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](#)

An Emendation of Lucian *Philopseudes* 9

Campbell Bonner

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 06 / July 1906, pp 301 - 304

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994630, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994630

How to cite this article:

Campbell Bonner (1906). An Emendation of Lucian *Philopseudes* 9. The Classical Review, 20, pp 301-304 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994630

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

already been paid for,' the *again* and the *already* could hardly fail to be expressed. ἐπώλει must, I think, stand for ἐποίει, and οὐκ ἐβεβαίον (= οὐκ ἐποίει) decidedly supports this.

ib. 72 ἐπιβλέψατε δ' ἐπὶ τὴν Θηβαίων πόλιν. ἐγένετο πόλις, ἐγένετο μεγίστη.

πόλις is unmeaning, but its proposed omission unsatisfactory. Where did it come from? Read rather πάλαι, which gives excellent sense. Cf. generally § 75.

ib. 87 τῇ τούτου ἀληθείᾳ <πιστεύουσαι> or something similar?

ib. 110 εἰς τὸ τῆς πόλεως σῶμ' ἀποβλέψαντες καὶ τὴν πρότερον δόξαν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῇ.

No parallel is cited for such a use of σῶμα. Read σχῆμα. Cf. Eur. *Androm.* 1

Ἀσιάτιδος γῆς σχῆμα, Θηβαία πόλις, where the schol. uses καλλώπισμα and κόμπος. So πρόσχημα in Herod. 5. 28 Μίλητος, τῆς Ἰωνίας πρόσχημα. In [Dem.] 61. 12 the MSS. vary between σώματος and σχήματος: Plut. *Luc.* 8 σχῆμα is a certain emendation for σῶμα.

2. 9 ὅτ' εἰς τὸ δεσμοτήριον τὸ πρῶτον ἀπήχθη . . ., τοιαῦτα τολμήσαντα ποιεῖν αὐτούς.

αὐτοῦ Blass with other editors, meaning, I suppose, *there*: but this would be a misuse of αὐτοῦ which is not = simple ἐκεῖ. αὐτούς seems to admit of defence as referring to τοὺς δεσμώτας implied in δεσμοτήριον. So e.g. Ar. *Eth.* 3. 11. 1118 b 19 καλοῦνται γαστρίμαργοι, ὡς παρὰ τὸ δέον πληροῦντες αὐτήν, and many other passages.

3. 16 Perhaps καὶ τρις ἦν ἂν (for ἤδη) δικάως ἐξημωμένος.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

AN EMENDATION OF LUCIAN *PHILOPSEUDES* 9.

Πάνυ γὰρ ιδιώτης, ἔφη ὁ Δεινόμαχος, εἶ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐκ ἐμέλῃσέ σοι ἐκμαθεῖν ὄντινα τρόπον ὠφελεῖ τοῖς νοσήμασι προσφερόμενα, καὶ μοι δοκεῖς οὐδὲ τὰ προφανέστατα ἂν παραδέξασθαι ταῦτα, τῶν ἐκ περιόδου πυρετῶν τὰς ἀποπομπὰς καὶ τῶν ἐρπετῶν τὰς καταθέξεις καὶ βουβώνων ἰάσεις καὶ τὰλλα ὅποσα καὶ αἱ γράες ἤδη ποιῶσιν. εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνα γίνεται ἅπαντα, τί δὴ ποτε οὐχὶ ταῦτα οἴση γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ὁμοίων;

The words τῶν ἐρπετῶν τὰς καταθέξεις stand in all the manuscripts, and seem to have passed the editors unsuspected. Apart from the context they contain nothing objectionable. *κατάθεξις*, indeed, I have not found elsewhere; but the form is a legitimate one, and *θέξις* occurs in Plutarch *Qu. Conv.* iv. 3 (p. 662 A) and Aelian *N.A.* viii. 24. *κατάθελγω*, *subdue by enchantment*, *charm*, is used of the arts of Circe, κ 213:

τοὺς αὐτῇ κατέθελεν, ἐπεὶ κακὰ φάρμακ' ἔδωκεν.

