

NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S MORALIA

De genio Socratis XIII, 582 D (p. 477. 12 Sieveking¹)) . . .
 ἐωρῶμεν ἡγούμενον μὲν τὸν Ἐπαμεινώνδαν καὶ συνεστώτων
 φίλων Ἴσμηγόδωρον καὶ Βακχυλίδαν καὶ Μέλισσον . . ., ἐπόμενον
 δὲ τὸν ξένον.

Συνεστώτων is corrupt: the entry of new people being described, part of them cannot possibly be said to be 'standing together'²). Materially the point of this sentence is the introduction of two outstanding persons: Epameinondas and Theanor; it is underlined by the contrasting ἡγούμενον μὲν: ἐπόμενον δέ. The three other men form the retinue of Epameinondas; their names, then, ought not to appear on a level with his, nor can they syntactically be related to the singular participle ἡγούμενον. Changing συνεστώτων into a qualifying adjective³) will not remove the hitch; moreover any such conjecture would necessitate the addition of the article before it. Some link is required which would connect the 'friends' with Epameinondas and, at the same time, subordinate them to this leading figure. Read σὺν αὐτῷ τῶν for συνεστώτων. Planudes⁴) (or his Vorlage) failed to decipher two letters in a copy written with no indication of the division of words (ΕΣ for ΑΥ); in consequence he misinterpreted the whole group of letters.

Ib. XXIV, 593 D (p. 500. 11). As kings and generals make their will known at large by signals, but tell their friends personally, οὕτω τὸ θεῖον ὀλίγοις ἐντυγχάνει δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ σπανίως, τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς σημεῖα δίδωσιν.

Σπανίως is wrong. It suggests an inappropriate antithesis ('rarely' to friends — but frequently to the many?), which obscures the real one between 'personal'⁵) and indirect communication; the assertion that the former occurs 'rarely' is beside the point. Read ἐμφανῶς for σπανίως. Uncial EM was easily misread ΣΠ: hence the mistake of the Byzantine editor. Cf.

1) In vol. III of the Teubner edition, 1929.

2) And is συνεστώς at all capable of this meaning?

3) Such as συνηθεστάτων, suggested by Wilamowitz.

4) De genio is one of the many writings of Plutarch the preservation of which is exclusively due to Planudes.

5) For this connotation of δι' αὐτοῦ cf. my Schweich Lectures on The Text of the Epistles, 1953, 44 ff.

De facie . . . XXVI, 941 F (p. 461. 20 Bern.), where a similar idea is expressed with similar words: οὐκ ὄναρ μόνον οὐδὲ δια συμβόλων, ἀλλὰ φανερώς.

De defectu oraculorum II, 410 A (p. 60. 10 Siev.) read ἀνήρ φιλοθεάμων <ὦν> καὶ φιλομαθῆς· οὐσίαν δ' ἔχων κτλ.

The particle δ' necessitates punctuation before οὐσίαν. The syntactical need for the added participle is underlined by the many analogous participles in the preceding and following clauses.

De E apud Delphos XVII, 392 A (p. 18. 18 Siev.) δ . . . θεὸς ἕκαστον ἡμῶν προσαγορεύει τῷ (τὸ MSS.) 'γνώθι σαυτόν'.

I do not think that προσαγορεύω could be used with the double accusative to convey the meaning 'to address someone with a word' or 'to address a word to someone'. Τὸ for τῷ recurs a few lines later (392 B, p. 19. 3) in one family of MSS.

De facie in orbe Lunae⁶) XXV, 940 E (p. 458. 11 Bern.). If we did not know the sea but by hearsay and inaccurately, we would be incredulous if someone told us that . . . θηρίων ἐστὶ πλήρης ὕδατι χρωμένων ὄσα περ ὑμεῖς ἀέρι.

Read . . . ὡσπερ ἡμεῖς ἀέρι. The neutre ὄσα περ is impossible: 'we' are not all θηρία. Ὑμεῖς, I suppose, is but a misprint in Bernardakis⁷)?

Ib. XXVIII, 942 F (p. 464. 22) 'Τίς δ' οὐτός ἐστιν'; <ἔφην· ὁ δ'·> ὦ Σύλλα, μὴ κτλ.

Ib. XXVIII, 943 D (p. 466. 22) τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ ἀλογον καὶ [τὸ] παθητικόν; cf. De def. or. XIII, 417 B (p. 75. 23 Siev.) τοῦ παθητικοῦ καὶ ἀλόγου.

Ib. XXIX, 944 C (p. 469. 10). The part of the Moon that lies towards heaven is called Ἡλύσιον πεδίον, τὰ δ' ἐνταῦθα Φερσεφώνης οὐκ ἀντίχθονος.

Bernardakis, following Wyttenbach, deletes οὐκ; but whence did it come? And how is one to construe the genitives? They would form a strange parallel with Ἡλύσιον, if πεδίον were to be understood. What is more, one does not easily imagine a Φερσεφώνη ἀντίχθον; Persephone being the goddess of the Moon — that is, evidently, the Moon as a whole; while 'opposite the Earth' applies to a part of it. I suggest reading Φερσεφώνης οὐδος ἀντιχθόνιος⁸), 'the threshold opposite the

6) For this writing I had to rely exclusively on Bernardakis. I apologize in advance if, in consequence, any of the following suggestions should prove to have been anticipated by others.

