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](#)

A Few Notes on the Text of Marcus Aurelius

C. R. Haines

The Classical Review / Volume 28 / Issue 07 / November 2014, pp 219 - 221

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00007824, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00007824

How to cite this article:

C. R. Haines (1914). A Few Notes on the Text of Marcus Aurelius. The Classical Review, 28, pp 219-221 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00007824

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

εἶπεν, ἄξιον δὴ κ.τ.λ. Pro ὅθεν lege ὁ Θεών et verba εὖ γε ποιοῦντα a praecedentibus disjunge, quod Wyttenbach iam monuit.

C. 19, pag. 403F. Theopompus qui aequalibus comprobare vult, sua quoque aetate oracula numeris composita Pythiam edere παντάπασιν ὀλίγων χρησμών ὑπόρηκεν, ὡς τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τότε καταλογάδην ἐκφερομένων.

Pro τῶν ἄλλων, quod minus recte opponatur vocabulo ὀλίγων, recte restituit v. Herwerden, Plut. et Luc., pag. 15 τῶν πολλῶν.

C. 20, pag. 403F. Ἐνιοι (sc. χρησμοὶ) δὲ καὶ νῦν μετὰ μέτρων ἐκτρέχουσιν, ὧν ἕνεκα καὶ πρᾶγμα περιβόητον πεποίηκεν.

Pro verbis ὧν ἕνεκα καὶ Paton scripsit ὧν ἓνα ἢ κακία παράγουσα, ingeniosius, mea quidem sententia, quam verius; Wyttenbach conjecit ὧν ἓνα καὶ πρᾶγμα, quem Bernadacis secutus proposuit ὧν ἓνα καὶ τι πρᾶγμα. Mihi vero in KAKAI latere videtur KAINONTI, et noster scripsisse ὧν ἓνα καὶ τὸν τι πρᾶγμα, ut sensus sit: *e quibus unum (oraculum) res admodum nova notissimum reddidit*, quae sententia optime iis quae sequuntur convenit.

C. 27, pag. 407F. Ἴστε (Reiske, codd. εἰς) γὰρ τὸν Χίον . . . ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς ἡγεμόνας στολῶν ὅσοις ἔδει τεκμηρίους ἀνερεῖν τὴν . . . ἰδρυσιν ὧν ἔνιοι καὶ

διημάρτανον, ὥσπερ Βάττος. ἔλεξε γὰρ ἐκπεσεῖν οὐ καταλαβὼν ἐφ' ὃν ἐπέμφθη τόπον· εἶτα ἤκε δεύτερον πορνιῶμενος.

Vocabulum ἔλεξε corruptum esse nemo non vidit. Quod autem Reiske proposuit ἔδοξε, id, quamquam artis palaeographicae rationibus optime defenditur, minus tamen sententiae convenit, quod ipse vidit vir doctissimus, quippe qui ἐκπεσεῖν in ἐψεύσθαι vel ἐξηπατῆσθαι mutandum censuerit. Neque quae Paton conjecit mihi placet. Fortiore quadam medicina usus, lege ἑλπίδος γὰρ ἐξέπεσεν: *spe enim dejectus est*. Id certe optime congruit cum Batti casibus quibus in enarrandis Plutarchus maxima e parte Cyrenaeos secutus est, cf. Herod. iv. 154-157.

C. 29, pag. 408F. ἢ δὲ τῆς Πυθίας διάλεκτος . . . εὐθεῖα πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὔσα, πρὸς δὲ πίστιν ἐπισφαλῆς καὶ ὑπεύθυνος οὐδένα καθ' αὐτῆς ἐλεγχον ἄχρι νῦν παράδεδωκεν. Nil opus est Madvigii conjectura, *Adv. Crit.*, I. pag. 637, ἀνεπισφαλῆς. Sensus loci, quem supra laudavi, hic est: Pythiae sermo, etsi facile *fidem*, quam homines in eo ponunt, *amittere* potest, semperque rationi reddendae obnoxius est, nullam tamen usque ad hoc tempus facultatem sui accusandi dedit.

J. H. W. STRIJP.

Amersfoort, Holland.

A FEW NOTES ON THE TEXT OF MARCUS AURELIUS.

I. 5. It is not known whom Marcus meant by τροφέως. Possibly the name has dropped out. He is generally identified with the educator mentioned in Capit. Vit. Pii x. § 5: 'Cum Marcus mortuum educatorem suum fleret vocareturque ab aulicis ministris ab ostentatione pietatis, ipse dixerit, "Permittite," inquit, "illi ut homo sit; neque enim vel philosophia vel imperium tollit adfectus." If the identification is correct, the τροφεὺς of Marcus must have died about 139. But it has not been noticed that Aristides in his funeral oration over Alexander of Cotiaeum (Jebb § 148) says of him: γενόμενος τοίνυν ἐπ' ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμειος

τοσαύτης ὥστε καὶ τροφέως χώραν οὐχὶ διδασκάλου μόνον τῶν παίδων (i.e. Marcus and Lucius) ἔχειν. We know from Aristides that he was at Rome in 145 and residing at the Palace. But as he is the Alexander the Grammarian mentioned I. 10 it does not seem likely that he was meant by τροφέως.