The verb is rare, however, and hardly occurs in the literature until the beginning of the Christian era. As applied to the physical effect of enchantment I have found it nowhere except in the passage from the *Odyssey*. It is elsewhere used of the charm or seduction exercised upon the human mind by music, eloquence, flattery, pleasant sights, etc. So Lucian *Indoct.* 12 [*Philopatr.* 3], Clem. Rom. *Epit. de Gestis S. Petri* clii. p. 584, Migne, Nic. Paph. *In laud. S. Hyac.*

4, cv. p. 424 Migne, Anast. Sin. *Viae Dux* lxxxix. p. 253 A Migne, Schol. Rav. on Ar. *Eq.* 210 (θαλφθῇ κατατελχῇ). I have been unable to verify the quotation in Stephanus from Chrysipp. ap. Eustrat. 511, 20.¹ This is also the commonest use of the simple θέλγω from Homer down. It is, however, used of Medea's quieting the dragon in Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* iv. 150 αὐτὰρ δ' γ' ἤδη | οἴμῃ θελγόμενος, and is also applied to the magical stilling of winds and waters, Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* viii. 7. 28, Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* i. 27. Nicander (*Ther.* 556) uses it of bees attracted by the odour of balm; Longus (ii. 7 *ad fin.*) of cattle charmed by the shepherd's pipe.

As to the facts concerned, that the art of charming snakes was known to the Greeks is adequately proved by two passages in Plato, *Rep.* 358 B, Θρασύμαχος γὰρ μοι φαίνεται . . . ὑπὸ σοῦ ὥσπερ ὄφεις κληθῆναι, and *Euthyd.* 290 A, ἡ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἐπωδῶν (sc. τέχνη) ἔχεών τε καὶ φαλαγγίων καὶ σκορπίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θηρίων τε καὶ νόσων κήλησις ἐστίν. It may seem a little strange in our Lucian passage that snake-charming should be mentioned as within the powers of mere village witches. But old women are the chosen vessels of occult lore, and popular superstition set no limit to their capabilities.

¹ The verification of several out-of-the-way references was made possible by the kindness of Mr. G. C. Scoggin.

In themselves, then, no fault can be found with the words τῶν ἐρπετῶν τὰς καταθέλξεις. But a careful examination of the context seems to me to throw grave doubt upon the reading. The narrator, Tychiades, has been visiting Eucrates, who is ill with a gouty or rheumatic affection of the feet. In § 7 another visitor, Cleodemus, suggests a marvellous remedy—the tooth of a field-mouse tied up in a lion's skin and wrapped around the legs of the sufferer. Tychiades is skeptical (§ 8), and finally declares that he should have no faith in the remedy, even if sixteen whole field-mice were to be wrapped in the hide of the veritable Nemean lion. He has seen a lion limping, not protected from lameness by the virtues of his own skin! Then follows the speech of Deinomachus quoted above. Here the clause τὰ τοιαῦτα . . . ὄντινα τρόπον ὠφελεῖ τοῖς νοσήμασι προσφερόμενα would lead one to expect in the next clause only allusions to well-known magical cures; and certainly the insertion of a reference to snake-charming between two examples of old wives' medicine seems strange. Furthermore, Deinomachus's last sentence is simply an argument by analogy: if our old women accomplish magical cures, why scoff at Cleodemus's remedy, which operates by like means? But the feasibility of charming serpents is no argument for the efficacy of the remedy suggested.

Again, the reply of Tychiades to Deinomachus takes no account of the mention of snake-charming. Only the second sentence need come into consideration: ἦν γοῦν μὴ πείσης πρότερον ἐπάγων τῷ λόγῳ διότι φύσιν ἔχει γίγνεσθαι, τοῦ τε πυρετοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἰδήματος δειδύτος ἢ ὄνομα θεσπέσιον ἢ ῥῆσιν βαρβαρικὴν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο [ἐκ τοῦ βουβώνος] δραπετεύοντος, ἔτι σοι γραῶν μῦθοι τὰ λεγόμενά ἐστι. Would not Tychiades have had his fling at the snake-charming, had it been mentioned? § 10 is occupied by some further discussion between the champions of legitimate and magical therapeutics. Finally, the conversation takes a turn in § 11, where Ion tells how a Chaldean magician cured a man who was at the point of death from a viper's bite, and then (§ 12) caps this with a still more marvellous yarn of how the same magician rid a farm of reptiles in a manner that remotely suggests the Pied Piper.

