

# Luigi Castiglioni πλουταρχίζων and the Text of Plutarch's *Aquane an ignis utilior*

*Antonio Tibiletti*

IF ONE BROWSES the Nachlässe of the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Göttingen, several unpublished yet interesting documents can be found: they are of great value for the history of classical scholarship and sometimes for textual philology itself. This is the case for Cod. Ms. M. Pohlenz 215.9 of the Nachlass of Max Pohlenz, which preserves the draft of Luigi Castiglioni's brief critical essay *Coniectanea ad Plutarchi Moralia* and the reply of Pohlenz, his long-standing friend and *editor maximus* of Plutarch.

Luigi Castiglioni<sup>1</sup> was a “peerless expert on Plutarch's *Moralia*.”<sup>2</sup> He studied Plutarch's works from the earliest years of his academic career, commenting on hundreds of passages; as a result, he wrote essays, taught classes, and published reviews of the volumes of the new Teubner edition which came out be-

<sup>1</sup> Luigi Castiglioni (Azzate, 28 Sept. 1882 – Milan, 23 Feb. 1965) was professor of Latin literature and classical philology at the University of Milan (1926–1952). He studied and graduated at the Scuola Normale in Pisa, where he knew Giorgio Pasquali. He considered Girolamo Vitelli (professor of Greek literature in Florence) his most important teacher. Ignazio Cazzaniga and Alberto Grilli were his pupils in Milan and later successors to the University chair. Biography: A. Grilli, “Castiglioni, Luigi,” *DBI* 22 (1979) 169–171. Some recollections in A. La Penna, “Ritratti critici di contemporanei. Luigi Castiglioni,” *Belfagor* 18 (1962) 42–68; I. Cazzaniga, “Luigi Castiglioni,” *Gnomon* 38 (1966) 106–108, and “Luigi Castiglioni,” *Maia* 18 (1966); A. Grilli, “Luigi Castiglioni (1882–1965),” *Eikasmos* 4 (1993) 147–149. A complete bibliography is compiled by G. Faranda, in *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni I* (Florence 1960) xv–xxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> La Penna, *Belfagor* 18 (1962) 46.

tween 1925 and 1955:<sup>3</sup> “for Plutarch, his reviews are essential,” observed his philological ‘nephew’ Antonio La Penna, Pasquali’s most talented pupil.<sup>4</sup> The last review (1957) marked his “departure from the reading of Plutarch.”<sup>5</sup>

Castiglioni had an in-depth knowledge and experience of Plutarch’s style and language. Alberto Grilli offers a vivid picture of his teacher:<sup>6</sup>

Una volta, durante la discussione di una tesi di laurea, disse dell’*Orazio* del Bentley, ridendo: “Se Orazio tornasse a questo mondo, direbbe del Bentley: ‘Però, l’ha pensata meglio di me!’.” Forse più d’una volta si può dire lo stesso, io credo, di lui.

Indeed, Castiglioni’s critical remarks, even in their preliminary stage, are worthy of attention: in fact, although he partially reconsidered his positions on the Plutarchean passages he analyzed, this draft still offers some good philological observations on the text of the pamphlet *Aquane an ignis utilior* (Πότερον ὕδωρ ἢ πῦρ χρησιμώτερον). One must admit that his suggestions do not always result in the best textual solution; nevertheless:<sup>7</sup>

La critica congetturale dei filologi acuti è utile anche quando non riesce a restituire il testo con sicurezza o con forte probabilità, persino (nessuno si scandalizzi!) quando impugna una lezione giusta: congetture anche inadeguate possono essere frutto di uno sforzo d’interpretazione che indica problemi interessanti, impensati, aiutano, cioè, ad interpretare bene. [...] Se c’è qualcosa che suscita un po’ di diffidenza nella critica congetturale del Castiglioni, è una certa raffinatezza umanistica, per

<sup>3</sup> *StIt* 2 (1913) 112–144, *BollFilClass* 33 (1926) 81–87, 36 (1930) 202–211, *RendIstLomb* 64 (1931) 879–909, *Athenaeum* 11 (1933) 281–285, 14 (1936) 89–91, *RivFil* 64 (1936) 82–85, *Gnomon* 13 (1937) 136–142, *Athenaeum* 15 (1937) 115–116, *Gnomon* 14 (1938) 154–162, *Athenaeum* 17 (1939) 312–313, *Gnomon* 16 (1940) 92–94, 17 (1941) 251–257, 24 (1952) 16–20, 26 (1954) 80–85, 29 (1957) 332–337.

<sup>4</sup> La Penna, *Belfagor* 18 (1962) 51.

<sup>5</sup> Castiglioni, *Gnomon* 29 (1957) 337.

<sup>6</sup> Grilli, *Eikasmos* 4 (1993) 148.

<sup>7</sup> La Penna, *Belfagor* 18 (1962) 55, 58–59.

cui a volte la ricerca dell'eleganza sembra superare la ricerca della probabilità. [...] Capita d'incontrare sue congetture che a prima vista sembrano un giuoco umanistico, ma, se vai avanti ed esami i paralleli citati, gli argomenti stilistici apportati, si rivelano necessarie o fortemente probabili.

