

## LEXICAL AND EXPLANATORY NOTES ON DIO CHRYSOSTOM

This article draws its origin from two relevant articles by Gilbert Highet published in GRBS 15 and 17 (1974 and 1976) and may be seen as a supplement to them. It contains lexical and some explanatory notes on certain passages of Dio Chrysostom, as well as additions to LSJ – whose recent Revised Supplement has not really paid more attention to Dio than this Lexicon had paid to him in the first instance (cf. Highet, GRBS 15 [1974] 247 init.). Most of the material comes from Dio's Seventh Discourse, with which I have dealt extensively in my unpublished Ph.D thesis (A Commentary on the Seventh Discourse of Dio Chrysostomos, London 1981). For the present paper I have also made use of the TLG (Version E), so as to find out whether a particular phrase or syntax appears first in Dio or occurs in other authors as well, contemporary with him or earlier.

For the convenience of readers with lexicographical interests I have arranged the material alphabetically, following Highet's practice. Some of my notes, however, are not restricted to lexicographical matters, but contain also explanatory and interpretative remarks on the relevant passages of Dio, which seemed necessary for the proper interpretation of those passages or pertinent enough to include.

ἄκλειστος:

7.140: ὅπως ὑμῖν μὴ τὰ φανερὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἄκλειστα οἰκήματα τὰς κεκλεισμένας οἰκίας καὶ τοὺς ἔνδοθεν θαλάμους ἀναπετάση: ἄκλειστα οἰκήματα means here 'houses open to everyone', in contrast to κεκλεισμένας οἰκίας, i. e. respectable houses, where admittance is always under strict control and presumably only allowed to decent persons who have been invited (so also ἔνδοθεν θαλάμους, 'the women's apartments, the inner part of the house' [LSJ], s. v. θάλαμος I. 1.), which are not seen by anybody, is contrasted to φανερὰ οἰκήματα, which are conspicuous to everyone). Such a

nuance is missing from LSJ, s. v. ἄκλειστος, which renders merely ‘not closed or fastened’, without citing Dio. A reference to Dio’s passage should be added, along with an explanation of its particular meaning: ‘not closed to admittance, allowing unrestricted admittance (for a brothel), D. Chr. 7.140’.

ἀναλαμβάνω:

7.56 (fin.): ἕως ἀνέλαβον (sc. ἡμᾶς) ἀπεψυγμένους: “until they made us regain our strength (they made us recover / revive), as we had grown very cold (chilled)”. Dio’s passage clearly requires a construction of ἀναλαμβάνω c. acc. pers. (trans.). In LSJ, s. v. ἀναλαμβάνω, II. 3., we find this construction of the verb, but only as ‘ἀ. ἐαυτὸν recover oneself, regain strength’, with examples from Thucydides, Plato Comicus, and Menander. It is perhaps Dio who first makes use of the properly transitive, non-reflexive construction (7.56), and accordingly a reference to him should be made in LSJ, l. c. The TLG too gives no examples earlier to the one of Dio.

ἀναπετάννυμι:

7.140: ἀναπετάση (see on ἄκλειστος above): the only relevant example in LSJ, s. v. ἀναπετάννυμι, is τὰς πύλας ‘throw wide the gates’ (Hdt. 3.146, cf. Xen. An. 7.1.17); perhaps a reference to D. Chr. 7.140 might be added: ‘open wide, οἰκίας, θαλάμους’.

ἀπλῶς:

7.148: οὕτως ἀπλῶς ἔχη: LSJ, s. v. ἀπλῶς, II. 4. give, felicitously: ‘in bad sense, loosely, superficially, ... lightly’ or, perhaps, in D. Chr. 7.148, ‘negligently’. D. A. Russell<sup>1</sup> actually prints Reiske’s ἀμελῶς, to convey precisely the latter meaning<sup>2</sup>; but ἀπλῶς ‘in bad sense’ can probably cover such nuances (cf. E. IA 899 κούχ ἀπλῶς οὕτω φέρω, ‘I do not treat this lightly’, i. e. ‘I am serious about it, I do not neglect its importance’) and emendation seems unnecessary. Note that H. von Arnim (1893), G. de Budé (Teubner 1916) and J. W. Cohoon (Loeb 1932) all print ἀπλῶς (MSS.).

1) Dio Chrysostom: Orations VII, XII and XXXVI, Cambridge 1992.

2) Other conjectures: σαπρῶς (possit ἀθλίως vel ἄβρωῶς) Emperius, in his app. crit.

ἀργός:

7.33: τὴν ἀργὴν τῆς χώρας: LSJ, s. v. ἀργός (B), 2. a. ‘of land’: after the mention of Thphr. (HP), add ‘opp. γ. ἐνεργός, D. Chr. 7.33, v. ib. 35’; cf. also below, on ἐνεργός (7.35).