I cannot believe that Lucian introduced into the speech of Deinomachus in § 9 this utterly irrelevant mention of serpent-charming. Two courses, then, remain open: (1) the words τῶν ἐρπετῶν τὰς καταθέλξεις may be regarded as an interpolation, perhaps suggested by the snake-stories in §§ 11 and

12; (2) these words may contain a corruption, and conceal an allusion to the magical healing of some disease. Against the former alternative may be urged the improbability of the rare word *κατάθελξεις* being interpolated. We might have expected *κήλησις* (see the passages from Plato quoted above), especially as Lucian uses *κηλέω* several times—I have counted ten cases, as against eight of *θέλω* and its derivatives—and *κήλησις* occurs in *De Salt.* 72, not, it is true, in the sense of a physical fascination. Again, I would suggest—though I do so with some hesitation—that while *βουβώνων* *ιάσεις* instead of τῶν βουβώνων τὰς *ιάσεις* is a natural variation in a list of three items, the omission of the article would be hardly so likely to occur if only two diseases had been mentioned.

On the other hand, if the words τῶν ἐρπετῶν τὰς καταθέλξεις contain a corruption, it occurs to me that the right reading might be τῶν ἐρπήτων τὰς καταθέλξεις, the *allaying* (by a charm) of *herpes*. Of this disease more must be said later. A question may arise as to the use of *κατάθελξεις* with reference to the relief or cure of a disease. The word is found only here, and *θέλεις* in Plutarch and Aelian cited above (the only examples in the lexicons) means *charm*, *allurement*, of a pleasant sensation. Of the few examples of *καταθέλω*, as has been explained, only one (κ 213) implies a physical effect resulting from the action of the verb. Yet it seems natural enough that the notion of *bewitch*, *charm*, *beguile*, should pass into *quiet*, *soothe*, *heal*; and when we examine the more frequently occurring *θέλω*, evidence for this transition is not wanting, though it is scanty and has been overlooked by the lexicographers.

The usage of Lucian himself affords no example of *θέλω* in the sense of relieving pain or disease. The nearest approach to it is *De Salt.* 79, where there is a mediate comparison between the soothing influence of the sight of dancing and the effect of an opiate upon a mind tortured by passion. Among other authors especial attention is due to Eur. *Fr.* 725 (Nauck), from Plut. *De Aud.* 16 (p. 46 F): ὡς Εὐρυπιδῆς φησὶ, τὸ Τηλέφου τραῦμα

πριστοῖσι λόγχης θέλγεται ῥινήμασιν.

Marcellus of Side, a contemporary of Lucian, writing of the *σκάρος* in his fragmentary *Medicina ex Piscibus*, has the lines (55 f.):

τοῦ δριμεῖα χολὴ μέλιτος μέτα φάεα θέλγει,
ὁξὺν σέλας φορέουσα λιπανγέσιν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν.

Corroborative evidence may also be found

in the following examples of derivatives from θέλω. *Hymn. Hom.* 16. 4 (*ad Aescul.*) the god is called *κακῶν θελκτῆρ' ὀδυνάων*. *Eur. Or.* 211, ὦ φίλον ὕπνου θέλγητρον, ἐπίκουρον νόσου. *Hierogl.* 477 ff.:

νοσοῦσα δ' εἶ πως τὴν νόσον καταστρέφου.
εἰσὶν δ' ἐπωδαὶ καὶ λόγοι θελκτῆριον
φανήσεται τι τῆσδε φάρμακον νόσου.

Here the disease is love. Cf. also Aesch. *Choeph.* 666 πόνων θελκτῆριος | στρωμνῇ, and *Suppl.* 456 γένοιτο μύθου μῦθος ἂν θελκτῆριος, which L. and S. render *speech that heals speech*. The propinquity of *ιατρός* and *θέλξαν* in Pindar *Nem.* 4. 2f. is worthy of notice.

The analogy of two verbs of similar meaning, *κηλέω* and *πραῖνω*, may be regarded as confirming to some extent the application of *θέλω* to the soothing of pain or the healing of diseases. In the passage quoted above from the *Euthydemus*, the enchanter's art is called *θηρίων τε καὶ νόσων κήλησις*. In *Soph. Trach.* 1001 ff. the tortured Heracles cries

τίς γὰρ αἰοδός, τίς δ' χειροτέχνης
ιατορίας, ὃς τήνδ' ἄτην
χωρὶς Ζηνὸς κατακληθήσει;

Just before we have *τόδ' ἀκήλητον | μανίας ἄνθος*, where the scholiast has the note *ἀκήλητον· ἀνίατον, ἀκαταπραῖντον*. Cf. Aelian *N.A.* ii. 24, *σοφάτατος . . . κηλεῖν τε ὀδύνας καὶ ἀφανίζειν*. In *Soph. Phil.* 649 f. Philoctetes says:

φύλλον τί μοι πάρεστιν, ᾧ μάλιστ' αἰὲ
κοιμῶ τόδ' ἔλκος, ὥστε πραῖνεν πάνυ.

