

Notes on Dio Chrysostom

James N. O'Sullivan

IN GRBS 17 (1976) 154–56 Professor Highet suggests a number of changes in the text of Dio Chrysostom. My view of most of the places affected differs from his. In this paper I shall try to defend the transmitted text of a number of those passages, except for 3.86, where I would modify Professor Highet's solution. For convenience I shall follow him in basing my comments on von Arnim's edition (2 vols., Berlin 1916, 1919).

3.86. *φιλίαν γε μὴν ἀπάντων νενόμικε τῶν αὐτοῦ κτημάτων κάλλιστον καὶ ἱερώτατον. οὐ γὰρ οὕτως αἰσχρὸν εἶναι [τὸ βασιλεύειν] οὐδὲ ἐπικίνδυνον χρημάτων ἀπορεῖν ὡς φίλων, οὐδ' ἂν οὕτως τῇ χορηγίᾳ καὶ τοῖς στρατοπέδοις καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ δυνάμει διαφυλάττειν τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ὡς τῇ πίστει τῶν φίλων.*

τὸ βασιλεύειν del. Wilamowitz : τοῖς βασιλεύειν Weil.

Highet would read οὕτως <ἀσφαλές> τῇ χορηγίᾳ . . . Since it does not seem that οὕτως . . . ὡς . . . can mean 'as well (securely) . . . as . . .', he is very probably right in thinking that something has fallen out after οὕτως. I see no objection, either, to the suggestion that the missing word was a form of ἀσφαλής, which is supported not only by 3.96 (quoted by Highet) but also by the much nearer 3.89 τοῖς μὲν τυχοῦσιν οὐκ ἀσφαλές εἰκῆ μεταδιδόναι δυνάμεως; it is worth noting that in this whole passage Dio does not seem to be striving for any great variety of vocabulary. I am not, however, happy with <ἀσφαλές>: with it one would have to understand εἶναι, and this would divert to itself the ἂν that surely belongs to διαφυλάττειν (why ἂν with this understood εἶναι, though not with αἰσχρὸν εἶναι just above?).

There is a way of providing οὕτως with a form of ἀσφαλής, leaving ἂν to διαφυλάττειν, and getting a common construction with that verb: read οὕτως <ἀσφαλή>, the adjective being predicative, agreeing with εὐδαιμονίαν. Cf. Plut. Rom. 21F οὐτ' ἀήττητον ἑαυτὸν διεφύλαξεν οὕτε . . .; Comp. Ages. et Rom. 663D ἀεὶ διεφύλαξεν ἑαυτὸν ἀνίκητον; Mor. 14E, 85B, 87D.

8.8. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔφη παύσειν τοὺς πεισομένους αὐτῷ ἀγνοίας καὶ πονηρίας καὶ ἀκολασίας, οὐδεὶς αὐτῷ προσεῖχεν οὐδὲ ἐκέλευεν ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν, οὐδ' ἂν εἰ πολὺ προσλήψεσθαι ἀργύριον ἔμελλεν, . . .

οὐδ' <ἂν> εἰ von Arnim : οὐδὲ εἰ *codd.*

Highet proposes the deletion of ἀργύριον: “Diogenes never suggested that his spiritual cures would make his patients rich: he would have scorned the idea. Delete ἀργύριον as an addition by a reader who did not know that προσλαμβάνω can be used without an object, as in Dem. 2.7.” He does not say what he would do with πολὺ: with ἀργύριον deleted, what would πολὺ be if not object of προσλήψεσθαι? In any case suspicion of the text comes from misunderstanding it, as the Loeb translator also did: ‘no matter how much richer he might become thereby’. The Greek means ‘not even if he was (had been) going to get a lot of money besides’ (the προσ- means ‘in addition to the cure’): those in need of intellectual and spiritual improvement would not seek that improvement, ‘not even if you paid them’. There is nothing in the Greek about long-term wealth.

11.96. καταφανῆς οὖν ἐγεγόνει αὐτῷ διὰ τούτων ἀπάντων εὐάλωτος ὢν, ἄτε δεινῷ τὴν πολεμικὴν τέχνην· ὥστε θαρρῶν ἀπήντησεν αὐτῷ κατὰ μέσον τὸ πεδίον. καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐνέκλινεν ὡς φεύγων, ἀποπειρώμενος αὐτοῦ, ἅμα δὲ κοπῶσαι βουλόμενος, ὅτε μὲν περιμένων, ὅτε δὲ ἀποφεύγων· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἑώρα βραδύνοντα καὶ ἀπολειπόμενον, οὕτως ὑποστρέψας αὐτὸς ἦκεν ἐπ' αὐτόν οὐδὲ τὰ ὄπλα φέρειν ἔτι δυνάμενον, καὶ κυμβαλῶν ἀπέκτεινε καὶ τῶν ὄπλων ἐκράτησεν, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο Ὅμηρος εἶρηκε. τοὺς δὲ ἵππους διῶξαι μὲν φησι τὸν Ἑκτορα, οὐ λαβεῖν δέ, κἀκείνων ἀλόντων.

