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](#)

Notes on Julian's First Oration

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 03 / April 1903, pp 150 - 152
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207713, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207713

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1903). Notes on Julian's First Oration. The Classical Review, 17, pp 150-152
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207713

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

is greatly enhanced by the genitive continuing in τῶν κ.τ.λ. I conclude therefore that some such expression as ἀμελεῖν, ὀλιγωρεῖν, μηδὲν φροντίζεω has been lost.

2. 18 The only parallel cited for οἷος ἔμπειρος is Ar. *Wasps* 970 ὁ δ' ἕτερος οἷός ἐστιν οἰκουρὸς μόνον, where since Brunck οἰκουρεῖν has often been read. The nominative is not really intelligible, and it would be easy for εἶναι to drop out (so probably εἰσί in 3. 15).

2. 28 Ἀμφίπολις κἂν ληφθῇ, as it is usually written (Madvig and Blass in some of his texts omit Ἀμφίπολις altogether), throws an unreasonable emphasis on the name, which requires none at all. The parallel sentence with Δάμνακος, Σίγειον, τὰ πλοῖα strongly suggests, I think, that one or two names have dropped out.

3. 26 By itself εἰς περιουσίαν is in no way contrasted with τὸ κοινὸν αὔξειν. There may be a surplus in the treasury as well as in private hands.

Chers. 32 Is the meaning sufficiently expressed without such a τοιοῦτον as appears in the parallel clause? The resemblance in letters to τὸν αἵτιον would facilitate its omission.

There are one or two other places where the insertion of a word or two might make things easier (e.g. *Ol.* 1. 2 an infinitive like φυλάττεσθαι before μὴ πάθῃτε: 2. 29 a participle with ὡς τούτους: 3. 7 something after ἡμεῖς); but I do not wish to propose it.

I will add a brief appendix on one passage in the *de Halonneso* and two in the *Letter of Philip*.

7. 13 τὰ σύμβολα ταῦτα γίνεται εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ μηδ' ἀμφισβητῆσαι εὐλόγως ὑμᾶς ἐτι Ποτειδαίας, 'as an admission that you cannot lay reasonable claim any further to Potidaea.' The sense requires μηδ' <ἀν> ἀμφισβητῆσαι. ἀν dropped out before αμ. The future ἀμφισβητήσειν would be less suitable. So in 16. 5 it would seem necessary to insert ἀν before ἀντιπάλους.

12. 5 ὥστ' ἔγωγ' ἀπορῶ τί ποτ' ἔσται καινότερον ἢ ἀπολογησῆτέ μοι πολεμεῖν καὶ γὰρ ὅτε φανερώς διεφερόμεθα, ληστάς ἐξεπέμπετε καὶ τοὺς πλείοντας ὡς ὑμᾶς ἐπωλεῖτε, τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἐβοηθεῖτε, τὴν χώραν μου κακῶς ἐποιεῖτε.

Read ὅτ' <οὐ> φανερώς διεφερόμεθα. The time referred to is from 346 to 340, when Philip and Athens in spite of acts of hostility on both sides were not at open variance and war. Cf. 18. 43, 44.

12. 14 προῦκαλούμην κριθῆναι περὶ τούτων πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

The meaning is clearly the same as that expressed in 16 by προκαλούμενος ὑμᾶς εἰς κρίσιν ἐλθεῖν, and it follows that πρὸς ὑμᾶς should be πρὸς ἡμᾶς, This would be evident even without the parallel passage. In the *Letter* ἡμεῖς is constantly used of Philip.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

NOTES ON JULIAN'S FIRST ORATION.

