The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes on the Philostrati

H. Richards

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 3 / Issue 02 / April 1909, pp 104 - 109

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800018279, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800018279

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1909). Notes on the Philostrati. The Classical Quarterly, 3, pp 104-109

doi:10.1017/S0009838800018279

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES ON THE PHILOSTRATI.

FOR the following notes, which are mainly on the *Life of Apollonius*, I have taken Kayser's Teubner text (1870) as the foundation, and my references are to the Olearius paging in his margin.

2 ἐπήσκητο.

There is no reason for the pluperfect. The tense should be imperfect, ἐπῆσκειτο, like those before and after.

7 (end) προῖὼν δ' ἐς ἡλικίαν ἐν ᾗ γράμματα.

Some verb, e.g. ἐμάνθανε, seems missing in the relative clause.

9 Birds can be trained to say χαίρε etc. οὔτε εἰδότες ὅτι λέγουσιν οὔτε διακείμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

One would think that an adverb must have gone with διακείμενοι. It might be something significant, like φιλικῶς, or something slight and neutral, like πως, which would easily fall out before πρὸς.

10 ποιείται and ἀμπίσχεται ought, I think, to be imperfects. They have imperfects all about them, and such historical presents do not seem to occur in the text, or to be suitable.

17 αὐτόν γε μὴν τὸν χρόνον ἀγῆρω τε καὶ ἀθάνατον παρὰ τῆς μνημοσύνης εἶναι. Evidently παρὰ τὴν μνημοσύνην *by reason of memory*.

ibid. ἂν πρὸς ἄνδρα ἴδωσιν, ἐρυθριῶσι.

Not if they see a man, that is, any man; but only if he is a *vir pietate gravis*. Some adjective is missing, or perhaps disguised in πρὸς. πρεσβύτερον?

27 πάλαι γάρ σε ἠκούομεν.

Read ἀκούομεν.

54 Some points of physical science may perhaps be studied best on mountains, but neither Athos nor Olympus will help you in moral and theological questions, εἰ μὴ διορῶη αὐτὰ ἡ ψυχὴ, ἣν εἰ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀκήρατος αὐτῶν ἄπτοιτο πολλῶ μείζον ἔγωγ' ἂν φαίην ἄττειν τουτουὶ τοῦ Καυκάσου.

The general meaning must be that the mind will go further, higher, than any mountain. ἄττειν, used of rapid motion, the swiftness of thought, is no doubt right enough, though its implied application to the Caucasus rising into the air is a little strange. But ought not μείζον to be μάσσον, *further* or *higher*,

not *greater*? I have suggested a similar change in Xen. *Mem.* 4. 7. 10, and the confusion of *μᾶλλον*, *μᾶσσον*, and *μέγιστος*, *μήκιστος* occurs, I think, elsewhere.

66 (end) *ἔοικας . . . μεταγράφειν τὸ ἱαμβεῖον.*

Perhaps *μεταγράφειν*.

79 (end) *ἐπειδὴν ἐς τοῦ βασιλέως πίνωσιν.*

ἐν for *ἐς*?

81 *πόθεν οὕτως ἔχεις φωνῆς Ἑλλάδος;*

This may be right, but it looks as though an adverb governing the genitive, *e.g.* *ἐμπίρως*, was lost.

83 (end) *πλειόνων δὲ ἢ ἐγὼ ἄρχει καὶ εὐδαίμων ἢ χώρα παρὰ πολὺ τῆς ἐνταῦθα. εὐδαιμονεστέρα* or *εὐδαίμων* <*μᾶλλον*> is required. *παρὰ πολὺ* is only *by much*, and has not in itself any comparative force.

96 *οὐτ' <ἂν> νοσῆσαι . . . οὐτ' ἂν τρωθεῖς ἀλγῆσαι.*

104 *νομίζειν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἥθεσι.*

Read *ἔθεσι*. So in 172 we ought perhaps to read *ἀδικῶν περὶ τὰ ἔθη*, but that is less clear.