Highet sees οὐ λαβεῖν δέ, κἀκείνων ἀλόντων as self-contradictory and goes on, “The horses, like Hector himself, were tired: Dio remembers *Iliad* 17.75–78 and rationalizes it. Read καμνόντων.” I have found no basis for καμνόντων in the *Iliad*; and I see nothing wrong with ἀλόντων: οὐ negatives not just λαβεῖν but also the dependent participle: ‘it was not the case that they too having fallen prey to him he got them into his hands’. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 614D (*Quaest.conv.* 1.4) οὐδ' ὑποκονίεται, τὴν λαβὴν ὥσπερ εἴωθεν εὔτονον ποιῶν καὶ ἄφυκτον, where ποιῶν would contradict οὐδ' ὑποκονίεται unless it too were negated by οὐδ': here, and in Dio, the participle and the verb on which it depends express aspects of a single complex activity, and it is this

activity as a whole that is negated. In Dio the *καί* of *κακείνων* means 'as well as Achilles' and *άλόντων* echoes *εὐάλωτος* used of Achilles in the first sentence of the paragraph.

The Loeb translation is also wrong here: 'but he did not bring them in though they too were caught'.

18.8. μέλη δὲ καὶ ἐλεγεία καὶ ἴαμβοι καὶ διθύραμβοι τῷ μὲν χολήν ἄγοντι πολλοῦ ἄξια· τῷ δὲ πράττειν τε καὶ ἄμα [τὰς πράξεις] καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὖξιν διανοουμένῳ οὐκ ἂν εἴη πρὸς αὐτὰ χολή.

τὰς πράξεις secl. von Arnim.

Hight would read *ἄμα ταῖς πράξεσι*. There is no pressing need for emendation: *ἄμα* is adverbial, expressing the simultaneity of progress in *πράξεις* and in *λόγοι*, and *τὰς πράξεις* as well as *τοὺς λόγους* is governed by *αὖξιν*: 'to engage in public affairs and to promote his political career and at the same time develop his rhetorical powers', i.e. 'to engage in politics and to develop his powers as an orator while at the same time making progress in his career'.

30.4. καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκέλευε λέγειν, ὅταν σοὶ ἐντύχωμεν, ὅτι σοῦ μεμνημένος ἐτελεύτα. καὶ γὰρ τὸ συνεῖναι αὐτῷ καὶ διαλέγεσθαι ἕως ὑστάτου παρέμεινεν.

Hight objects to *συνεῖναι*: "the infinitive of *συνίημι* (= 'understand') is shown, for instance by Herodotus 3.46.1, 3.63.4, and 5.80.1, to be *συνιέναι*." *ιέναι* is, to be sure, the present infinitive of *ἴημι*, but the second aorist infinitive is *εἶναι* (Ar. *Ran.* 133). The simple form is rare, but *-εῖναι* is common: in Plato e.g. *ἀνεῖναι* *Grg.* 492D; *La.* 179A; *Ly.* 209B; *Resp.* 368C, 538B; *Symp.* 179C; *Soph.* 235A; *ἀφεῖναι* *Phlb.* 50D, 62E; *Resp.* 327C, 599A; *ἐφεῖναι* *Prt.* 338A; *μεθεῖναι* *Phlb.* 50D; *ξυνεῖναι* (*συν-*) *Cra.* 414D; *Epin.* 979B; *Leg.* 683B.

30.18. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ταῖς τύχαις τε καὶ δόξαις καὶ τιμαῖς ἀλλήλων ὑπερέχειν, ὥσπερ τοῖς σώμασιν. εἶναι γὰρ τοὺς μὲν βασιλέας, τοὺς δὲ ἰδιώτας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν πλουσίους, τοὺς δὲ ἀπόρους.

Hight regards *ἀλλήλων* as corrupt, saying "All men cannot be superior to one another: read *ἄλλους ἄλλων ὑπερέχειν*." He believes, it seems, that this would mean '... some are superior to others', whereas it would in fact be Greek for '... some are superior to one group, others to another' and that would be nonsense here.