4 A. οὐδ' ὥσπερ ἐκ τίνος τραγικῆς μηχανῆς, φησί. 'The law does not ordain any form of words, nor, like a deus ex machina, bid men seek virtue and fly vice.' What then is φησί? Neither the law nor any other noun in the neighbourhood can be its subject, but the remedy is simple; read φασί. Then φασί stands for ὡς φασί, as people have it. This idiom is of course common enough, e.g. Theocritus xii. 13, ὁ μὲν εἰσπνιλος, φαίη χ' ὠμυκλαῖζων, xv. 125, μαλακώτεροι ὑπνω, ἃ Μίλατος ἐρεῖ, and it is particularly common in Julian, but seems to have misled his latest and generally excellent editor, Hertlein. At least at 32 A, ὁ δὲ...εἶξας ὀψέ ποτε, φασί, τῇ Θεταλκῇ πειθανάγκῃ, Hertlein actually wants to change φασί to φησί. At 145 D this φησὶν positively appears in his text in place

of the old vulgate φασίν. At 148 B he remarks 'ego φασί deleverim.' Yet by the time he has got to 225 C he is of a better mind and restores φασίν rightly for φησὶν of the MSS. The same correction was also made by Hercher at 402 D. Other instances of this usage are to be found at 27 B, 173 B, 200 D, 244 B, 307 B, 366 B, 369 B, 376 D, 389 C, 411 B, 443 D, 444 A, and another instance of confusion between φησὶ and φασί in the MSS. at 444 D.

9 D. καὶ πολλῶν αὐτοκρατόρων οὐχὶ δὲ ἐνὸς μητέρα, ὧν ὁ μὲν τις τῷ πατρὶ συγκρατεργάσατο τὸν πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους πόλεμον κ.τ.λ. Julian is speaking of the mother and brothers of Constantius, to whom he is writing this oration. If he said ὁ μὲν τις, it could hardly

mean anything but 'one of your brothers, I really don't quite know which,' and that is absurd. He must have said *ὁ μὲν εἷς*. For the correct use of *ὁ μὲν τις* see 11 B.

12 B. *κρατούντων δὲ ἱππεύσι τῶν πολεμίων, ὥρα μηχανᾶσθαι τοῖς μειρακίοις σωτηρίας τρόπον δυσεπινόητον*. Julian is here criticising the proposal of Plato that the children of the guardians should be taken on horses to see their parents fight. It would be all very well, he remarks, if the enemy were all infantry, but if they had a superiority in cavalry, what then? *ὥρα μηχανᾶσθαι κ.τ.λ.* Now in this sentence anyone will feel that there is something wrong about *ὥρα* and *δυσεπινόητον*. No one who knows his Julian will suppose him likely to have expressed his meaning by saying 'it will be time to devise a difficult way,' when he ought to have said either, 'it will be time to devise a way,' or else 'it will be difficult to devise a way.' And if we look up the passage in his mind, *Rep.* 466 c, we find *προσμηχανᾶσθαι δ' αὐτοῖς ὠφέλειαν*, and hence we may perhaps suppose that Julian also wrote *προσμηχανᾶσθαι*. As one form of *π* is just an *ω* with a lid to it, *προς* might conceivably be corrupted to *ὥρα*. A scribe finding what he thought to be *ωρος* would naturally alter it to *ὥρα*.

15 C. *τὸ δὲ ἦν, οὐ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐξελεῖν τῶν νέων, ἀλλὰ τὸ λαθεῖν πειρᾶσθαι ἰδρῶτα προστάτειν*. We cannot praise the Carthaginian custom, says Julian, of turning children out to make their living for themselves, only forbidding them *δρᾶν τι τῶν δοκούντων αἰσχρῶν*. 'That is not to bridle their desires, but to order them to try and not be found out.' Where then does *ἰδρῶτα* fit in? Read *τι δρῶντα*. It may be added that Julian is very careful in this oration about hiatus, and probably would not have allowed *πειρᾶσθαι ἰδρῶτα* to stand together.

17 C. *χαλεπῶς φέροντες πρὸς τὸ δουλεύειν. 'πρὸς delere Reiske vult,'* says Hertlein, 'aut ἔχοντες pro φέροντες scribere,' and Hertlein himself brackets *πρὸς*. But one need not go beyond Liddell and Scott to find *χαλεπῶς φέρειν* used with genitive, with dative, and with *ἐπὶ* and dative, by a *constructio ad sensum*, and why not with *πρὸς* and accusative?