105 *εἶδον . . . οἰκοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ οὐκ ἐπ' αὐτῆς καὶ ἀτειχίστως τετειχισμένους καὶ οὐδὲν κεκτημένους ἢ τὰ πάντων.*

A remarkably clear case, though the editors strangely fail to see it, of *ἢ* substituted by confusion for *καί*. The contradictions must of course be carried on by *οὐδὲν κεκτημένους καὶ τὰ πάντων*. The same sentence, *εἶδον κ.τ.λ.* occurs with the same uncorrected blunder in 245. Yet in 106 we have the true sense and antithesis given in the phrase *τὸ δὲ μηδὲν κεκτημένους τὰ πάντων ἔχειν ὧδε ὁ Δάμης ἐξηγεῖται κ.τ.λ.* Through similar corruption and want of perception we have in 194 *τὸ τετμήσεσθαι τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἢ οὐ τετμήσεσθαι*, in spite of 163 *τὸ τὸν Ἰ. τετμήσεσθαι καὶ οὐ τετμήσεσθαι*, and of 162 *οὗτος ὁ ἀνχὴν τῆς γῆς τετμήσεται, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ*.

With these examples before us we need not hesitate much in reading *καὶ γάρ* for *ἢ γάρ* in 6.

110 *τίνα θαυμασιώτερον ἡγή τῶν ἐπὶ Τροίαν τε καὶ ὑπὲρ Τροίας ἐλθόντων; ἐγὼ, ἔφη, Ἀχιλλέα.*

We should read no doubt *τίνα θαυμασιώτατον*. In 241, on the contrary, *οὔτε ξυμβούλους ὑμᾶς βίον ποιησόμενος ἦκω . . . πρεσβυτάτος τε ὑμῶν . . . ἀφειγμένος αὐτὸς ἂν μᾶλλον εἰκότως ξυμβούλευον ὑμῖν*, it is equally clear that we need *πρεσβύτερος*.

111 *φάσμα . . . προϊόντας αὐτοὺς ἤλαυνεν ἐνταραττόμενον τῷ ὁμίλῳ.*

There is no meaning in *ἐνταραττόμενον*. *ἐνταττόμενον τῷ ὁμίλῳ* *appearing in the ranks*? In Plato *Laws* 797 E *ταχθέντα* is a variant for *ταραχθέντα*.

ibid. τὸ δὲ πορθεῖν πόλεις ὅστις εὐκλεέστερον ἡγείται τοῦ ἀνοικίξειν πόλιν οὐκ ἔστι.

It is difficult to believe that, according to the writer, no one (οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις) thought this. It has always been the idea of the mass of men. Is some predicate to οὐκ ἔστι lost? A dozen might be suggested.

115 καὶ λαμπρύνοντες αὐτοὺς ἐπαίνοις οἷσπερ τὰ ἀνδράποδα ξηλωτοὺς πέμπετε. Perhaps οἷσπερ, or <τοῖς αὐτοῖς> (lost after αὐτοὺς) ἐπαίνοις οἷσπερ.

116 οὓς ἐβουλόμην ἂν μᾶλλον λίμνην αὐτῷ περιβλύσαι <ποιῆσαι> νέκταρος? περιβλύω is intransitive.

118 (end) ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐς ἄνδρας ἐξαλλάττεις ἤδη (*are growing a man*), φειδόμεθα τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ εὐκόλων.

εὐκόλων is mere nonsense in this context. Probably εὐτελῶν. Menander has ἐγὼ δ' ἀνόητος εὐτελὴς ὑπερβολῇ (M. 4. 266: K. 3. 185).

119 (init.) ἐμοὶ δὴ, not δέ.

140 ἐφοίτων . . . ξένον τε αὐτὸν ἡγούμενοι καὶ βίου ξύμβουλον βωμῶν τε ἰδρύσεως καὶ ἀγαλμάτων. By a mistake which is found elsewhere (cf. a suggestion of mine on Herod. 6. 52) ἡγούμενοι has been written, I should say, for ποιούμενοι. Cf. 147 ἱατρὸν ποιούμενοι αὐτὸν τοῦ πάθους: 171 ξένον τε παρὰ τῷ Διὶ ἐποιοῦντο . . . βίου τε νομοθέτην: 178 ἡγεμόνας αὐτοὺς ποιεῖσθαι. The word ἡγούμενοι is even less appropriate to καὶ . . . ἀγαλμάτων than to ξένον.

142 ἀσωτίαν καὶ τρυφήν can hardly be predicates of ἐκείνον. An infinitive to govern them is missing.

