the quite inappropriate *τούτον*. *ib.* 58 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην διατεριφέναι. Cobet *περί* for *ἐπὶ*, but why not *ἐπὶ τῇ θεωρίᾳ ταύτῃ*? 6. 66 πρὸς τὸν λιπαροῦντα τῇ ἐταίρᾳ; usage points to τὴν ἐταίραν. *ib.* 68 ἐρωτηθεὶς εἰ κακὸς ὁ θάνατος, Πῶς, εἶπε, κακός, οὐ παρόντος οὐκ αἰσθανόμεθα; usage points as distinctly to κακόν. 6. 70 συνεχεῖ for *συνχεῖς*? 7. 14 ἐνίους δὲ καὶ χαλκὸν εἰσέπραττε τοὺς περισταμένους τὸ δίδοναι μὴ ἐνοχλεῖν. Cobet reads (I do not know how far on conjecture) τῶν περισταμένων ὥστε δειδιότας τὸ δίδοναι μὴ ἐνοχλεῖν. I suggest in any case ἐνίους for ἐνίους, just as τότε and τοὺς get confused. *ib.* 85 αὐτῷ after οἰκειούσης should probably be αὐτό. *ib.* 169 ἐκέλευεν ὀβολὸν φέρειν ἀποφορᾶς. The genitive is impossible in Greek; read ἀποφοράν, as *μισθοῦ* has been corrected to *μισθόν* in 7. 25. So again in 8. 13 τοῦτον γάρ (φασι) καὶ τὸ φονεῖν ἀπαγορεύειν, μὴ ὅτι γεύεσθαι (so Cobet for μὴ ὅτι γε ἅπτεσθαι) τῶν ζώων, κοινὸν δίκαιον ἡμῖν ἐχόντων τῆς ψυχῆς the last words should surely be τὴν ψυχὴν. The *ψυχὴ* of plants was to Pythagoras their δίκαιον: their right and claim consisted in it. 9. 13 ὥστε . . . διαπορεῖσθαι τῆς ὀρθῆς δοκούσης γεγράφθαι παρὰ σοι διηγήσεως. It may be questioned whether the genitive without *περὶ* is right after *διαπορεῖσθαι*, but there can hardly be a doubt that we should read *ὀρθῶς*. *ib.* 18 γέγραφε δὲ καὶ ἐν ἔπεσι καὶ ἑλεγείας καὶ ἰάμβους καθ' Ἡσιόδου καὶ Ὀμήρου; put datives for the accusatives. *ib.* 51 πρώτος ἔφη δύο λόγους εἶναι περὶ παντὸς πράγματος . . . οἷς καὶ συνηρώτα. In the special sense a man is said ἐρωτᾶν λόγον, etc.; read therefore οὐς.

Confusion of prepositions, particles, pronouns, etc.

1. 73 καὶ τήνων τυράννων εὐδαιμονίζω ὅστις καὶ οἶκοι ἐξ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ καθάνη should, I presume, be ἐν αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ according to the familiar idiom, e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 1070 εἰς ἐαντῶν, Plat. *Theaet.* 206 A ἐν καθαριστοῦ; and 1. 116 ἀνιόντα εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἐς Μεσσήνην must of course be ἐκ Μεσσήνης. 5. 66 καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς στέφανον πολλοὺς ἀπιέναι. There seems no meaning in ἀπ-. Read παρ- or προσ-ιέναι. So again *ib.* 83 τοὺς φίλους ἐπὶ μὲν τὰγαθὰ παρακαλουμένους ἀπιέναι, ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς συμφορὰς αὐτομάτους. I do not see how the ἀντι- can be justified in 7. 34 ὅς καὶ ἐκτμηθήναι φησιν ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τὰ κακῶς λεγόμενα...εἴτ' ἀντιτεθῆναι αὐτά. ἀνατεθῆναι were put back seems likely, though I do not find that meaning given to ἀνατίθημι in Liddell & Scott. *ib.* 181 ἡ παρεδρεύουσα πρεσβύτις αὐτῷ is an obvious blunder for προσεδρεύουσα, the old woman who waited on him.

I should like to write ἀλλά for ἄρα in 2. 13. ναὶ μὲν in 8. 75 can hardly have escaped correction by someone to καὶ μὲν. 7. 2 γοῦν is found by a very common error for δ' οὖν. In 2. 41 we find the quite formless sentence δτ' οὖν κατεδικάσθη, in which editors seem to suppose that ὅτε is more or less the same as τότε. I take it that here also we should read ὁ δ' οὖν, which the context makes quite suitable. It is surprising how often δ' οὖν was corrupted, usually to γοῦν or οὖν.