It is precisely here that the value of publishing such observations lies. Although they were, in Castiglioni's view, a mere draft, nevertheless "they help us interpret well." In fact—Grilli observes—"it would be unreasonable to say that his conjectures are all, if not obvious, at least valid; by contrast, it is meaningful to say that none of them is absurd and that they all have a sound methodological basis."<sup>8</sup>

*The documents*<sup>9</sup>

The essay sent to Max Pohlenz is dated in Milan on the 17<sup>th</sup> of May 1952. The Teubner volume of the *Moralia* containing the pseudo-Plutarchean pamphlet *Aquane an ignis utilior* had yet to be published.<sup>10</sup> While reading the documents and the following commentary, one should keep in mind that Castiglioni read Plutarch's text in Bernardakis' edition and did not know Wegehaupt's more recent critical work.<sup>11</sup> Benefiting from Pohlenz's remarks and Wegehaupt's edition, Castiglioni reworked this note and included it, along with further statements, in *Decisa Forficibus* (Milan 1954, hereafter *DF*) 281–286.

This *editio princeps* of the first draft provides an occasion to reconsider five critical notes by Castiglioni on one of Plutarch's *opuscula moralia* starting from their birth, to offer further justifications on their behalf, and to make some new textual suggestions. I indicate my supplements with <<abc>> and Castigli-

<sup>8</sup> Grilli, *Eikasmos* 4 (1993) 149.

<sup>9</sup> I wish to express my thanks to the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Göttingen for kind permission to publish these texts.

<sup>10</sup> C. Hubert, *Plutarchus. Moralia* VI.1 (Leipzig 1954).

<sup>11</sup> G. N. Bernardakis, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* VI (Leipzig 1895); H. Wegehaupt, "Plutarch πότερον ὕδωρ ἢ πῦρ χρησιμώτερον," in *XAPITEΣ. Friedrich Leo zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht* (Berlin 1911) 146–169.

oni's conjectures with <αβγ>; references to the apparatus are given with a sublinear number; Castiglioni writes σ *in fine verbi* and uses the symbols [αβγ] instead of {αβγ} for deletions.

Coniectanea ad Plutarchi Moralia

Quamquam doctorum hominum Pohlenzii in primis, cuius studio cum veteris Graeciae scriptores fere omnes, tum Plutarchi opuscula, si emendatiora prodierunt atque, ut speremus, sunt proditura, plurimum debent, auctoritate ac nomine propter levitatem ingenii desidiamque plura inquirendi me nihil dignum contulisse videbam, veteris tamen observantiae erga virum illustrem ex tempore confectum documentum legentis oculis subicere malui, quam officio et debito et mihi quoque gratissimo omnino deesse.

Plutarchi commentarium quo non ita gravis quaestio et adumbrata magis quam penitus explorata proponitur, sitne aqua utilior an ignis, cum legerem, multa mihi occurrerunt, sed quae ab homine in recessu domus suae paene segregato raptimque oculis paginas illas percurrente non possent facile expediri; sola igitur Bernardakisii editione auxilioque adiutus, ut omnes sciunt, non satis valido, pauca composui litterisque mandavi non cum aliis viris doctis, sed cum illo solo comunicanda, cui, ut est erga me homo summae humanitatis ac non semel expertae indulgentiae, hoc fortasse temere susceptum certe non, ut decuit, perfectum consilium facile possem excusare: leviora enim attingi, graviora seposui meliore in posterum spe, si quis mihi deus aut longiorem aut minus incommodum vitae cursum permiserit.

Humoris expertes esse omnis mortuos communem semper fuisse hominum opinionem Plutarchus credidit idemque eos ἀλιβάντας<sup>1</sup> appellatos esse ὡς ἐνδεεῖς λιβάδος τουτέστιν ὑγρότητος καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο [τοῦσ] στερουμένους τοῦ ζῆν (956A). Articulum delevi qui veram huius verborum circumscriptionis sententiam ita mihi conturbare videtur ut paene nulla sit; eo enim quod humore privati sint, homines etiam vita privantur, neque differentiam ullam nobis statuere licet inter ea verba quae sunt τοὺς ἀποθανόντας et ista mox adposita vel si mavis adiuncta τοὺς στερουμένους τοῦ ζῆν. Sublato autem articulo Plutarchi verba omnino cum Aristotelis congruunt (hist. anim. 1,4;489 a,20): ἔχει δὲ καὶ ὑγρότητα πᾶν ζῶιον, ἧς στερισκόμενον ἢ φύσει ἢ βίαι φθείρεται. Pereundi certe causam, non appellationis his verbis ostendere Plutarchi maxime interfuit; quae si tam aperta res huius libelli editores aestimatoresque adhuc latuit ad

