PHOENIX OF COLOPHON FR. 5 DIEHL

(ap. Athen. XI, 495 D)

Θαλῆς γάρ, † ὅστις ¹) ἀστέρων ²) † ὀνήιστος καὶ τῶν τότ', ὡς λέγουσι, πολλὸν ³) ἀνθρώπων ἐὼν ⁴) ἄριστος, ἔλαβε πελλίδα χρυσῆν.

- (1) Either (a) őστις or (b) ἀστέρων plus ἐών must be corrupt. If (b) is the case, then Casaubon's ἀστέων (for the transmitted ἀστέρων) combined with Gulick's ἔην (for the transmitted ἐών) seems to be the most likely emendation.
- (2) However, I hate to sacrifice the transmitted ἀστέρων. For, after all, Thales was the first Greek astronomer. Cf. Diog. Laërt. I, 23: δοκεῖ δὲ (sc. Θαλῆς) κατά τινας πρῶτος ἀστρολογῆσαι... ὅθεν αὐτὸν καὶ Ξενοφάνης καὶ Ἡρόδοτος (I, 74, 2) θανμάζει, μαρτυρεῖ δ' αὐτῶι καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Δημόκριτος. Timon. fr. 23 Diels:

ο ἶόν θ' ἐπτὰ Θάλητα σοφῶν σοφὸν ἀστρονόμημα.

A.G. VII, 83 (both ap. D.L. I, 34):

τόνδε Θαλῆν Μίλητος 'Ιὰς θρέψασ' ἀνέδειξεν ἀστρολόγον πάντων πρεσβύτατον σοφίηι.

(Incidentally, the form $d\sigma\tau \epsilon \omega v$, for $d\sigma\tau \tilde{\omega} v$, does not seem to be established).

(3) Consequently, I would consider the trivial ὅστις as a corruption. So did Gerhard, but his reading ἵστωρ (for ὅστις) is not convincing palaeographically. Thus read:

Θαλης (δέ), γνώστης ἀστέρων ὀνήιστος

Γνώστης was misread by some scribe as γὰ ϱ ὅστις, that is all (cf. perhaps also πολλῶν A, for πολλὸν).