An epigram of Diogenes' own (3. 45) on Plato has already been quoted, but it is necessary here to give the whole of it:

καὶ πῶς, εἰ μὴ Φοῖβος ἀν' Ἑλλάδα φύσε
Πλάτωνα,

ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων γράμμασιν ἠκέσατ' <ᾗ>;
καὶ γὰρ ὁ τοῦδε γεγώς Ἀσκληπιὸς ἐστὶν ἡγήρ
σώματος, ὡς ψυχῆς ἀθανάτοιο Πλάτων.

It may strike the reader, and it is certainly true, that in the last couplet things are put in the wrong order and relation. Asclepius should not be compared to Plato, but Plato to Asclepius: not body to mind, but mind to body. Even Diogenes knew this. What has happened is probably the following. It is well known that καί and ὡς often get interchanged, as do καί and ἡ, from similarity in the abbreviations by which they were written. Here then καί γάρ is for ὡς γάρ, and we have only to read ὡς γάρ...ὡς ψυχῆς ἀθανάτοιο Πλάτων. Ἡ seems to have got substituted for καί in 6. 32 τοῦτο δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐπικρατεῖν ἥδη τοὺς

Μακέδονας ἡ ἐκ ταπεινῶν ὑψηλοὺς γίγνεσθαι. In 3. 78 αὐ should be αὐτόν (another common mistake) and in 10. 126 οὔτε γάρ should be οὐδὲ γάρ. The occasional error of a double οὐδέ for a double οὔτε I need not point out. 1. 122 ἐπὶ μᾶλλον is ἔτι μᾶλλον.

At the end of the *Anaxagoras* we read (2. 15) γεγόνασι δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τρεῖς Ἀναξαγόρα, ὧν ἐν οὐδενὶ πάντα ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἦν ῥήτωρ κ.τ.λ. For πάντα, which is unintelligible, we may perhaps read ταῦτά, the same characteristics, i.e. devotion to philosophy, etc., though, even that seems rather an odd expression. Ταῦτό should also be read for τοῦτο in the verse quoted in 1. 29 and perhaps in 2. 73 ταῦτό καὶ ἡμίονος, though there τοῦτο may stand. In the *Antisthenes* 6. 10 διδακτὴν ἀπεδείκνυε τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς εὐγενεῖς τοὺς καὶ ἐναρτέους we shall be safe in changing τοὺς to οὓς. Diogenes (6. 54) ἐρωτηθεὶς ποῶ καίρῳ δεῖ γαμῆν ἔφη τοὺς μὲν νέους μηδέποτε, τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους μηδεπώποτε. It is plain that the temporal particles have here got into some confusion. Without good MS evidence the right reading can hardly be restored with certainty, but τοὺς μὲν νέους μηδέπω (?), τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους μηδέποτε (?) or μηκέτι would give the right sense. σου in 7. 17 τὸν ὑποκάτω σου should be μου. *Prooem.* 13 καὶ οἱ μὲν σοφοὶ wants perhaps οἶδε either added after σοφοί or put instead of οἱ.

Antisthenes' remark to Plato (6. 7) ἐδόκει μοι καὶ σὺ ἵππος ἂν εἶναι λαμπρυντής is in the wrong tense and requires δοκέει. On the other hand Zeno's self-congratulation (7. 5) εὖ γε ποιεῖ ἡ τύχη προσελαύνουσα ἡμᾶς φιλοσοφία refers to the past and needs ἐποίηε, and in 8. 85 and 9. 43 δοκεῖ should no doubt be ἐδόκει (cf. 8. 76: 9. 7, 45, 57, etc.). δουλώται in 1. 113 stands for δεδούλωται.

Words out of order.