graviora intentos, cum multa illi expedierint satis perplexa aliaque restent eaque graviora expedienda, minime mirum est. Expectanda alibi (956C) fuit editio, quae vel de codicum lectione nos certiores faceret, quam verba tam male habita temptanda, ut iure verear ne corrigendi periculum temere fecisse videar, medici instar qui, prius quam morbi naturam quae sit certa ratione intellegat, medicinam audeat adferre: οὐ μὴδεμία ζωὴ (ita libri aliquot, alii vero et Bernardakis ζωῆς)<sup>2</sup> φύσις ἄνευ ἴσταται καὶ διαμένει. Hiatu in opere inchoato magis quam perfecto absolutoque non multum moveor, verborum ordine cuius ratio non satis aperta est, adverbium ἄνευ vel loco sibi debito alio delapsus esse vel casu quodam aut scribarum errore inlatum esse admonemur; illud vero, postquam aut χωρίς aut simili potestate aliud quid praeditum evanuerit, ad temptandam huius loci emendationem aliquam supra versum additum compositam aliquam verbi formam corrupisse, Plutarchum autem sua ita composuisse, non inanis, ut arbitror, suscipio est: οὐ <χωρίς> μηδεμία ζωὴ φύσις ἀνίσταται καὶ διαμένει, sc. “nulla omnino animalis natura exoritur et manet.”

At alibi (957C) omnia quae igne careant arida ac sterilia esse ignis laudator adfirmat: οὐδεμίαν γὰρ αἰτίαν εὐροι τις ἄν, δι’ ἣν ἄγονοι πέτραι καὶ τὰ κατεσκληκότα τῶν ὀρῶν πᾶσιν ἢ ὅτι πυρὸς οὐδ’ ὄλωσ ἢ ὀλίγον<sub>3</sub> μετέσχηκε.<sup>4</sup> Haec neque explicari neque ulla ratione, ut sunt tradita, retineri posse iure Bernardakis existimavit, sed quae ille proposuit pro πᾶσιν legendum esse πάρεισιν vel πάρεστιν non magis probari possunt quam articulus ante πέτραι suppletus; <παντά>πασιν si quis coniciat significatione minime absurdum videatur, sed ut est facili coniectura repertum, ita ipsa verborum collocatione excluditur. <πεφύ>κασιν, sive sententiam spectas sive vocabuli formam et potestatem, nisi fallor, optimum est, ut ab ipso scriptore venisse credam: “natura steriles petrae sunt et asperrima montium.” Dissident verborum formae ac displicet fortasse modo singularis, modo pluralis ad eadem relatorum verborum numerus; sed haec, nisi potius, quo mihi inclinatur animus, credis ab auctore rebus magis quam verbis intento profecta, facili negotio expediri possunt, ut eiusdem Bernardakisii coniectura ostendit, quae in apparatu ab illo confecto legitur: μετεσχήκασιν.

Sequitur verborum conclusio multis de causis intricatior et quam certa et indubitata ratione expedire non possum (957D) ἀμέλει τὰ λιμναῖα καὶ ὅσα στασιμα<sub>5</sub> τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ τινα ἐν ἀδιεξόδοις

ἐγκαθήμενα κοιλότησι μοχθερὰ καὶ ... τηρεῖ περὶ τὰ μάλιστα φερόμενα ... ζῆν λέγοντες. Duas hic circumscriptionum verborum partes aliquot deperditis vocabulis errore in unum coaluisse vetus est Xylandri opinio, cui nemo refragari possit, at quas novi emendationes loci sententiam parum adiuvant. Displice[n]t etiam post ὅσα illud τινὰ, quod vix possumus ita interpretari ut pronominis, quod ἄτινα est, illud simile habeamus (cf. adnotationem ad Papyros Mediol. 20, p. 183);<sup>12</sup> sed ut illo omnino carere optimum esset, ita levi sane negotio molestum pronomen cum articulo permutabimus: καὶ τὰ ἐν ... ἐγκαθήμενα. At περὶ ab aliis aliter emendatum duplicem esse verbi huic adpositi, τηρεῖ, scripturam ob eamque rem amovendum mihi concedi velim, neque enim sententiae video satis commodae περὶ τὰ μάλιστα tamquam adverbium adiungi posse. Immo vero novum hinc verborum ambitum initium in hunc fere modum cepisse existimo: ἢ τὸ θερμὸν ... τηρεῖ [περὶ] τὰ μάλιστα. <τὰ δὲ> φερόμενα καὶ ρέοντα ... οὕτω καὶ προσαγορεύομεν, ζῆν λέγοντες, quae prioris partis sententiae recte et opportune respondet, τὰ λιμναῖα ... τῶν ὑδάτων. Minus commode fortasse extrema adnectitur concluditurque enuntiatio non satis meo iudicio explicata et perfecta, sed ζῆν λέγοντες recte traditum esse non Graeca quidem, cuius nullum exemplum novi, sed Latina certe consuetudo demonstrat; aquam enim quae e fonte viva profluit cur non potuerint Graeci illam vivere dicere non video; certe ρεῖν, quod Bernardakisio in mentem venit, plane absurdum est omnemque eorum quae precedunt significationem corrumpit; οὕτω enim καὶ προσαγορεύομεν, addito ζῆν λέγοντες idem est atque οὕτω καὶ ζῶντα προσαγορεύομεν.

