NOTES ON PLUTARCH’S MORALIA

De genio Socratis XIII, 582 D (p. 477. 12 Sieveking 1) . . . ἐδείκτηκεν ἢγούμενον μὲν τὸν Ἑπαμεινώνδαν καὶ συνεστῶτων φίλων Ἑσιμηνόδωρον καὶ Βακχυλίδαν καὶ Μέλισσον . . ., ἐπόμενον δὲ τὸν ἕξον.

Συνεστῶτων 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 ἢγούμενον μὲν: ἐπόμενον δὲ. 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 ἢγούμενον. Changing συνεστῶτων into a qualifying adjective 3) 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 συνεστῶτων. Planudes 4) (or his Vorlage) failed to decipher two letters in a copy written with no indication of the division of words (ΕΣΣ 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 σήμεια 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 ΣΠΙ: hence the mistake of the Byzantine editor. Cf.

2) And is συνεστῶς at all capable of this meaning?
3) Such as συνηθεστῶτων, 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: οὐχ ἄναρ μόνον οὔδε διὰ συμβόλων, ἀλλὰ φανερῶς.

De defectu oraculorum II, 410 A (p. 60. 10 Siev.) read ἄνηρ φιλοθεάμων ᾗν καὶ φιλομαθῆς οὕσιν δ’ ἔχων κτλ.

The particle δ’ necessitates punctuation before οὕσιαν. 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 ἐκαστὸν ἡμῶν προσαγορεῖται τῷ (τῷ MSS.) ‘γνώθι σαυτόν’.

I do not think that προσαγορεῖται 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 Lunae 6) 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 ... ὅρηλων ἔστι πλῆρες ὕδατι χρωμένων διαπερ ὑμεῖς ἄφρ.

Read ... ὥσπερ ὑμεῖς ἄφρ. The neuter διαπερ is impossible: ‘we’ are not all ὅρηία. ὑμεῖς, I suppose, is but a misprint in Bernardakis 7).

Ib. XXVIII, 942 F (p. 464. 22) ‘Τίς δ’ οὕτος ἐστιν’; ἐφην’ δ’ ἔστιν Σύλλα, µὴ κτλ.

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

Ib. XXIX, 944 C (p. 469. 10). The part of the Moon that lies towards heaven is called Ἡλύσιον πεδίον, τὰ δ’ ἐν ταὐτόν Φερσεφόνης οὐκ ἀντίχθόνος.

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 Φερσεφόνη ἀντίχθων; 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 Φερσεφόνης οὕδος ἀντίχθόνος 8), ‘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 ἐν τῇ θαύμῳ: should we read τὰ δὰ ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὰ ἔντα (cf. τὰ πρὸς γῆν two lines above)?

Ib. XXX, 944 E (p. 470. 5) . . . ἐρωτεύτω τῆς περὶ 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 ἐνδός> after εἰκόνος? Or, perhaps, <τοῦ νοητοῦ>, or <τάγαθου>?

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

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, Πυθών became Τυφών under the spell of Τιτων καὶ Τυφώνες (!) preceding and τυφώ following. It is an elementary school-example of manuscript corruption.

Amatorius XXI, 767 E (p. 385. 20 Hubert)¹²) • • • οἱ τοῖς σωμασιν ὄριζομενοι τὰς ψυχὰς βίας συνάγουσι καὶ συνήχουσι.

Read οἱ τ. σ. ἐνιζόμενοι τ. ψ. βιαῖως συνάγουσι κατο. For ἐνιζομενοι cf. XXIV, 770 A (p. 391. 17) on the ἐνότης effected by Eros. EN easily became OP:Ε and O are constantly interchanged; nor was it difficult to mistake a Ρ (with open head) for Ν (with the second and third stroke half size). — Βία implies resistance; here however the notion ‘powerfully’ is required. The conjecture βιαῖως 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 Φερασφόνης ἀντιχθόνων (neglecting οὐκ). Reading Φ. ὑπόδος, and comparing Simplicius (ib. 184 n. 2), perhaps ἀντιχθόνων could be held: ‘of P. (as being) the counter-Earth’.

⁹) La démonologie de Plutarque, 1942, 181.

¹⁰) As Soury puts it (l. 1. 209): ‘Et un critique, K., irait jusqu’à substituer Πυθών au Tυφών des mss. ’— Voilà!

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

¹²) In vol. IV of the Teubner edition (1938).
Determining the precise pronunciation of the initial phonemes of the first syllable of "nepos" is challenging. Thereafter, the loss of one single letter could produce the reading of EB: BIAI[Ω]ΣYNÆI.

Ib. XXIII, 769 B (p. 389.11) ἀνανεοσθαι τὸν γάμον ἐκ τῶν ἐκάστοτε συλλεγομένων σχημάτων.

Read ... ἀμαρτημάτων, comparing 769 Ε (p. 391.1): Eros ἀμαρτημάτων ἀπαλλάττει ... τὸν γάμον 13).
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ZU ZWEI OSKISCHEN INSCHRIFTEN


I.


χλοφατογαυκίεσσας [- - δ]:
ομοιομετεώπηε
δνλωσις, αφικείτ
ωντι . θατοθεκλο
5 Φατησισπλαμετοδ 1)

13) Two lines below punctuate τι δ'. οδχι πλεόνα (as e. g. in Apoth. Lac. 219 B, p. 145. 1 Nachstedt). Perhaps <τά> should be added after πλεόνα, to prevent τῶν παιδῶν being mistaken for genit. partit.

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