145 He said a beautiful city was like the Zeus of Phidias; καθῆσθαι γὰρ αὐτὸ (the statue)—οὕτως τῷ δημιουργῷ ἔδοξε τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας ἐπὶ πάντα ἤκοντας μηδὲν ἀπεικέναι τοῦ Ὀμηρίου Διός, ὃς κ.τ.λ.

The point is the fixity and immobility of the one, the freedom and movement of the other. But οὕτως . . . ἔδοξε gives poor sense, and the words are hardly grammatical, for ἔδοξε should be δόξαι. Both faults are cured together, if we add ὡς after the last letters of οὕτως and read καθῆσθαι γὰρ οὕτως <ὡς> τῷ δημιουργῷ ἔδοξε.

146 (end) ἡ περὶ αὐτοῖς (not αὐτοῖς) εὐβουλία.

148 (end) τόν τε Φοῖνικα τροφέα καὶ ὀπαδὸν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τιμῶν ἐνόμιζεν.

Kayser τιμᾶν ἐνόμιζεν, which I have difficulty in translating. It is pretty clear that τιμῶν ὠνόμαζεν is what Philostratus wrote. The parts of νομίζω and ὀνομάζω are, it is well known, often confused.

163 (init.) Write δέ for τε after κομίζοιντο.

169 κρινεῖσθαι, not κρίνεσθαι.

171 ναὶ τῷ σιώ, ἔφη.

Is ἔφη for ἔφη τις (?) right?

189 δοκῶ μοι τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον ἐπεσκέφθαι τὸ ὄν.

μοι is meaningless here, and should perhaps be μέν. πιστοῦται δὲ κ.τ.λ. will then correspond to it. If, as appears to be the case, πιστοῦται is the writer's own addition (otherwise we should have πιστοῦσθαι and ἀπολείπειν), ξυμβαίνει must be read for ξυμβαίνειν.

193 Nero performing in Greece λεαίνων τὴν φωνὴν καὶ δεδιὼς τὸν Ἡλείον ἢ τὸν Δελφόν, ἢ μὴ δεδιὼς μέν, κακῶς δὲ οὕτως ὑποκρινόμενος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τέχνην ὡς μὴ μαστιγώσεσθαι νομίζειν πρὸς τούτων ὧν αὐτὸς ἄρχειν τέτακται.

(Cf. the picture in Suetonius *Nero* 24 *avidus et metuens ne ob delictum certamine summoveretur*.)

The words ὡς μὴ μ. ν. seem to give the very opposite sense to what we naturally look for, 'so badly as *not* to be scourged.' Can a ὅσον have dropped out, ὡς <ὅσον> μὴ μ. ν., 'so badly as just to escape a scourging'? I have also thought of μεμαστιγώσεσθαι, but the sense would be odd.

Immediately afterwards τοῖς δὲ Ἑλλήσι τίνα (=πότερον) ἡγή, ὦ Μένιππε; πότερα Ξέρξην καταπιμπράντα ἢ Νέρωνα ἄδοντα; seems to lack a predicative word or phrase to go with τίνα ἡγή, e.g. φοβερώτερον, or πλείω παρέχειν πράγματα.

197 A word or words also lost with τρεῖς Ῥωμαίων αὐτοκράτορες, which is again subject without predicate. So in 206 οὐ πάντες is incomplete.

198 ἔστι τι μυθολογία; Νῆ Δί', εἶπεν ὁ Μένιππος, ἣν γε οἱ ποιηταὶ ἐπαινοῦσι.

Perhaps ἐπασκοῦσι. Cf. 1 above and also 3 σοφίας ἦν . . . ἐπήσκησεν. ἐπαινοῦσι is senseless.

214 ὡς ὑπὸ γυναιῶν ἡττηθεὶς ἐπελάθετο <οὐ μόνον> τοῦ ἄρχειν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ξῆν?

216 (end) βελτίων ἂν ἦν should be β. ἂν ἦσθα.

241 ἐν Πυθαγόρου. Surely Πυθαγόρα, unless anything is omitted.

251 ἐπεὶ δὲ πιθανὸς ὑμῶν ἔδοξε τοῦμὸν διαβάλλειν ἦθος. πιθανῶς or διαβάλλων.