Pulchra omnia esse quae nobis a dis tribuantur egregia sententia est, in qua desinere et fausti ominis est aequum (non posse suav. vivi 1103B); sed vocabulum abundat ex eius quod praecedit exitu natum: καλὰ μὲν οὖν εἰκὸς εἶναι [καὶ] τὰ ... παρὰ τῶν θεῶν. Legendum denique (1090A) ἄλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν θαλάσσει κατ' Αἰσχύλον “ὠδῖνα τίκτει νύξ κυβερνήτηι σοφῶι” καὶ γαλήνη<ι>. Coniunge mare et maris tranquillitatem, ut recta sententia evadat; Aeschylus versus interpositus Plutarcho haud sane invito ea diiunxit, quae structura ipsa essent coniuncta.

<sup>12</sup> A. Vogliano, *Papiri della Università di Milano* (Milan 1937) 183.

Scripti Mediolani, XV Kal. Iun. MCMLII  
L. Castiglioni

<sup>1</sup> ἀλιβαντας <sup>2</sup> ζῶης <sup>3</sup> ὀλιγον <sup>4</sup> μετεσχηκε <sup>5</sup> στασιμα

The surviving draft of Pohlenz's reply (Göttingen, 19<sup>th</sup> of August 1952) is the outline of the letter sent to Castiglioni: spaces were left for Greek words and phrases to be handwritten. On the back of the letter is a typewritten page of a German essay (on Plato?), with corrections in pen. Castiglioni took advantage of Pohlenz's opinions in reworking his draft for *Decisa Forficibus*.

Maximilianus Pohlenz Ludovico Castiglioni S.P.

Gratias tibi ago ex animi sententia quod etiam tu volumini in honorem meum composito "Coniectanea ad Plutarchi Moralia" inserere voluisti. quid enim gratius fieri poterat Plutarchi editori ab homine docto, sagaci, vere Plutarcho?

nec minus gratum donum tuum ob eam rem mihi est quod libellus qui inscribitur<sup>2</sup> "Utrum aqua an ignis utilior?" olim ab amico meo Ioanne Wegehaupt iam a. 1914 lugubri fato abrepto quasi<sup>3</sup> specimen nostrae editionis editus est.<sup>13</sup> quam editionem te fugisse minime mirum est, cum in volumine vix noto apparuerit (<<XAPITEΣ>>. Friedrich Leo zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht, Berlin 1911). qui p. 957c praeclare mihi sanasse videtur <<πλήν ὅτι>> pro <<πᾶσιν>> scribens. consentit tecum in p. 956a articulum <τοὺς> delens, quod sine dubio necessarium est. Plutarchi ingenio digna est coniectura quam tu profers <<οὐ <χωρίς> μηδεμία ζωὴ φύσις ἀνίσταται καὶ διαμένει>>, sed ipse mones in hoc libello non perpo<l>ito summa cautione agendum est.<sup>14</sup> 957d recte tu pro <<τινα>> scribis <<τὰ>>, quod ego quoque ap. Wegehauptium proposui. reliqua difficillima, sed plane tibi adstipulor <<ζῆν λέγοντες>> tenenti, ac tantum<sup>4</sup> dubito utrum <<ζῆν>> ut in LXX Num. 5.17<sup>5</sup> (<<ὕδωρ ... ζῶν>>) explicandum sit an sec. p. 877<sup>6</sup>

<sup>13</sup> The edition mentioned is that of Wegehaupt (1911).

<sup>14</sup> This impression is confirmed by Castiglioni, *Gnomon* 29 (1957) 334.

<<ζῶα>><sup>15</sup> scribere oporteat. 1090a Reiskii emendationem <<γαληνή>> veri simillimam iudico.

vides igitur me nonnu<<m>>q<<u>>am a iudicio tuo discedere; sed etiam talibus locis tu deliberanti viam optime monstras.

credo bibliopolam tibi exemplar fascicul<<i>> VI 2 a me editi misisse;<sup>16</sup> de quo si forte in his vel illis annalibus iudicium ferre volueris, pergratum mihi facies; sunt autem multi loci de quibus dubitare<sup>7</sup> possis.<sup>17</sup>

vale gratissimoque me animo esse scito.

scr. Gottingae a.d. XIII Kal. Sept. MCMLII

<sup>1</sup> mihe <sup>2</sup> inscribiaur <sup>3</sup> abreptoquasi <sup>4</sup> actantum <sup>5</sup> 517 <sup>6</sup> 677  
<sup>7</sup> dubirae

### Commentary

The passages of the pamphlet *Aquane an ignis utilior* on which Castiglioni and Pohlenz comment are difficult. Let us now analyze these.<sup>18</sup>

956A {τοὺς} στερουμένους:

ἀμέλει τοὺς ἀποθανόντας ἀλιβάντας καλοῦσιν ὡς ἐνδεεῖς λιβάδος, τουτέστιν ὑγρότητος, καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο στερουμένους τοῦ ζῆν.

That, of course, is the reason why the dead are called *alibantes*, meaning that they are without *libas*, “moisture,” and for lack of that deprived of life.

Bernardakis accepted the reading of some manuscripts τοῦτο τοὺς στερουμένους. Castiglioni noticed a syntactical inconsistency in τοὺς—he had already observed that “the complement παρὰ τοῦτο leaves no doubt about the relationship of

<sup>15</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 877B reads λέγουσι ζῶον λογικὸν ἢ ζῶον χρεμετιστικόν.