Cf. Galen xiii. p. 749 K., *τὴν ὀδύνην πρῶτον πραῖνομεν*. The interrelations of the verbs *θέλω*, *κηλέω*, and *πραῖνω*, and their compounds, are shown by the following glosses: Hesych. *κηλεῖ· πραῖνει, θέλγει. καταθελγόμενα· καταπραῖνόμενα*, Suidas: *κατακληλοῦσαν· θέλγουσαν, πραῖνουσαν. θέλω, καταθέλω, and κηλέω* are synonyms in Lucian *Indoct.* 12, where they are applied to the effect of music. Cf. also Alciphr. ii. 14 (Schepers' numbering), where Meineke's objection to *κατακληλήσασα* is ill founded.

The name of the disease *έρπης* survives in modern medicine, *herpes zoster* being the ailment commonly called *shingles*. The ancients, however, did not restrict the name to the eruptions now called by the generic name of *herpes*. Hippocrates speaks of *έρπητες ἐσθιόμενοι* (*Aphor.* 5. 22, *περὶ ὑγρῶν χρήσιος* 6), which are evidently corroding ulcers (cf. *Prorrheth. Secund.* 13, Galen ix. p. 273 K.). Other writers seem to have classed *herpes* and *erysipelas* (*ignis sacer*) together (Pliny

N.H. xxvi. 121, Celsus v. 28. 4, Marcel. *Emp.* xi. 29, xx. 12); and Galen's discrimination (xi. p. 74f. K.) perhaps points to a confusion in other authorities. The reason for the manifold application of the name *έρπης* lies in its meaning, 'the creeping disease.' The ancients did not lose sight of this etymology, a fact which goes far to remove any difficulty that may still be felt with regard to the use of *κατάθελξις*, originally *charming*, in the sense of *allaying, healing*. Certain diseases were viewed in an imagery derived from animal life. *έρπης* was also called *ὀφίτης* (Galen xix. p. 440 K.). The language used in describing the *φαγέδαινα* in *Eur. Fr.* 790, is such as might be applied to a devouring animal (cf. Aesch. *Fr.* 252). *θηρίον* and *θηρίωμα* are terms for malignant ulcers (see L. and S. s.vv.), and it seems possible that this meaning of *θηρίον* may have been felt in addition to its abusive significance in Dem. *Aristog.* 95. Cf. also *καρκίνος*, cancer.

One of my objections to the reading *έρπετων* might be raised against *έρπήτων* also—namely, that the answer of Tychiades takes no account of it. To this I should reply that the disregarding of one of three *homogeneous* items in the speech of Deinomachus is natural enough; the mention of all three would savour of preciseness. But the failure of the skeptic to notice an allusion to serpent-charming, if it really belongs in the speech of his antagonist, is not so easily explained. Besides it may be that *πυρετός* and *οἶδημα*, the two items mentioned by Tychiades, were so symptomatic of some disease classed with, or confused with *έρπης*, as to render the express mention of that disease superfluous. Fever and swelling accompany *erysipelas*.

The argument for *έρπήτων* would be strengthened, if it could be shown that this disease, like fevers, received special attention from magical practitioners. Direct proof of this is not at hand. There can be no doubt, however, that the *medicina anilis* had its prescription for every fleshly ill. There is a peculiar sentence, perhaps a gloss, in Pliny *N.H.* xxx. 116: *Herpes quoque animal a Graecis vocatur, quo praecipue sanantur quaecumque serpunt*. Of an animal *herpes* we hear nothing elsewhere; but the sentence may be a confused allusion to a sympathetic cure of *herpes*, or some other 'creeping' disease, by means of a creeping animal. It follows directly upon an account of the medicinal uses of snails. Several astonishing remedies for *ignis sacer*—under which, it should be remembered, Pliny and Celsus

include *herpes zoster*—are recorded in Pliny *N.H.* xxx. 106. Among them are earth-worms, crickets, a viper's head, a snake's slough. The significance of the choice of creeping things is not to be overlooked. The blood of tortoises was used for anointing *ignis sacer* according to *N.H.* xxxii. 41. Some such remedy, accompanied by an appropriate ἐπιψύξη, may have been meant by Lucian in our passage.