274 (end) 'ἐγὼ δέ . . . οὕτω ἔγνω οὐρανοῦ προγενεστέρους ἀστέρας,' διδάσκων ὅτι μὴδ' ἂν γένοιτό τι τοῦ ἐν ᾧ φύεται μὴ ὄντος. Read φύσεται.

ibid. καθιέντος ἐς αὐτοὺς ὑποψίας, ὑφ' ὧν διειστήκεσαν ἐκκλησιαζομένη πόλεις.

The last words, as they stand, are unintelligible. But the last letters of the verb suggest a remedy. Should it not run διειστήκεσαν <ὡς ἂν> ἐ. πόλεις?

287 (init.) ἐδίδαξαν ὑμᾶς ᾧδὴν Μοῦσαι μήπω ἐς δίκας ἢ διαβολὰς ὑπαχθεῖσαν. Read ὑπαχθείσαι.

288 ὁ μὴδέ should be ὁ μὴδέ.

310 αὐτοῦ τε γὰρ τοῦ σχήματος <ἐνεκα>? ἀπεβλέπετο . . . καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ ἦκειν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρῶν κινδυνεύοντα καὶ τοὺς βασκαίνοντας αὐτῷ πρότερον ἐπιτηδείους ἐποίει.

ἀνδρῶν can hardly be right. Either add something to it or read ἄλλων.

In Plut. *Mor.* 603 B ἄλλων is a mistake for the Homeric ἀνδρῶν.

323 Σωκράτην . . . ὅτε ἔφυγε τὴν γραφήν. Read ἔφευγε. ἔφυγε would mean *was acquitted*. So in *Heroicus* 660 read γραφὴν ἐκεῖ ἂν τις, οἶμαι, φεύγοι (not φύγοι) μὴ τρυφῶν.

324 ἤδη μέτρει, βασιλεῦ, ὕδωρ· εἰ γὰρ ξυγχωρήσεις αὐτῷ μῆκος λόγων, ἀπάγξει ἡμᾶς.

Cobet θέλξει for ἀπάγξει, but the words are very unlike. By the omission of one letter we can get ἀπάξει, which seems suitable enough: e.g. cf. Dem. 19. 242 εἰν ὑμᾶς ἀπαγάγη τῷ λόγῳ and τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀπαγαγὼν ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποθέσεως. In Plut. *Demetr.* 5 πορθεῖν Συρίαν καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἀπάγειν καὶ βιάζεσθαι. Madvig's ἀπάγχειν may be right.

328 ὥς μὴ τὸ εὐθὺ ἐχούσης. Rather ἐξούσης.

359 (end) ἀκροάσασθαι should be ἀκροάσεσθαι. So too 312 (end).

I add a very few notes on the other writings.

LIVES OF SOPHISTS.

479 πατέρας δὲ οὐ προσέγραψα, μὰ Δί', οὐ πάσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπ' εὐδοκίμων. Punctuate μὰ Δί' οὐ, πάσιν. Otherwise οὐ could not well be repeated.

ibid. οἶδα γὰρ δὴ καὶ Κριτίαν τὸν σοφιστὴν οὐκ ἐκ πατέρων <ἀρξάμενον>, ἀλλ' Ὀμήρου δὴ μόνον σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἐπιμνησθέντα?

500 καὶ οἱ τύραννοι δὲ αἰρετώτεροι τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἀνειμένοι μάλλον ἢ ξυντείνοντες· εἰ γὰρ ἀνήσουσιν, ἡττον μὲν ἀποκτενοῦσιν, ἡττον δὲ δράσονται τε καὶ ἀρπάσσονται.

δράσονται is a *vox nihili*. Perhaps it represents διασπάσσονται, ρ and ι being exchanged, as often, and the repetition of ασ leading to loss. But I am not quite sure that διασπᾶν gives a good meaning here, for its sense is not *plunder* but *rend in pieces, divide*, etc. If we could run the two futures into one and read διαρπάσσονται, we should get a quite appropriate word.

ἀνειμένοι ought, I think, to be ἀνιέμενοι, matching ξυντείνοντες. The two forms are often confused. Thus in Clem. Alex. *Paedagog.* 3. 11. 74 it should be ἀνειμένα (not ἀνιέμενα) τὰ τοῦ σώματος μέλη, to match the perfects καθειμένη etc. preceding.