19 A. *Ἀρμένιοι παλαιοὶ σύμμαχοι στασιάζοντες καὶ μοῖρα σφῶν οὐ φαῦλη Πέρσαις προσθέμενοι*. The nominative *μοῖρα* is intolerable, not because of the masculine plural *προσθέμενοι* (for such a construction is common in Julian) but because it has no

proper construction otherwise, and because *σφῶν* is not reflexive. He uses *σφῶν* very often and almost always as a reflexive. I have collected the following references on this point: 21 B, 26 c, 61 c, 64 B, D, 76 A, 83 A, D, 86 B, 92 A, 99 A, 168 B, 437 c. The only exception is 99 D, *ταῖς τῶν ὑπηκόων ξυμφοραῖς, ὅπως ἂν γίνωνται, εἴτε κακία σφῶν καὶ ἀμαθία...* where *σφῶν* is used loosely as if he had said *ὅπως ἂν οἱ ὑπῆκοι εἰς ξυμφοράς καταστῶσι*, so that it is a *constructio ad sensum*, like *ἐπὶ σφῶς* in Thuc. II, 101, or the *γυμνοὶ* of Thuc. II, 49, or fifty other passages. In Julian 60 A, *τὰ δόρατα σφῶν* if right is to be explained in the same way, but *σφῶν* is there ejected by Petavius and Hertlein; I myself think *σφῶν* ought there to be retained. Anyhow these two passages are both defensible, but that we are now concerned with is not. (It is curious to observe, by the way, how *σφῶν* drops out from Julian's later writings; here we have fourteen instances in the first hundred pages and only two in the other 350. It is also to be noted that Julian does use *σφίσι* for *αὐτοῖς* as well as *αὐτοῖς*.)

To come back to 19 A, it is obvious that we must read *μοῖρα*—*φαῦλη*.

19 D. *λυσitelēs μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ὅτι μὴ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ καλὸν ἔμοιγε φαίνεται, ὅλως δὲ εἴ τι καθ' αὐτὸ τὸ συμφέρον ἐξετάζειν δοκεῖ κ.τ.λ.* For *ὅλως* read *ὁμως*. Julian knew how to use both appropriately; for *ὅλως* see 46 c, 80 c; for *ὁμως* *passim*.

20 C. *πορείας μὲν τάχει χρησάμενος ἀθρόως ἐκ Παιόνων ἐν Σύροις ὤφθη, οὐδὲ τῷ λόγῳ δεῖξαι βᾶδιον. 'ὅπως πορείας Schaefer, Petavius vero ὅπως μὲν pro ἀθρόως conjecit.'* Hertlein. But *ἀθρόως* has only got in by accident from some three lines down, and I think that what Julian said was *πορείας μὲν ὅσῳ τάχει χρησάμενος ἐκ Παιόνων κ.τ.λ.*

21 D. *χρημάτων δὲ ἐπενόεις πόρους οὐκ αὔξων τοὺς φόρους...ἐμμένων δὲ οἶμαι τοῖς ἀρχαίοις πλὴν εἴ που πρὸς βραχὺ καὶ πρὸς εὐκαιρον ἐχρῆν αἰσθῆσθαι δαπανηροτέρων τῶν λειτουργημάτων.* V has two variants, *ἄκαιρον* for *εὐκαιρον*, whence Hertlein rather unhappily conjectures *ἀκαριαῖον*, and *αἰσθεσθαι*. That *αἰσθῆσθαι* is wrong is indeed apparent, for it is manifest that the sense we require is 'unless it was needful occasionally to add a little to the taxes.' That would be *προσθέσθαι*. Compare for this 23 D *ad fin.*: *κατ' ὀλίγον προστιθεῖς τῷ τάχει*. From this we see that Julian probably wrote a dative after *προσθέσθαι* without any accusative. But what of the accent in V? Of course

it may easily be a slip, but it may very well point to αὐτὸ being the original, and on the whole, I incline to think that Julian wrote: ἐχρὴν αὐτὸ προσθέσθαι (or προστίθεσθαι) δαπανηρότερον (adverb) τοῖς λειτουργήμασιν. Once the missing letters had fallen out (and our author is full of lacunae) and what was left was taken for αἰσθεσθαι, the rest followed as matter of course, and in the inferior MSS. the accent also was corrected to αἰσθέσθαι.