βλέπω:

7.70: καὶ μειδιάσας ἔβλεψεν εἰς τὸν νεανίσκον: in LSJ there is no example of βλέπω εἷς τινα in this sense ‘look at, cast one’s eyes over someone’ but only βλέπω εἷς τι (s. v. βλέπω, II. 1.) with an early example from A. Pers. 802. Is it as late as in Dio that βλέπω εἰς c. acc. pers. appears in the above sense<sup>3</sup>? Anyhow, βλέπω πρὸς c. acc. pers., in the very sense ‘look at someone’, appears as early as Plato (Prt. 328d). A reference to Plato and to D. Chr. should be added in LSJ, l. c.: cf. a similar case below, on ἐμβλέπω (7.30).

βοάω:

7.24: LSJ, s. v. βοάω, I. 1. ‘of acclamations’. Before the other (later) examples, a mention of D. Chr. 7.24 should be added.

δίδωμι:

7.68: ἀλλ’ ἐκείνη ... πάλαι πρὸς ἄνδρα ἐδόθη: δίδωμι with πρὸς c. acc. pers. does not appear in LSJ, which records (s. v. δίδωμι, II. 2.) only the standard classical construction with dat. pers. A reference to this unusual and postclassical construction with a prepositional phrase<sup>4</sup> and to Dio’s passage should be added in LSJ, l. c.: ‘of parents, give their daughter to wife’.

δίχα:

7.106 (init.): δίχα δὲ ὕδατος: ‘and except for water’: LSJ, s. v. δίχα, II. 4. give two references to Aeschylus only, and one might think that this use is an early poetical one or perhaps confined to Aeschylus. A reference to D. Chr. 7.106 should be added.

3) The cases listed in LSJ, s. v. βλέπω, II. 2. (where βλέπω εἷς τινα = ‘look to, rely on’) are different.

4) Cf. Russell (n. 1, above) 128 (on §68): ‘unusual’; W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus des Dio Chrysostomos*, in: *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, I, Stuttgart 1887 (Hildesheim 1964) 168: ‘ungewöhnlich und spät’. δίδωμι εἷς τι (from Macho, 3rd c. BC), added in the LSJ Supplement (cf. the Revised Suppl.), is a different case.

ἔδραιότης:

7.110: ὅσαί μιν (viz. τῶν συμπασῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐργασιῶν καὶ τεχνῶν – cf. §109) σώματι βλαβεραὶ ... δι' ἀργίαν τε καὶ ἔδραιότητα: LSJ, s. v. ἔδραιότης, II., refer to Dio's passage, but their rendering ('sedentary occupation') is not exact: ἔδραιότης (an abstract substantive) describes a quality of the occupations in question, not the occupations themselves. Russell's 'sedentariness' (o. c. [n.1, above], 141 [on §110]) is the mot juste.

ἐμβλέπω:

7.30: καὶ δεινὸν ἐμβλέψας εἰς ἐμέ: the construction of this verb c. εἰς and acc. pers. does not appear in LSJ, s. v. ἐμβλέπω. However, apart from D. Chr. 7.30, this construction occurs already much earlier in Plat. Euthd. 275d ἐνέβλεψεν εἰς ἐμέ. See also above, on βλέπω (7.70).

ἐνεργός:

7.35: s. v. ἐνεργός, II. 'of land, productive, opp. ἀργός' is given in LSJ with two examples from Xenophon, and one from Plutarch (in the Comparative). Dio's χώρα οἰκουμένη καὶ ἐνεργός (7.35; contrast οἱ τὴν ἀργὴν τῆς χώρας ἐργαζόμενοι ib. 33) is a very good example from an exact contemporary of Plutarch.

εὐθύς:

7.69: καὶ ἀπεδώκαμεν αὐτοῖς εὐθύς τῆς θερείας: "straightway (or: forthwith) with the harvest, immediately on reaping". The use of εὐθύς (as adv.) c. gen. to denote time does not appear in LSJ, s. v. εὐθύς, B.II.1. Note that this is not the same as the construction 'with a part.' (ibid. below), as e. g. in τοῦ θέρους εὐθύς ἀρχομένου (Th. 2.47.1) or παραχρῆμα τῶν λόγων εἰρημένων καὶ εὐθύς τοῦ ψηφίσματος ἐπαναγιγνωσκομένου (D. 7.19). A parallel to this use of εὐθύς c. gen. is παραχρῆμα c. gen., see LSJ, s. v. παραχρῆμα, 2. 'in later writers', where the first example mentioned comes from Dio, 'π. τῆς εὐεργεσίας D. Chr. 11.130', add 'π. τῶν ἔργων ib. 145 fin.'. Thus, 'εὐθύς τῆς θερείας (adv. c. gen., D. Chr. 7.69)' should be added in LSJ, l. c. Note that the first known use of εὐθύς c. gen. appears in Dio, just like the first known use of παραχρῆμα c. gen.: is that a coincidence, or was actually Dio the first to use both adverbs with the genitive in a similar sense?