576 (end) Ἑλλησπόντῳ γῆν ὀλίγην ἐπιβαλὼν ταύτην οἶε σοι μένειν.

Obviously μενεῖν.

580 (init.) ἀξιούντα κατηγορεῖν τοῦ μὲν Δημοσθένους Μηδισμοῦ, τοῦ δὲ Αἰσχίνου Φιλιππισμοῦ.

Read Μηδισμόν . . . Φιλιππισμόν. So in *Letter* 40 κατηγορεῖ δὲ καὶ γῆρας τοῦ προσώπου.

603 ἐκτῆσατο δὲ καὶ οἰκίας, δύο μὲν ἐν ἄστει, μίαν δὲ ἐν Πειραιεὶ καὶ ἄλλην Ἐλευσίνι.

Before the δ of δύο I suspect another δ=τέτταρας has been lost. So in 510 λόγοι δ' Αἰσχίνου κατ' ἐνίους μὲν καὶ τέταρτος it has been pointed out that we have to add a γ=τρεῖς (λόγοι δ' Αἰσχίνου γ' κατ' ἐνίους μὲν καὶ τέταρτος).

605 μὴ ἀπεῖναι τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοὺς θεραπεύοντας.

Read θεραπεύσοντας, comparing 703 ἔρημον τῶν θεραπευσόντων, 716 ὅτι μὴ πέπασαι τὸν θεραπεύσοντα, etc. The future is regular.

This makes the fifth correction of present to future in these few notes. No error is commoner.

HEROICVS.

662 Add ἄν to καὶ κάρνα δοῖν καὶ μῆλα δοῖν. Possibly καὶ κάρνα δ' ἄν καὶ μ. δ., for the repetition of δοῖν seems to lack point.

682 (end) περὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Πάριδος οὐδ' ἀκούειν ἀξιῶ οὐδέν . . . , περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἑκτορος . . . οὐκ ἂν ἐροίμην γέ τι οὐδ' ἂν ἀκούσαιμι χαίρων, εἰ μὴ διαπηδῶς ἀντὰ μῆδ' ἀμελῶς λέγοις.

εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ. is quite absurd. 'I should not care to listen, unless you went very fast and carelessly.' Of course we want the opposite, not *unless* but *if*. It would be awkward to double the μὴ (εἰ μὴ <μῆ> διαπηδῶς), and therefore <πλὴν> εἰ μὴ seems not unlikely, or εἰ μὴ <μήτε> . . . μήτε . . .

It is not a bad instance of the carelessness with which editors follow one another that both Kayser (1870) and Westermann (Didot 1878) give these words quite erroneously as a question. The mistake was probably made in some earlier text, which they reproduce.

705 (end) δίδωσιν ὑμῖν ξυμμάχους ἑκατὸν πόλεις καὶ ὡς τὴν Τροίαν ἐλεῖν παίζοντας. καί is unmeaning. It is sometimes confused with ὡς, and has perhaps here been repeated from it by accident: that is, one compendium has been interpreted twice over, once as καί and again as ὡς. The alternative is to suppose an omission, e.g. καὶ <τοιούτους> ὡς. Cf. a little below: τοιοῦτοί ἐσμεν . . . οἷοι Τροίαν μὲν ἐσπουδακότες λαβεῖν, Κρήτην δὲ παίζοντες.

722 τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ ἐν Ἰλίῳ νέον τὸν Ἑκτορα καὶ μειρακιώδη φέρει. Probably φαίνει. *Sexcenties in φέρειν et φαίνειν scribae turbant et titubant*, says Cobet (D. Hal. p. 112).

726 δεθῆναι δ' αὖ should probably be δεθῆναι δ' ἄν, though the mistake is oftener the other way, ἄν for αὖ. But cf. for instance Thuc. 6. 91. 2, where M has ὅμως δ' αὖ for ὅμως δ' ἄν.

In the remarks on epistolary style appended to the letters read at end of p. 364 ἵνα τούτῳ γοῦν ἡ βραχυλογία ὠραῖζοιτο ἐς ἄλλην ἡχὴν πᾶσαν (for πᾶσα) στενὴ οὐσα.