33 D. φαυλοτέρας καὶ ἐλάττονος VM, φαυλότερα cet. Here again V preserves a nonsensical reading corrected in the other MSS. But the correction is not complete, for καὶ is quite pointless. Julian said φαυλότερα ἐλάττονος, this was corrupted to φαυλοτέρας ἐλάττονος, and καὶ was then added by someone to give an appearance of sense by connecting the two adjectives. But that someone did not thereby make a sentence that would stand investigation and so a later corrector altered φαυλοτέρας back to φαυλότερα, quite rightly so far as he went.

37 D. Julian is describing the chain-mail armour which was then coming into use. ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν ἄκρων καρπῶν, says he, ἐς τοὺς ἀγκῶνας, ἐκέιθεν δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ὤμους, καὶ ὁ θώραξ <ἐκ> τμημάτων κατὰ τὸ στέρνον καὶ τὰ νῶτα συναρμολογούμενος, τὸ κράνος αὐτῷ προσώπῳ σιδηροῦν ἐπικείμενον ἀνδριάντος λαμπροῦ καὶ στιλβόντος παρέχει τὴν ὄψιν. This sentence is in a lamentable state, and all the editors have done for it is Reiske's insertion of ἐκ and Hertlein's ἐπικείμενον for ἐπικείμενος. Without wasting space by raising obvious objections, I will propose, (1) to mark a lacuna after ὤμους, (2) to read καὶ τὸ κράνος or τὸ δὲ κράνος, (3) to add τῷ between αὐτῷ and προσώπῳ. For αὐτῷ προσώπῳ could only mean 'face and all' and even if that were any sense there would be nothing left for ἐπικείμενον to govern. For the whole passage compare 57 B, C, especially θώραξιν ἐλατοῖς καὶ ἰ κράνεσιν.

38 B. ἢ πάντως τὸ τέλος ἀποδοῦναι τῶν ἔργων ποθοῦσιν ἄξιον; Hertlein observes 'τοῖς ποθοῦσιν malim,' but, though he is well advised in desiring some change, his proposal is not sufficient. 'Shall I leave off at

this point?' asks Julian, 'or is it not better to pay up the reward in full?' Pay it τοῖς ποθοῦσιν? No, indeed; it was Julian himself who desired to complete it (or who pretended to desire it in this disgraceful piece of hypocrisy and flattery). For at 40 c he writes ἐμοὶ δὲ ποθοῦντι μὲν ἐπεξελεῖν κ.τ.λ. So here what he wrote was ποθοῦμεν, whether the corruption can be 'scientifically' accounted for or no.

40 D. μήτ' εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερον τῶν πάλαι γεγόνος λέληθε τοὺς πολλούς. 'I won't mention this and that of your exploits,' says the orator, 'nor'—what? Apparently 'any other ancient exploit of which the public know nothing.' Apart from the irrelevancy of such a remark, you would expect him then to go on to talk of the flood or the tower of Babel. But not he, he trots out the city of Antioch, which may be named after Antiochus but has only become fit for human habitation by the benefit of Constantius. Therefore what the public did not see was this very recent debt due to Constantius from the city of Antioch, they did not appreciate the Emperor's magnificence. All that has happened is that the word ἄξιον has dropped out between ἕτερον and τῶν πάλαι.

43 A. πλουτοῦσι μὲν γὰρ ἅπασαι διὰ σὲ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν ἐνδεεῖς οὔσαι καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων. Wytttenbach, followed by Hertlein, reads διὰ σὲ διὰ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν. But what can be more wiredrawn and senseless than this change of case after διὰ? Also τῶν (after σέ) is the reading of V alone, the vulgate has τόν. And in this case the vulgate is nearer the truth than V, which can by no means be trusted through thick and thin; within the next few lines V is twice wrong in differing from other MSS. Here the original plainly was τό γ' ἔμπροσθεν.

I add a few suggestions for what they are worth. In 12 A read τοῦ μὲν <οὖν> ἀκίνδυνον. In 18 c στρατευομένοις for στρατενομένοις. In 26 D φιλόανθρωπον seems corrupt; so also in 35 B the sentence beginning σκηπτός. And in 48 A query <τῶν> ἐρμμάτων to avoid hiatus?

ARTHUR PLATT.