A clear and simple instance occurs in 3. 69' where it is said that Plato δύο τῶν πάντων ἀπέφηνεν ἀρχάς, θεὸν καὶ ὕλην, ὃν καὶ νοῦν προσαγορεύει καὶ αἷτιον. θεὸν and ὕλην have of course changed places. So in 2. 50 ἐχθρῶς δὲ διέκειτο πρὸς Μένωνα τὸν Φαρσάλιον περὶ τὸν χρόνον τῆς ἀναβάσεως, τὸν ξεναγόν we may presume that τὸν ξεναγόν was first accidentally omitted and then inserted in the wrong place. In the summary of Aristotle (5. 32, 33) we read καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν δὲ ἀσώματον, ἐντελέχειαν οὖσαν τὴν πρώτην· σώματος γὰρ φυσικοῦ (! τὴν πρώτην σώματος φυσικοῦ) καὶ ὀργανικοῦ δυνάμει ζωὴν ἔχοντος. διττὴ δ' αὕτη ἐστὶ κατ' αὐτόν. λέγει δ' ἐντελέχειαν ἧς ἐστὶν εἰδὸς τι ἀσώματον· ἡ μὲν κατὰ δυνάμιν...καθ'

ἔξιν δὲ λέγεται ἐντελέχεια κ.τ.λ. This exposition is enough to puzzle anyone, until we see that διττή...κατ' αὐτόν should follow εἰδός τι ἀσώματον and refers to ἐντελέχειαν. Zeno 7. 24 ἐν συμποσίῳ κατακείμενος σιγῇ τὴν αἰτίαν ἠρωτήθη. ἔφη οὖν τῷ ἐγκαλέσαντι ἀπαγγέλλαι πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ὅτι παρὴν τις σιωπᾶν ἐπιστάμενος. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ ἐρωτῶντες παρὰ Πτολεμαίου πρέσβεις ἀφικόμενοι καὶ βουλόμενοι μαθεῖν τί εἴποιεν περὶ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα. The third sentence ἦσαν...βασιλέα should of course precede the second ἔφη...ἐπιστάμενος. In 2. 95 the words καὶ μὴ μισήσῃ, μᾶλλον δὲ μεταδιδάξῃ must be put a little earlier or a little later.

Miscellaneous.

The difference between ἀνείπον, ἀνείπειν, used of heralds etc. and ἀνέilon, ἀνελείν, used of gods and oracles, is often lost in MSS. It is quite certain that Hipponax never said of Myson (1. 107) δν' Ἀπόλλων ἀνείπεν ἀνδρῶν σωφρονέστατον πάντων, but ἀνέilen, and the same change must be made in 1. 30 twice, and in 5. 91. [Make it also twice in Dio Chrys. 31. 97 (M. 340).] In 2. 37 the right form ἀνελούσης has survived. On the other hand the aorist of αἰρεῖν has itself perhaps taken the place of another word in 1. 26 πάμπλειστα συνέιλε χρήματα, where συνέγγε (or συνέγγαγε) seems probable. In 1. 64 again κἂν τῇ πόλει χάριν κατὰθοιτο ἐξευρών, where the context is conspiracy against a tyrant, ἐξευρών seems to stand for ἐξαίρων or ἐξελών, removing, killing. The aorist εἴρε was foolishly repeated, as though it was emphatic, in Diogenes' verse 1. 85 εἶπε γάρ, εἶπε δίκην ἐτάρου τινός. It seems a mistake for εἴτε γὰρ εἴτε, the εἴτε being answered by the εἴτα following as often by ἔνθα, τότε, etc. In 4. 16 μεθύνω εἰς τὴν Ξενοκράτους ἤξε σχολήν, ὃ δ' οὐδὲν διατραπεῖς ἦρε τὸν λόγον ὁμοίως the sense required, that Xenocrates went on with his lecture, is plain enough, but ἦρε cannot convey it. εἴρε has been suggested. I rather incline to ἦγε, though I cannot adduce an example of λόγον ἄγειν. 8. 46 τελευταῖοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο τῶν Πυθαγορείων οὓς καὶ Ἀριστότενος εἶδε Ξενοφίλος τε...καὶ Φάντων κ.τ.λ. should I suppose be οὓς καὶ Ἀ. οἶδε or ᾗδει (a very common mistake). 5. 65 Lycon is called φραστικός ἀνὴρ καὶ περὶ παιδῶν ἀγωγῆς ἄκρως συνεταγμένος, but of course Diogenes wrote συνεταμένος.