<sup>16</sup> M. Pohlenz, *Plutarchi Moralia* VI.2 (Leipzig 1952).

<sup>17</sup> See Castiglioni, *Gnomon* 26 (1954) 80–85.

<sup>18</sup> Text and translation according to H. Cherniss and W. C. Helmbold, *Plutarch's Moralia* XII (Cambridge [Mass.]/London 1957). The pamphlet is now published by G. D'Ippolito and G. Nuzzo, *Plutarco. L'origine del freddo. Se sia più utile l'acqua o il fuoco* (Naples 2012), in the series *Corpus Plutarchi Moraliūm*.



this sentence to the previous one or about what the writer really means to say”<sup>19</sup>—and here explains his decision to delete the article: “I deleted the article, which seems to me to disturb the real meaning of this sentence, rendering it meaningless; in fact men, just because they have been deprived of water, are also deprived of life, and we are not allowed to link τοὺς ἀποθανόντας to those placed—or, if you prefer, added—immediately after: τοὺς στερουμένους τοῦ ζῆν. Once the article is deleted, however, Plutarch’s words are perfectly coherent with Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* 1.4.489a20 ἔχει δὲ καὶ ὑγρότητα πᾶν ζῶιον, ἧς στερισκόμενον ἢ φύσει ἢ βίαι φθείρεται.” His view is confirmed by the greater part of the manuscripts, where the article is absent. In *DF* 282 he admits that he has to abandon this conjecture since the text without the article had already been adopted by Wegehaupt.

956C οὐ <χωρίς> ... ἀνίσταται:

τοῦτ’ οὖν χρησιμώτερον, οὐ μηδεμία ζωῆς φύσις ἄνευ ἵσταται καὶ διαμένει.

That element, therefore, without which no living nature can subsist or endure is the more useful.

Castiglioni read “<without> which no living creature arises and survives” and repeats his conjecture in *DF* 282–283. He thought that the *ordo verborum* of the manuscripts was not clear because of the isolated ἄνευ; he thus believed that the adverb ἄνευ had been “dragged to this position from its original place or introduced by the scribe either by chance or by mistake” (in *DF* 282 he says “quasi peregrinando”).

Pohlenz applauded Castiglioni’s idea as “befitting Plutarch’s genius.” Hubert had access to Castiglioni’s note (probably through Pohlenz) and quoted the conjecture in his apparatus; I would suggest that the correction provides the most plausible text. Castiglioni’s ἀνίσταται offers a better sense and provides a simple correction to ἄνευ ἵσταται: for ἀνίσταμαι = Lat. *surgo* see Plut. *Pomp.* 34.3 ποταμόν ... ἐκ τῶν Ἰβηρικῶν ὀρῶν ἀνιστά-

<sup>19</sup> *RendIstLomb* 64 (1931) 882–883.

μενος and Pind. *Pyth.* 4.155 μή τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀναστάη κακόν. The double conjecture is even more convincing in the light of what precedes: in *Mor.* 956A–C several sentences with the prepositions ἄνευ and χωρίς come in succession, always accompanying a genitive.<sup>20</sup> If one wishes to accept the transmitted reading, this would be the only instance of an isolated ἄνευ.

957C <πεφύ>κασιν instead of πᾶσιν:<sup>21</sup>

οὐδεμίαν γὰρ αἰτίαν εὖροι τις ἄν, δι' ἣν ἄγονοι πέτραι καὶ τὰ κατεσκληκότα τῶν ὄρων πλὴν ὅτι πυρὸς οὐδ' ὅλως ἢ ὀλίγον μετέσχηκε.

It is impossible to find any other reason why rocks and the bare bones of mountains are barren except that they have either no part at all, or very little share, in fire.

Castiglioni discussed his conjecture in these terms: “one would not be able to explain why ‘the stones and the slopes of the mountains are sterile by nature’ but for the fact that they are totally or in part devoid of fire.” Wegehaupt emended the text with the phrase πλὴν ὅτι πυρὸς: this solution makes perfect sense and the scribal error may be conjectured on palaeographical grounds.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> ἄνευ μὲν πυρὸς ἦν πολλά, ὕδατος οὐδέποτε ἄνθρωπος ... βίος πυρὸς ἄνευ, οὐκ ἄνευ δ' ὕδατος ἦν ... ἔστι γὰρ ἀνθρώπων γένη τινα χωρὶς πυρὸς ποιούμενα τὴν διαίταν ... χωρὶς δ' ὕδατος οὔτε καλόν τις ἐνόμισε ζῆν οὔτε δυνατόν ... καὶ βίος αὐτοῖς ... ἐκ ριζῶν καὶ καρπῶν καὶ σαρκῶν ἄνευ πυρὸς· ὕδατος δὲ χωρὶς οὐκ ἔναλον οὐδὲ χερσαῖον οὐδὲ αἰθέριον.

<sup>21</sup> Castiglioni read the following in Bernardakis: οὐδεμίαν γὰρ αἰτίαν εὖροι τις ἄν, δι' ἣν ἄγονοι πέτραι καὶ τὰ κατεσκληκότα τῶν ὄρων πᾶσιν ἢ ὅτι πυρὸς οὐδ' ὅλως ἢ ὀλίγον μετέσκηκε. The apparatus given by D'Ippolito and Nuzzo reads as follows: πλὴν Naber, Wegehaupt: πᾶσιν CYJNΓhM1 (in W lac. 5 litt.), ἢ codd. rell. (Reiske, Wyttenbach, Dübner), πᾶσιν ἢ Bernardakis.