καταψάω:

7.75: καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν, καταψήσασα φύλλοις ἀπὸ τῶν κρεῶν: the meaning of καταψάω (τὴν τράπεζαν) is here ‘wipe off, clean out, clear, empty it (Lat. *detergo mensam*)’. This meaning should be added in LSJ, s. v. καταψάω, 3., with a reference to Dio 7.75; ‘scrape down, τοὺς τοίχους’ (the closest example, LSJ, l. c.) bears too strong a meaning for this passage of Dio.

μακάριος:

7.11: ἀνδρὸς μακαρίου: ‘rich, wealthy’. LSJ s. v. μακάριος, I. 2. give the more general rendering ‘prosperous’, but here μακαρίου is used in opposition to πένητες immediately above, and a more particular meaning is required; so also in §107 and §145. Of the examples listed in LSJ, I. 2. only Arist. EN 1157b21 ‘οἱ μακάριοι opp. οἱ ἐνδεεῖς’ comes somewhat close to the nuance of the word in Dio, which may be added to the LSJ lemma, I. 2.: ‘opp. πένης, wealthy, rich, D. Chr. 7.11, ib. 107, 145, cf. Arist. *supra*’. I have not found examples of this nuance outside Dio’s *Seventh Discourse*: elsewhere in Dio (1.30, 3.128, 4.130) the word is used in its original sense ‘blessed, fortunate’.

μεταχειρίζομαι:

7.111: ἄν τι μεταχειρίζεται τοιοῦτον, sc. ἔργον, cf. §110 πᾶν ἔργον, a collective term which includes the ἐργασίαι καὶ τέχνηαι of §109. Thus in LSJ, s. v. μεταχειρίζομαι 4., besides ‘an art, study’ (which clearly refer to the fine arts and liberal studies, to judge from the examples given), ‘a task, a job’ may be added.

μοχθηρός:

7.137: οὔποτε φιλεῖ τὰ μοχθηρὰ μένειν ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς: LSJ, s. v. μοχθηρός, II. give ‘knavish, rascally’ which is rather weak for this case; a stronger word like ‘vicious, wicked’ (cf. Lat. *pravus, depravatus*) is clearly needed for D. Chr. 7.137 (where τὰ μοχθηρὰ is used as an abstract substantive, ‘vices’, ‘wickedness’).

οίστράω:

7.134: οἰστρῶντας καὶ ἀκολάστους ἀνθρώπους: LSJ, s. v. οἰστράω, I. (fin.) comment ‘of sexual passion’ and give examples from Iamb., Ael., and Luc., but certainly Dio’s example (7.134) is earlier than those mentioned; in any case, it would seem that this use of the verb appears in Hellenistic times (with Theoc. 6.28).

ὄρφανός:

7.114: ἡ μισθοῦ τιθεύση παῖδα τῶν ὄρφανῶν: probably a motherless child is meant. LSJ s. v. ὄρφανός acknowledge only the meanings ‘without parents’ and ‘fatherless’ and in II. 1. cite examples only for ὄρφανός πατρός. But in E. Ph. 988 (μητρὸς στρηθεὶς ὄρφανός τ’ ἀποζυγείς) and presumably also here (7.114), ὄρφανός is used in the particular sense of ‘motherless’, which should be added to LSJ.

ποικιλτική:

7.117: καὶ ποικιλτικῇ πάσῃ: the rendering ‘embroidery’ (LSJ s. v. ποικιλτική) applies only to ἐσθήτος, but is unsuitable for τριχῶν καὶ χρωτός, especially when ἐγχούση καὶ ψιμυθίῳ καὶ πάσι φαρμάκοις follow next in immediate relation. In Dio’s passage, which is not cited in LSJ, the term ποικιλτική is used by a kind of syllepsis and acquires a more general sense, ‘the art of adorning’.

προσωφελῶ:

7.148: ἄτε οὐδὲν αὐτοῦς δυναμένων τῶν σπειράντων προσωφελῖν: LSJ, s. v. προσωφελῶ note rightly ‘help, assist besides’. But in Dio’s passage (7.148), if προσ- carries any special force<sup>5</sup>, it must signify addition in a temporal sense, ‘any longer, any further’.