The familiar confusion of λόγος and νόμος (see for instance Ar. Eth. 5. 6 1134 A 35) has, I think, taken place in 1. 102 where the dying Anacharsis says διὰ μὲν τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος σωθῆναι, διὰ δὲ τὸν φθόνον ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἀπολίσθαι. There is no sense in

λόγον. He means that he had returned home (σωθῆναι) διὰ τὸν νόμον, though he was said (see just before) τὰ νόμιμα παραλύειν τῆς πατρίδος. 3. 29 Aristippus φησὶν αὐτὸν (Plato) Ἀστέρος μειρακίου τινός...ἐρασθῆναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ Δίωνος τοῦ προειρημένου. Ἐνιοὶ καὶ Φαίδρου φασί. Remove the stop after προειρημένου. 4. 4 πρὸς τὸν ἐρῶντα πλούσιον ἀμόρφου ἔφη τί δέ σοι δεῖ τούτου; ἐγὼ γάρ σοι δέκα ταλάντων εὐμορφότεραν εὐρίσω. There is absolutely no point in this; but there will be some humour in it, if we read ἀμορφότεραν, or rather, as τούτου shows, ἀμορφότερον. The joke is partly the same as in the Oxford story of the tutor who, hearing another express his surprise at So-and-So's giving such bad lectures for so high a stipend, rejoined that he was himself ready to give much worse lectures for half the money. 5. 1 περιπατοῦντι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ συμπαρῶν διελέγετο ἅπαντα. περιπατῶν is suggested; perhaps συμπεριμῶν (sometimes written with only one ι) would be better. 5. 36 Theophrastus was συνετώτατος and φιλοπονώτατος, Menander's teacher, and ἄλλως τε καὶ (omit?) εὐεργετικός καὶ φιλόλογος. εὐεργετικός seems, if not poor in sense, at any rate rather out of place among the other adjectives; did Diogenes write ἐνεργητικός? (In M. Aurel. 1. 7 φαντασιοπλήκτως τὸν ἀσκητικὸν ἢ τὸν εὐεργητικὸν ἄνδρα ἐπιδείκνυσθαι the same suggestion is an old one.) 6. 11 Antisthenes held τὴν ἀρετὴν τῶν ἔργων εἶναι, μήτε λόγων πλείστων δεομένην μήτε μαθημάτων. No doubt we should read λόγων πλαστῶν: so Herod. 1. 68 ἐκ πλαστοῦ λόγον. 7. 20 λέγοντος δὲ τινος αὐτῷ περὶ Πολέμωνος ὡς ἄλλα προθέμενος ἄλλα λέγει, σκυθρωπάσας ἔφη Πόσον γὰρ ἡγάπας τὰ διδόμενα; this is nonsense and πόσον seems a mistake for πῶς οὐ, 'why weren't you content?' 9. 73 καὶ Ἰπποκράτην ἔπειτα ἐνδοιαστὸς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνως ἀποφαίνεσθαι. There is no meaning in ἔπειτα. I have thought of ἔστιν ἃ or ἔνια or ἐνίστε. There is an equally impossible ἔπειτα in 8. 58 where he is speaking of tragedies attributed to Empedocles: Ἱερώνυμος δὲ φησιν αὐτὸν (αὐτὸς conjectured: αὐτῶν?) τρισὶ καὶ τετταράκοντα ἐντετυχηκέναι (probably read). Νεάνθης δὲ νέον ὄντα γεγραφέναι τὰς τραγωδίας καὶ αὐτὸν (?) ἔπειτα αὐταῖς ἐντετυχηκέναι. Here ἔπειτα might be ἐνίστε, but the context suggests the mention of some specific number of plays. 9. 104 οὐ γὰρ τὸ ὁρᾶν ἀναρεῖν (they do not do away with sight) ἀλλὰ τὸ πῶς ὁρᾶν ἀγνοεῖν: perhaps τὸ <ὁρᾶν> πῶς ὁρᾶ, or omit ὁρᾶν and leave τὸ πῶς. 7. 86 τοῦ δὲ λόγον τοῖς λογικοῖς κατὰ τελειοτέραν προστασίαν δεδομένου, τὸ κατὰ λόγον ζῆν ὀρθῶς γίνεσθαι τοῖς κατὰ φύσιν. He

is speaking of the various forms of animation (plants, animals, rational creatures) and the life *κατὰ φύσιν* for them on the Stoic theory. The point of this sentence seems to be exactly inverted, like that of 3. 45 above noticed. It should not be that rational creatures living *κατὰ φύσιν* will live *κατὰ λόγον*; but that, if they live *κατὰ λόγον*, then, being rational creatures, they will be living *κατὰ φύσιν*. In other words *λόγον* and *φύσιν* should change places. An understanding of this suggests the correction of the preceding sentence too. Speaking of animals, which as distinguished from plants have *ὁρμή impulse*, he says *τούτοις μὲν τῷ (or τὸ) κατὰ φύσιν τὸ κατὰ τὴν ὁρμὴν διοικεῖσθαι*, where similarly the sense should be that for them *ζῆν κατὰ τὴν ὁρμὴν* is *ζῆν κατὰ φύσιν*: read therefore *τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τῷ κατὰ τὴν ὁρμὴν διοικεῖσθαι*.