III. 16, § 2 τὰ λοιπὰ κοινά. The word λοιπά comes awkwardly with λοιπὸν following so soon, and τοιαῦτα would seem a possible substitution. In the preceding lines certain persons are ambiguously referred to as 'disbelievers in Gods, traitors to their country and doers (of unnameable deeds) when the doors are shut.' Marcus sums them up in the curious

neuter τὰ εἰρημένα. The three stock charges against the Christians were that they were atheists, men without patriotism, and guilty of incest and cannibalism. It is impossible not to believe that they are referred to here. If so, the accepted view of the attitude of this Emperor towards the Christians must be revised, for he admits that such persons, as are alluded to, τὸν νοῦν ἡγέμονα ἔχουσι ἐπὶ τὰ φαινόμενα καθήκοντα. Compare again VII. 28, where he speaks of those 'who can live out their lives in the utmost peace of mind, even though all the world cry out against them what they choose, and the beasts tear them limb-meal.' He cannot be thinking of ordinary criminals, for the persons mentioned are obviously innocent people wrongfully ill-treated. Again VIII. 51, he quotes the indignant cry of whom but the Christians?—They kill us, they cut us limb from limb, they execrate us—adding: 'How does that prevent you from being pure, sane, sober, just?' But, we shall be told, in XI. 3, he distinctly mentions the Christians with disapproval. No doubt he is there glancing at the Christians, but nevertheless the words ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ must I think, be a gloss. They are quite ungrammatical, and have the precise form that a marginal note would take. Moreover the word παράταξις, persistently translated 'obstinacy,' according to the usage of Marcus and of Lucian¹ means 'opposition,' not 'obstinacy.' Very instructive is another passage, if, as I think quite possible, Marcus has the Christians in his eye: Μέμνησο ὅτι ἀκαταμάχητον γίνεται τὸ ἡγεμονικόν ὅταν εἰς ἑαυτὸ συστραφέν ἄρκεσθῇ ἑαυτῷ, μὴ ποιοῦν τι ὃ μὴ θέλει, κὰν ἀλόγως παρατάξῃται. Such opposition does not meet with his entire disapproval. In fact conduct such as that of the martyrs is exactly what Marcus is never tired of commending—not under any compulsion to transgress the demands of the ruling Reason, and if it be found impossible to act up to the standard of right set by the conscience owing to external things, then to depart cheerfully from life. This was a cardinal

doctrine of the Stoic creed. What Marcus does disapprove of is the Christian habit of rushing on death (as he deemed it) without due consideration or dignity and too theatrically. Another reason for thinking the word Χριστιανοὶ a gloss is that the term was a barbarism, and as such tabu with the literary purists, of whom Marcus was undoubtedly one. It is eschewed by Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Aristides, Galen, Apuleius, Dio Cassius and Philostratus, even where they are apparently speaking of Christians. Lucian uses the word in his *Alexander* and *Peregrinus*, if those pieces are by him.

IV. 3 § 3. τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν δοκούντων. This, the reading of the MSS., is corrected by Gataker to τῶν εὐφημεῖν δοκούντων. It is worth while suggesting τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν or τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν <εὐφημεῖν>.

IV. 33. Here, in the citation of Roman heroes, Δέντατος for Δεοννάτος (Wyse) has won wide acceptance. Why not also Οὐαλέριος for Οὐόλεσσος, seeing that Volesus was the Sabine ancestor of the Valerii?

V. 6 § 2. εὖ ποιήσας. The following ἕτερον suggests the possibility of ἔν having fallen out before εὖ, whereas in X. 8 § 3 ἔν γε τοῦτο would read better as εὖ γε τοῦτο.

V. 12 *ad fin.* χέση. A reference to the rather disgusting story in Diog. Laert. *Diog.* § 6 (repeated in *Arist.* § 4) might seem to suggest πτύση as a possible emendation for χέση.

V. 36. διὰ τοῦτ' οὖν. Perhaps διὰ τούτους gives more point to the taunt.

V. 36. ἐπεὶ τοι γίγνη. This passage is given up by Stich and Schenkl, and a satisfactory emendation seems hopeless. But ἔπειτα τί seems likely for ἐπεὶ τοι.