<sup>22</sup> Wegehaupt attributed the emendation to himself [πλὴν *Wz*], but it had already been proposed by S. A. Naber, “Observationes miscellaneae ad Plutarchi Moralia,” *Mnemosyne* 28 (1900) 353: “mihi lenior placet coniectura πλὴν ἢ ὅτι. Corruptela orta ex usu uncialium literarum,” that is ΠΛΗΝ / ΠΛΕΙΝ (iotacism) / ΠΑCIN: see D'Ippolito and Nuzzo 241 n.34. On this

By contrast, Castiglioni's <πεφύ>κασιν ("they are by nature") causes the syntax to vacillate: as he admits, "the verbs disagree in number, and it is probably disturbing that now a singular, now a plural refers to the same subject" (whence Bernardakis' μετεσχήκασι). Later (*DF* 283–284) Castiglioni left the problem open: "conieceram πεφύκασιν ἢ, nimirum credens ἢ veram codicum lectionem esse; quod contra esse ex Wegehauptii editione nunc didici. Qua re [...] integrum de tota hac quaestione iudicium aliis relinquo."

In defense of Castiglioni's syntax: πλήν (see Isoc. *Phil.* 63.1 ἀφορμὴν οὐδεμίαν ἄλλην ἔχων πλήν τὸ σῶμα and Lys. 1.4 οὔτε ἔχθρα ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐκείνῳ οὐδεμία ἦν πλήν ταύτης) is in theory not indispensable, given that οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὐροί τις ἄν ... ἢ ὅτι = ἄλλην/ἑτέραν αἰτίαν οὐκ εὐροί τις ἄν ... ἢ ὅτι (LSJ s.v. ἢ "comparative as antecedent"): see Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.41 μηδένα παριέναι ἢ τοὺς φίλους. Nonetheless, ἢ is a variant of πᾶσιν in the paradosis and the two words are never simultaneously present in the manuscripts (see n.21). If one wishes to accept Castiglioni's emendation, one should posit that the reading in a hypothesized archetype πᾶσιν (for πεφύκασιν) ἢ later resulted in two separate traditions—one giving the false πᾶσιν and the other the correct ἢ—and restore Plutarch's text as Castiglioni had suggested (<πεφύ>κασιν ἢ ὅτι): admittedly, the conjecture is more complicated, being obtained by emendation + supplement, not simply by emendation (πλήν ὅτι); however, one should acknowledge that his emendation was and remains worthy of consideration, given the information available to him.

957D τὰ instead of τινά:<sup>23</sup>

ἀμέλει τὰ λιμναῖα καὶ ὅσα στάσιμα τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ τιν' ἐν ἀδιεξόδοις ἐγκαθήμενα κοιλότησι μοχθερὰ καὶ τελευτῶντα σήπεται τῷ κινήσεως ἥκιστα μετέχειν.

kind of corruption see J. Irigoin, *Plutarque. Oeuvres Morales* (Paris 1987) ccxxvii–cccx.

<sup>23</sup> Castiglioni wrote τὰ ἐν ἀδιεξόδοις here and τὰ ἀδιεξόδοις in *DF* 284: it is not possible to say with certainty whether this is oversight or intentional.

It is, of course, marsh waters and such as are stagnant, some too that have drained into depressions with no outlet, that are bad and finally putrefy because they have very little motion.

Pohlenz had suggested the same emendation in Wegehaupt's edition. Although *τινα* can replace *ἄτινα*,<sup>24</sup> in Castiglioni's view *τά* would go better with *τὰ λιμναῖα* and eliminate "the bothersome pronoun with an easy device"; in *DF* 284 he writes: "vix enim ferri post ὅσα illud *τινα*."

Hubert and D'Ippolito and Nuzzo<sup>25</sup> accept the *τιν'* ἀδιεξ- of *Ambr.* 881, which can be defended only by understanding *τις* as a 'vague plurality' or 'indefiniteness' (see *Plut. Dem.* 19.35 *πραοτέρους γενέσθαι τινός*, 21.66 *κἄν ἄμεινον ἀγωνίσωμαί τινος*). The result is a *trikolon*-structure, whose elements become increasingly lengthy and semantically broad: "for example, (1) swamps and (2) stagnant waters and (3) any other kind (of water) gathering in dead-end holes rot once they become bad and spoiled."

Castiglioni's solution (*τὰ ἐν ἀδιεξόδοις ἐγκαθήμενα*)<sup>26</sup> is compelling: for *ἐγκαθήμεαι* + *ἐν* + *dat.* see *Pl. Thet.* 184D *εἰ πολλαί τινες ἐν ἡμῖν ὥσπερ ἐν δουρείοις ἵπποις αἰσθήσεις ἐγκαθιήνται*, *Aeschin.* 3.206 *ἐγκαθήμενοι καὶ ἐνεδρεύοντες ἐν τῇ ἀκροάσει*, *Polyb.* 18.11.6 *ἐν Κορίνθῳ βασιλικῆς φρουρᾶς ἐγκαθιήμενης*.