On 1. 104 and 4. 48 see vol. xvi. of this Review, p. 394.

I will mention finally three or four passages, where the mistake seems to be of one type, and that a type fairly well recognised now. The type I mean is the substitution of one word for another because the former or something akin to it occurs in the context and is in the writer's mind. In 1. 59 ἡξίωσε τ' Ἀθηναίους τὰς ἡμέρας κατὰ σελήνην ἄγειν, καὶ Θέσπιν ἐκώλυσε τραγωδίας

ἄγειν τε καὶ διδάσκειν this surely accounts for the second ἄγειν. There is no such phrase as *τραγωδίας ἄγειν* (we must not be misled by *agere*) and, if there were, it would mean the same with regard to Thespis as *διδάσκειν*. Probably the real word was *ποιεῖν*. Again in the lines to Dion ascribed to Plato (3. 30: *Anth. Pal.* 7. 99)

σοὶ δὲ, Δίων, ῥέξαντι καλῶν ἐπινίκιον ἔργων
δαίμονες εὐρείας ἐλπίδας ἐξέχεαν,
κείσαι δ' εὐρυχόρῳ ἐν πατρίδι κ.τ.λ.

εὐρείας is a strange epithet for *ἐλπίδας* and no skilful writer would have used it just before *εὐρυχόρῳ*. The lost word need not of course have resembled it. Then in 5. 57 he says αἱ διαθῆκαι κείνται ἀντίγραφα (<κατ' ἀντίγραφα?) τῷ Θεοφράστου δακτυλίῳ σεσημασμένοι, μία μὲν παρ' Ἡγησίᾳ . . . τὴν δ' ἑτέραν ἔχει Ὀλυμπιόδωρος . . . τὴν δ' ἑτέραν ἔλαβεν Ἀδείμαντος, where it is difficult not to think that the second *ἑτέραν* should be *τρίτην*. Lastly in 1. 102 Anacharsis is said *παράγοντος εἰς τὴν Σκυθίαν καὶ νομίζον τὰ νόμιμα παραλύειν τῆς πατρίδος* to have been killed by his brother. *δοκῶν* has been suggested for *νομίζον*. It seems likely enough, *νομίζον* being probably due to *νόμιμα*. But *νομιζόμενος* is also possible.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

CAESAR'S MOVEMENTS, JANUARY 21 TO FEBRUARY 14, 49 B.C.

DURING the third week in January, 49 B.C., active military operations in the North were momentarily suspended. Caesar himself was still at Ariminum, although detachments of his thirteenth legion had already occupied the coast towns as far south as Ancona, and by sending Antony to Arretium and Curio to Iguvium, he had guarded against a Pompeian advance along the western roads (Caes. *B.C.* i. 11. 4-i. 12. 2). Negotiations for peace were in progress. The pause, however, was but a brief one; Jan. 21 or 22 (Cic. *ad Att.* vii. 17. 3) Caesar heard that Pompey and the consuls had abandoned Rome, and possibly also that they were contemplating a forward movement into Picenum (*ad Att.* vii. 15. 3; 16. 2; 18. 2). Deciding therefore to re-unite his scattered forces, he sent word to Antony and to Curio, of whose occupation of Iguvium he had just been informed, to overtake him as soon as possible. He then marched slowly

down the coast, picking up his garrisons along the way. (Caes. *B.C.* i. 12. 3, *Quibus rebz cognitiz confusus municipiorum voluntatibus Caesar cohortes legionis XIII ex praesidiis deducit Auximumque proficiscitur.*)

The date at which this concentration of Caesar's forces was completed can be fixed with some precision. Curio's orders, sent Jan. 22, reached him Jan. 23; he doubtless started the 24th. To march the eighty-four miles to Ancona by way of Calis and Fanum would require at least four days; the earliest possible date of union, then, is Jan. 27 P.M. A *terminus ante quem* can be derived from Cic. *ad Att.* vii. 19, *Ecce tibi III Nonas Febr. mane accepi litteras tuas, Philotimi, Furni, Curionis ad Furnium, quibus irridet L. Caesaris legationem.* The letter of Atticus here mentioned could not have left Rome later than the night of Feb. 1-2, because Cicero at Formiae (ninety-six miles distant) received it early in the