7) As is, evidently, his λαλεῖν for καλεῖν p. 460.5.

Earth'. Homer (Θ 15) could suggest this detail of eschatological geography like so many others. Finally, 'towards the Earth' is very imperfectly indicated by ἐνταῦθα: should we read τὰ δὲ <πρὸς τὰ> ἐντ. (cf. τὰ πρὸς γῆν two lines above)?

Ib. XXX, 944 E (p. 470. 5) . . . ἔρωτι τῆς περι τὸν ἥλιον εἰκόνοσ.

G. Soury⁹⁾ feels able to translate 'par l'amour ardent de l'image du soleil'; which is beyond me. 'The image, around the sun', — of what? Ought we to add <τοῦ ἑνός> after εἰκόνοσ? Or, perhaps, <τοῦ νοητοῦ>, or <τάγαθοῦ>?

Ib. XXX, 945 B (p. 471. 25) Τυφών: read Πύθων.

This conjecture was anticipated by Kaltwasser¹⁰⁾; quite probably it has occurred to dozens of other, moderately attentive readers. I would have refrained from mentioning it here, were it not that Bernardakis failed to receive it into his text and that he was followed even by K. Reinhardt¹¹⁾ (whose attention evidently was, at the time, absorbed by very different problems). Typho can be charged with many a bad deed, but he is innocent of an attack on the Delphic sanctuary: that was left to the dragon Python. In our Plutarch text, Πύθων became Τυφών under the spell of Τιτωι και Τυφῶνες (!) preceding and τύφφ following. It is an elementary school-example of manuscript corruption.

Amatorius XXI, 767 E (p. 385. 20 Hubert)¹²⁾ . . . οἱ τοῖς σώμασιν ὀριζόμενοι τὰς ψυχὰς βίᾳ συνάγουσι και συντήκουσι.

Read οἱ τ. σ. ἐνιζόμενοι τ. ψ. βιαιῶσ συνάγουσι κτλ. For ἐνιζόμενοι cf. XXIV, 770 A (p. 391. 17) on the ἐνότης effected by Eros. EN easily became OP:E and O are constantly interchanged; nor was it difficult to mistake a P (with open head) for N (with the second and third stroke half size). — Βίᾳ implies resistance; here however the notion 'powerfully' is required. The conjecture βιαιῶσ will appear simple when it is remembered that 'silent iota' was written, if at all, as 'iota

8) The adjective is not recorded; but cf. χθόνιος, ἐπιχθόνιος, ὑποχθόνιος. Cumont's interpretation of this passage (*Le symbolisme funéraire*, 1942, 187) would require reading Φερσφόνης ἀντιχθων (neglecting οὐκ). Reading Φ. οὐδος, and comparing Simplicius (ib. 184 n. 2), perhaps ἀντιχθονος could be held: 'of P. (as being) the counter-Earth'.

9) La démonologie de Plutarque, 1942, 181.

10) As Soury puts it (l. l. 209): 'Et un critique, K., irait jusqu' à substituer Πύθων au Τυφών des mss.' — Voilà!

11) Kosmos und Sympathie, 1926, p. 326 n. 2.

12) In vol. IV of the Teubner edition (1938).

adscriptum' and that double σ is very often simplified. Thereafter the loss of one single letter could produce the reading of EB: BIAI[Ω]ΣΥΝΑΓ.

Ib. XXIII, 769 B (p. 389. 11) ἀνανεοῦσθαι τὸν γάμον ἐκ τῶν ἐκάστοτε συλλεγομένων σχημάτων.

Read . . . ἀμαρτημάτων, comparing 769 E (p. 391. 1): Eros ἀμαρτημάτων ἀπαλλάττει . . . τὸν γάμον¹³).

Manchester

G. Zuntz

ZU ZWEI OSKISCHEN INSCRIFTEN

Die Lektüre des ersten Bandes von E. Vettors Handbuch der italischen Dialekte — einem hochwichtigen Werk, das v. Plantas Buch erneuert und ersetzt, wie es vom ehrwürdigen Altmeister zu erwarten war — hat meine Aufmerksamkeit auf zwei oskische Inschriften in griechischer Schrift gelenkt, deren eine erst kürzlich als oskisch erkannt worden ist. Die Ergebnisse meiner Beschäftigung mit diesen Inschriften, deren Verständnis mir vielleicht gelungen ist zu erschließen, erlaube ich mir im Folgenden den Mitforschern zu unterbreiten.

I.

Die zuerst von Di Cicco in Notizie degli Scavi 1898, S. 219 veröffentlichte oskische Inschrift in griechischen Buchstaben aus Civita bzw. Rocchetta zwischen Tricarico und Albana di Lucania lautet in Vettors letzter Ausgabe (Handbuch der ital. Dialekte, Nr. 183):

κλοφατογαυκιεσσακ [- - δ]:
 οφοιμετσεδπεηε
 δφλουσοι . αφκειτ
 αυτι . φατοφεκλο
 5 φατησπλαμετοδ¹⁾

13) Two lines below punctuate $\tau\acute{\iota}\delta'$ οὐχι πλειονα (as e. g. in Apophth. Lac. 219 B, p. 145. 1 Nachstedt). Perhaps <τὰ> should be added after πλειονα, to prevent τῶν παιδικῶν being mistaken for genit. partit.

1) f ist durch ς bezeichnet, wie in der Defixio aus Tiriolo, ob. XCV, S. 289.