<sup>24</sup> Pohlenz refers to the observation of Paul Maas in Vogliano, *Papiri* 183: "io [i.e. Vogliano] avevo pensato ad ὅστις ἀναλέξεται – κλαύσεται, ma il Maas mi ha dimostrato che τίς ha qui precisamente il valore di ὅστις." Maas quotes only poetic passages.

<sup>25</sup> D'Ippolito and Nuzzo quote the wrong source for this conjecture, viz. Castiglioni, *Gnomon* 29 (1957). There, Castiglioni deals with the pamphlet *Aqua an ignis utilior*, but not with this passage in particular: he comments on it in *DF* and this draft.

<sup>26</sup> Hiatus are sporadic in Plutarch, but not impossible in a rough (juvenile or non-authentic) work. It is common, for example, in the phrase *τὰ ἐν κτλ.*: see *Arist. De an.* 423a30–31 *πρὸς τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι*, *Dem.* 7.19 *τὰ ἐν τῷ δήμῳ εἰρημένα*, *Pl. Euthyd.* 11C *τὰ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἔργα*, *Thuc.* 1.18.1 *τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσι*, *Xen. Mem.* 2.3.14 *τὰ ἐν ἀνθρώποις φίλτρα*.

957D τηρεῖ {περὶ} τὰ μάλιστα. <τὰ δὲ> φερόμενα:<sup>27</sup>

τὰ λιμναῖα καὶ ὅσα στάσιμα τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ τὰ ἐν ἀδιεξόδοις ἐγκαθήμενα κοιλότησι μοχθερὰ καὶ τελευτῶντα σήπεται τῷ κινήσεως ἥκιστα μετέχειν, ἢ τὸ θερμὸν ἐν ἐκάστοις ῥιπίζουσα τηρεῖ. διόπερ [*sic* Wyttenbach] τὰ μάλιστα φερόμενα καὶ ῥέοντα τῶν ὑδάτων, διὰ τὴν κίνησιν συνεχομένης τῆς θερμότητος, οὕτω καὶ προσαγορεύομεν, ζῆν λέγοντες.

It is, of course, marsh waters and such as are stagnant, some too that have drained into depressions with no outlet, that are bad and finally putrefy because they have very little motion, which preserves everything by stirring up its heat. This is the reason why we commonly say that those waters are 'living' which have most motion and the strongest current; the heat is maintained by their motion.

This passage is very hard to interpret. Castiglioni introduces an opposition by means of <τὰ δὲ>, but needs to delete the preposition *περὶ*. In his letter, Pohlenz unfortunately does not comment on this point, but later proposed a conjecture in Hubert's edition: τηρεῖ μάλιστα περὶ τὰ φερόμενα καὶ ῥέοντα τῶν ὑδάτων, <ἄ> διὰ τὴν κίνησιν ... οὕτω καὶ προσαγορεύομεν, ζῆν λέγοντες. Wegehaupt condemns the preposition (τηρεῖ †περὶ† τὰ μάλιστα φερόμενα).

The best solution so far is probably that given by D'Ippolito and Nuzzo: τηρεῖ· περὶ τὰ μάλιστα φερόμενα καὶ ῥέοντα ... οὕτω καὶ προσαγορεύομεν, ζῆν λέγοντες (see the comment at p.242 n.37): "the text [...] is acceptable only if we punctuate after τηρεῖ [...] and give περὶ a sense of relation," that is "[stagnant waters rot] for they almost completely lack that movement which excites and supports the heat in everything. As for waters flowing with a very rapid movement, ... we call them in this way (i.e. 'flowing waters'), meaning that they are living."

Castiglioni proposes something similar to D'Ippolito and Nuzzo, except the treatment of τὰ μάλιστα (that is: μάλιστα

<sup>27</sup> For a different interpretation of this passage see A. M. Milazzo, "Note critiche al testo di Plutarco. Aqua an ignis utilior," *Lexis* 27 (2009) 480–481.

stresses τηρεῖ for Castiglioni and φερόμενα for the recent editors). His reading makes perfect sense: “[stagnant waters rot] for they lack any of the movement which in the highest degree<sup>28</sup> excites and supports heat in everything. On the contrary, we call moving and flowing waters, ... in this way (i.e. ‘flowing waters’), meaning that they are living.” The conjecture <τὰ δὲ> is justified in *DF* 285: “certe, utcumque haec disposita malis, prioris partis sententiae, τὰ λιμναῖα τῶν ὑδάτων, evidentia ipsa verborum haec respondere fore qui neget non credo.”