The negroes of the Southern States tell of a cure for shingles that is worthy of any of the superstitious sympathizers who gathered around the bed of Eucrates. The eruption must be rubbed with the blood of a perfectly black cat. If the animal has a single white hair, the treatment will fail.

CAMPBELL BONNER.

Peabody College for Teachers,
Nashville, Tenn.

ON THE USE OF THE ARTICLE WITH ORDINAL NUMERALS IN GREEK.

It is well known that the article is often omitted before the ordinal numeral in Greek, but none of the grammars gives the rule for its omission correctly. For example, Kühner-Gerth, i. § 465, 14 says: 'Ein mit einem Ordinalsworte verbundenes Substantiv kann sowohl ohne als mit dem Artikel stehen, je nachdem der Gegenstand entweder unbestimmt oder bestimmt werden soll.' The instances however show that the article is only omitted when the ordinal is used with words denoting time like *ἔτος*, *ἡμέρα*, *μῆν*, and with these it is almost invariably omitted unless a preposition is inserted. With other words the article is not omitted. The following instances are only from Thucydides, but the usage of other authors is the same. (1) In the following the article is omitted: i. 12 ἐξηκοστῷ ἔτει, 18 δεκάτῳ ἔτει; ii. 2 μηνὶ ἔκτῳ, 47 πρῶτον ἔτος, 103 τρίτον ἔτος; iii. 25 τέταρτον ἔτος, 88 πέμπτον ἔτος, 116 πενηκοστῷ ἔτει, 116 ἔκτον ἔτος; iv. 51 ἑβδομον ἔτος, 90 ἡμέρᾳ τρίτῃ, 101 ἐπτακαίδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 116 ὄγδοον ἔτος; v. 39 ἐνδέκατον ἔτος, 51

δωδέκατον ἔτος, 56 τρίτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος, 81 τέταρτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος, 83 πέμπτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος; vi. 4 ἔτει πέμπτῳ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ, 7 ἔκτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος, 8 ἡμέρᾳ πέμπτῃ, 59 ἔτει εἰκοστῷ; vii. 18 ὄγδοον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος, 75 τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ; viii. 6 ἐνὸς δέον εἰκοστὸν ἔτος, 24 τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 58 τρίτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει, 60 εἰκοστὸν ἔτος, 107 ἡμέρᾳ τετάρτῃ. (2) In the following the article is inserted: (a) without any apparent difference of meaning from those under (1). ii. 2 τῷ πέμπτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει, 70 τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος; v. 24 τοῦ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτους; (b) when a preposition is added: i. 87 ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει καὶ δεκάτῳ; vi. 59 ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ (ἔτει); (c) with words other than *ἔτος*, *ἡμέρα*, *μῆν*: ii. 59 μετὰ τὴν δευτέραν ἐσβολήν; iv. 31 τὸ πρῶτον φυλακτήριον; v. 20 τῷ πρώτῳ πολέμῳ τῷδε, 24 ὁ πρῶτος πόλεμος, 26 ξὺν τῷ πρώτῳ πολέμῳ, 55 ὡς τὸ τρίτον μέρος, 68 ἡ πρώτη τάξις; vi. 44 ἡ πρώτη παρασκευή; viii. 17 ἡ πρὸς βασιλέα ξυμμαχία ἡ πρώτη.

JOHN THOMPSON.

NOTE ON HORACE, ODES III. iv. 9, 10.

Me fabulosae Volture in Apulo
Nutricis extra limen Apuliae.

Such is the reading of most MSS., the only important variant among the older ones being the *limina Pullie* of the Berne MS. and Paris A¹. It is of course impossible that it can be right. Horace would not have used the same word at the end of two successive lines with different quantity, even supposing that he would have repeated the word at all. Of the various suggestions—*limina*

Pulliae, *limina sedulae*, *limina patriae*, *limina Dauniae*, etc., etc., I have always preferred *Dauniae*, the conjecture of Paldamus, adopted by Ritter in his edition, on the theory that *Apuliae* was a gloss to explain *Dauniae*, which it finally ousted, and so forced the change to *limen*, *metri gratia*. It was not, however, until I chanced to be reading the first and third books of the *Odes* simultaneously with two different classes that the reading became a certainty in my own mind. Take the familiar I. xxii.