πτέρις / πτερίς:

7.75: καθαρὰν πτερίδα: a reference to D. Chr. 7.75 has been added to the Supplement (1968) of LSJ, s. v. πτερίς (-ίδος) or πτέρις (-εως), without mentioning that the acc. form πτερίδα occurs only in this passage of Dio. LSJ give ‘acc. πτέριν Dsc. 4.185’, which actually is the only acc. form commonly used in Greek Literature: cf. also Epich. fr. 158.8 K.-A. (161.3 Kaibel), Theoc. 5.58, Paus. 10.5.10 (and other late writers, e. g. Archigenes, Polyaeus [Hist.], Oribasius, Aëtius).

συφεός:

7.73 (fin.): ποιήσας ... συφεόν: after Homer and Parthenios it is Dio who makes use of the word συφεός, and a reference

---

5) Note that in some cases, especially in poetry (e. g. E. Alc. 41 προσωφελῖν, Med. 611 προσωφέλημα), προσ- seems rather weakened and perfunctory.

to him should be added in LSJ, s. v. So, ‘D. Chr. 7.73, cf. 8.24, 30.33’.

τρυγήτρια:

7.114: τρυγήτρια: a fem. of τρυγητήρ (-τής) ‘grape-picker’. LSJ, s. v. τρυγήτρια, give an example from Demosthenes and then from Pollux (2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD); D. Chr. (7.114) is earlier than Pollux.

ὑπερβάλλομαι:

7.72: ἐγὼ μὲν, ... οὐδὲν ὑπερβάλλομαι: “indeed it is not I who delay in any respect, or: for my part I am not causing any delay at all”. This is very probably what the hunter says here, with the verb used absolutely as in LSJ, s. v. ὑπερβάλλω, B. Med., II., where the examples cited come from Herodotus, Plato and Aristoteles, and a reference to D. Chr. 7.72 might be added. J. W. Cohoon, in the Loeb series, translates this passage with “it is not I who am delaying you”, assuming that ὑπερβάλλομαι has a pers. obj. (σε), a construction which does not appear in LSJ, l. c., nor is it found in the TLG. W. Elliger<sup>6</sup> translates (ad. loc.) ‘nicht ich bin es, ... der die Hochzeit hinauszögert’, with an impers. obj. (τοὺς γάμους) supplied from the context (cf. ib. §70) – a construction which is possible according to LSJ, l. c., but does not seem to be the case here: (a) to supply an object (τοὺς γάμους) from as far above as §70 would be stylistically very awkward; (b) οὐδὲν ὑπερβάλλομαι is said here in a general sense (see my translation above) and the specification τοὺς γάμους should have been mentioned here, had the speaker intended to emphasize the wedding.

φθάνω:

7.29: οὐκ ἂν φθάνομεν ἅπαντες ... διαρπάσαντες: “we will soon be snatching, we will inevitably end up snatching (lit. we couldn’t be too quick to snatch)”; φθάνω c. part. aor. is used here to express something logically consequent or inevitable. LSJ, s. v. φθάνω, IV. 2. b. (fin.) cite one example of φθάνω with aorist participle in this sense, Luc. Tox. 2; Dio 7.29 must be added here. In IV. 2. a. (fin.) LSJ give one further example of φθάνω with aorist participle, again from Lucian (Vit. Auct. 26), but this time in a different sense, to express a strong exhortation. It seems therefore that

6) Dion Chrysostomos: Sämtliche Reden, Zürich und Stuttgart 1967.

the use of φθάνω with aorist participle, in either sense, appears first in the Imperial Age (Dio: 1<sup>st</sup> c. AD; Lucian: 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD). As for οὐκ ἂν φθάνοιτε with present participle, two more examples can be added to LSJ: Xen. Mem. 3.11.1 (strong exhortation, LSJ, IV.2.a.), D. Chr. 12.62 (logical consequence, LSJ, IV.2.b.).

ὥς:

7.118: ... ὥς πρὸς τοὺς πλουσίους ἡμεῖς ἀγωνιζόμεθα: the transmitted text presents no problems, and there is no reason to emend ὥς into οἷς, as does von Arnim following Selden (Russell, Cohoon and G. de Budé all keep ὥς). ὥς here = ἐπεὶ, Lat. *namque*, '(inasmuch) as, since'. The examples in LSJ of ὥς in this use (s. v., B. IV.1.) are all poetical, whereas causal ὥς is common in Attic prose, e. g. Pl. Prt. 335d δέομαι οὖν σου παραμεῖναι ἡμῖν ὥς ἐγὼ οὐδ' ἂν ἐνὸς ἴδιον ἀκούσασμαι ἢ σοῦ, cf. Lys. 14.41, D. 52.33. This should be indicated in LSJ, l. c., and D. Chr. 7.118 is an instance of this use of ὥς in the later prose.

Athen

Nikolaos Georgantzoglou