VI. 16 § 4. ἐπὶ τί (or τί P.) σπεύδουσιν. Couat has suggested τοῦτο, but τουτὶ accounts better for the MS. reading. I think this form is found once in Marcus, and has been introduced into the text of V. 3 by Radermacher, and of VIII. 44 by Leopold.

VII. 24. ὅταν πολλάκις ἐναποθνήσκειν ᾗ τὸ πρόσχημα. Schenkl abandons this passage as beyond cure. As an attempt to patch it up, I would suggest ὃ ὅταν

¹ Marcus III. 3; VIII. 48. Lucian *Quom. Histor.*, §§ 45, 49.

πολλάκις ἐνῇ, ἀποθνήσκει δὴ (ἤδη) τὸ πρόσχημα.

VIII. 31. εἶτα ἔπιθι τὰς ἄλλας. Schenkl would understand αὐλάς, and marks a lacuna, a favourite resource of his. Could τὸν ὅλης φυλῆς stand, with Lofft's μηκέθ' ἑνος to follow?

VIII. 41 *ad fin.* ἄπτεται, ὅταν γένηται σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μένει. Rendall suggests μονίη (cp. XII. 3), and there is justice in his objection to the pointlessness of the received reading; but the words make a senarius if we substitute σφαῖρα (cp. VIII. 20, XI. 12) for σφαῖρος, and μενεῖ for μένει will perhaps slightly improve the sense. To obviate the want of a connecting particle after ὅταν, a dash must be placed after ἄπτεται.

XI. 21. ἐνεργείας ἀπόληξις, ὁρμῆς, ὑπολήψεως παῦλα. Richards suggests the loss of a substantive after ὁρμῆς, and the symmetry of the sentence appears to require it. Would ἀπόληψις answer the purpose?

IX. 30 *ad fin.* τὸ σύμπαν. Is this not rather too sweeping a negative? If so, τοιοῦτον may be the true reading.

XI. 11. εἰ μὲν οὐκ. Read εἰ μὲν οὖν <μή>.

XI. 18 *ad fin.* ἀσθενοῦς (ἀσθενεῖ A). A comparison with XI. 9 would suggest ἀσθενές = 'a weak thing,' a 'weakness.'

XI. 20. πνευμάτιον. Why not πνευματικόν, as in IV. 4?

XI. 26. τῶν Ἐφεσίων. Schenkl does not admit Gataker's drastic emendation Ἐπικουρείων (cp. Sen. *Ep.* XI. 8). Could Ἐφέσιοι mean the followers of Heraclitus? Or would τοῦ Ἐφεσίου stand as a designation of that philosopher?

XI. 34. οὐδὲν δύσφημον, ἔφη, ἀλλά. For ἀλλά we might recall ὄνομα from Epictetus III. 24. 88.

XII. 2. καθαρμάτων. This word is out of keeping with ἀγγείων and φλοιῶν. Perhaps καλυμμάτων.

XII. 36. πέντε ἔτεσιν <ἢ τρισί>. The two last words are added by Reiske, but would not εἰκόσιν be more likely to fall out after ἔτεσιν?

C. R. HAINES.

Mazagon, Godalming.

SOME NOTES ON THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

Hymn to Apollo, 402.

τῶν δ' οὐτις κατὰ θυμὸν ἐπεφράσατο νοῆσαι.

SUCH is the reading of M. For οὐτις the whole of the remaining MSS. have ὅς τις, and for ἐπεφράσατο, D has ἐπεφράσσατο, the *x* family ἐπιφράσσατο, the *p* family ἐπιφράσσαιτο. Allen-Sikes adopt the readings ὅς τις . . . ἐπιφράσσαιτο, which 'can mean 'whoever thought to observe the dolphin.' The sense, however, is not very good: it is not obvious why Apollo (the dolphin) should resent inspection, though in view of the lacuna which probably follows this must not be pressed. But the reading of *p* looks like a correction of the metre rather than a genuine reading, and this suspicion is strengthened by the combined readings of M, D, and the rest of *x*. Is it not likely that, details apart, the indicative was read in the

common ancestor of our MSS.? Then, of course, correction is needed. I suggest that the original reading was, οὐ τις . . . ἐπεφράσαθ' ὥστε νοῆσαι, meaning, roughly: 'no thought occurred to anyone leading him to recognise (the dolphin as Apollo).' This seems at least better sense. The trouble probably arose in an uncial MS.

Hymn to Hermes, 41.

ἐνθ' ἀναπηλήσας γλυφάνφ πολιοῦο
σιδήρου
αἰῶν' ἐξετόρησεν.

ἀναπηλήσας seems to defy explanation successfully: it is retained in the Oxford text (= *cum convertisset*), but this rendering is probably a guess, since the sense of the participle (see Allen-Sikes' note) is so uncertain. Of the conjectures Barnes' ἀναπηδήσας is graphically the simplest, but is stultified by the previous