Castiglioni also discusses the final phrase: “the fact that ζῆν λέγοντες has been correctly transmitted is not proved by the Greek use (for which I do not know examples), but by the Latin certainly. I cannot understand why the Greeks could not say that water flowing from a spring is living;<sup>29</sup> ρεῖν, proposed by Bernardakis, is definitely absurd and does not make sense after the previous words; in fact, οὕτω καὶ προσαγορεύομεν, with the addition of ζῆν λέγοντες, is the same as οὕτω καὶ ζῶντα προσαγορεύομεν.” Castiglioni refers to expressions like Cic. *Orat.* 2.360 *quem vivere hodie aiunt*, Varr. *LL* 5.102 *proxima animalia sunt ea quae vivere dicuntur*, Sen. *Q. Nat.* 3.7.3 *quod dici solet vivam aquam*. The Greek language would normally use:

a) a predicative participle (λέγω ὑδατα ζῶντα = λέγω ὑδατα ζῶα) for “to define/call water ‘living’” (see Pl. *Phd.* 276A τὸν τοῦ εἰδότης λόγον λέγεις ζῶντα καὶ ἔμψυχον);

b) an infinitive (λέγω ὑδατα ζῆν = λέγω ὅτι ὑδατα ζῶσιν) for “to say/affirm that water lives/is living” (see *Mor.* 956B χωρὶς δ’ ὑδατος οὔτε καλὸν τις ἐνόμισε ζῆν οὔτε δυνατὸν and Lk 24:24 λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν).

The difference between the two emerges from Arist. *De an.* 413b2–4 καὶ γὰρ τὰ μὴ κινουμένα μηδ’ ἀλλάττοντα τόπον,

<sup>28</sup> See Kühner-Gerth I 595 and, for example, Hdt. 2.147 εἶναι φίλους τὰ μάλιστα, 5.63 ξείνους σφι ἐόντας τὰ μάλιστα.

<sup>29</sup> Castiglioni adds in *DF* 285: “Plutarchus praesertim, qui in huius capitis initio καὶ θάνατος ὑδατι καὶ ὄλεθρος ἐπίλειψις θερμότητος. Necesse est vivat, qui mori potest ac νεκρὸν ὑδῶρ vivas quoque esse aquas ut intellegamus postulat.”

ἔχοντα δ' αἴσθησιν, ζῶα λέγομεν καὶ οὐ ζῆν μόνον.

Pohlenz agrees with Castiglioni, but is not sure whether to emend the passage to a participle by comparison with LXX Num 5:17<sup>30</sup> or to the adjective ζῶα by analogy with *Mor.* 877B (see n.15 above): ζῶα normally pertains to a living being, an animal.

All things considered, difficulties still persist (even taking into consideration Milazzo's proposals: see n.27) and οὕτω is not given due weight. *Mor.* 957D plays on the juxtaposition of 'movement = heat = life' and 'static nature = cold = death' (something similar is likely to be read in *Bacch.* 3.86–87 ὕδωρ δὲ πόντου / οὐ σάπεται, "Seawater does not putrefy"). I suggest this reading:

τὰ λιμναῖα καὶ ὅσα στάσιμα τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ τὰ ἐν ἀδιεξόδοις ἐγκαθήμενα κοιλότησι μοχθερὰ καὶ τελευτῶντα σήπεται τῷ κινήσεως ἥκιστα μετέχειν, ἢ τὸ θερμὸν ἐν ἐκάστοις ῥιπίζουσα τηρεῖ μάλιστα περὶ τὰ φερόμενα καὶ ῥέοντα τῶν ὑδάτων, διὰ τὴν κίνησιν συνεχομένης τῆς θερμότητος· οὕτω καὶ προσαγορεύομεν, ζῆν λέγοντες.

Once they became bad and spoiled, swamps and stagnant waters and those gathering in dead-end holes rot because they lack the movement which, exciting heat in everything, preserves it above all in moving and flowing waters, since heat is held (in them) thanks to the movement: this is exactly what we mean when we say ζῆν.

Plutarch explains here that the relation 'movement = heat = life' is confirmed when one says ζῆν, above all when water is the subject.

The concept of 'living waters' is not surprising, and Castiglioni himself notices its relevance (see n.29). Nevertheless, something remains that is not immediately obvious. Plutarch pronounced ζῆν as /zin/,<sup>31</sup> in the same way that he pronounced ζεῖν, "boil (over)," a verb denoting the movement of

<sup>30</sup> Also Gen 21:19 φρέαρ ὕδατος ζῶντος, Lev 14:5, Zach 14:8, Jn 4:10.

<sup>31</sup> See G. Horrocks, *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*<sup>2</sup> (Chichester 2010) 160–165.

water. What the reader should grasp is that Plutarch is here considering the two verbs simultaneously. His thought now turns out to be richer in sense: “this is exactly what we mean when we say *zin*” (whereby οὕτω takes an important place in the sentence, recalling the concepts related before: see Eur. *Ion* 225 οὕτω καὶ φάτις ἀνδῶ). In other words, whenever *zin* happens to be said, be it ζεῖν or ζῆν case by case, the correlation ‘movement = heat = life’ is implied.

In conclusion: In the handful of examples discussed we have entered an *officina philologica* and seen an idea develop from its birth in the *Coniectanea* to its definitive publication in the *Decisa Forficibus*. As Pohlenz himself says to Castiglioni, “you can see that I sometimes disagree with your opinion, but even in such cases you point the way excellently.” This is because Castiglioni’s conjectures “help us interpret well.”

*August, 2017*

Institut für klassische Philologie  
University of Bern  
Länggassstrasse 49  
CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland  
anto.tibiletti@gmail.com