The idea of reciprocity in *ἀλλήλων* does seem inappropriate at first

reading, but the word can, I believe, be defended and need be regarded neither as corrupt nor as an instance of loose usage. Men cannot, it is true, be superior to *one another* in one and the same respect, but here we have what are probably intended to be understood as three distinct features of life: *τύχαις . . . δόξαις . . . τιμαῖς*. Just as in the preceding paragraph one can think of the prisoners as ringing the changes on the physical characteristics mentioned, some being small and good-looking, others large and ugly, and so on, so one is probably meant here to envisage one man as being, say, honoured above others but otherwise dogged by misfortunes that those others escape, and so on: A is above B in one respect, B above A in another; they can in fact be said to be superior to one another.

If *ἀλλήλων* is, after all, used loosely, without any notion of reciprocity, then it may be compared with the use of *ἐπάλληλοι* = ‘one close after another’ rather than the impossible ‘close after one another’: see LSJ *s.v.* *ἐπάλληλος* I, and R. C. Jebb on Sophocles, *Antigone* 57 (Jebb’s generalisation stumbles at Achilles Tatius 2.11.3).

30.26. . . . ἐν τῇ γῆ ἐρήμη οὔσῃ κατοικίαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐφ’ ἧττοσι τιμαῖς καὶ ὄλβῳ, δικαίοις δὲ καὶ νόμοις τοῖς αὐτοῖς·

δικαίοις, which Professor Highet would change to *δίκαις*, should be kept. It is to be taken as a substantive, on the same footing as *νόμοις*, with the postponed *τοῖς*, and for the sense see LSJ *s.v.* *δίκαιος* B.1.2.

31.27. καὶ μὴν ἀτόπου γε ὄντος τοῦ τινα παρῆναι τῶν ἀξίων τιμῆς καὶ μηδεμίαν παρασχεῖν ἀμοιβὴν τῆς εὐεργεσίας, . . .

“The infinitive of *πάρειμι* = ‘pass over’ is *παριέναι*” (Highet). But *παρῆναι* is the second aorist infinitive of *παρίημι* (see on 30.4 above) and gives faultless sense: ‘pass over’ (LSJ II.2).

33.1. Ἐγὼ θαυμάζω τί ποτ’ ἐστὶ τὸ ὑμέτερον καὶ τί προσδοκῶντες ἢ βουλόμενοι τοὺς τοιούτους ἀνθρώπους διαλέγεσθαι ὑμῖν ζητεῖτε, πότερον εὐφώνους οἴεσθε εἶναι καὶ φθέγγεσθαι ἥδιον τῶν ἄλλων, ἔπειτα ὥσπερ ὀρνέων ποθεῖτε ἀκούειν μελωδούντων ὑμῖν ἢ δύναμιν ἄλλην ἔχειν . . .

“The adverb of sequence, *ἔπειτα*, makes no sense. A subordinate clause of explanation is needed, introduced by *ἐπειδὴ γε*” (Highet). But *ἔπειτα* also expresses *consequence*. This use is specially common in questions, with a connotation of surprise, contemptuous disbelief *vel sim.* (LSJ *s.v.* *ἔπειτα* II.3; cf. *εἶτα* II), and here, of course, we have an

indirect question. Dio is saying '... whether you think . . . , and really then (if that is the only merit you see in orators) long to hear . . .'. In view of my bracketed conditional elaboration, it is also worth comparing LSJ *s.v.* ἔπειτα 1.4.b (which, by the way, hardly belongs under 'of mere Sequence').

48.14. ἔμοι <δὲ> μέλει μὲν καὶ τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, μέλει δὲ καὶ τοῦ κατ' ἑμαυτόν. εἰ γὰρ φιλόσοφος πολιτείας ἀψάμενος οὐκ ἔδυνήθη παρέχειν ὁμοιοῦσαν πόλιν, τοῦτο δεινὸν ἤδη καὶ ἄφυκτον, ὥσπερ εἰ ναυπηγὸς ἐν νηὶ πλέων μὴ παρέχοι τὴν ναῦν πλέουσαν, καὶ εἰ κυβερνήτης φάσκων εἶναι πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ κῦμα ἀποκλίνει, ἢ λαβὼν οἰκίαν οἰκοδόμος, ὄρων πίπτουσαν, ὁ δὲ τούτου μὲν ἀμελοῖ, κοιῶν δὲ καὶ χρίων οἷοιτό τι ποιεῖν.

"Such a failure," writes Professor Highet, "is distressing but not literally inescapable, ἄφυκτον. Read ἀφόρητον." But is not Dio saying that if someone who claims to be a philosopher undertakes to bring about political harmony in his city and fails, *the resulting stigma* will be 'terrible and inescapable'? That is why in his rôle as political admonisher Dio is concerned for *himself*. Highet seems to see τοῦτο as referring to failure viewed as a prospect which could, of course, be avoided, by avoidance of the whole effort or by a better approach. It refers in fact (in what could be seen as exaggerated terms) to the situation obtaining after the hypothetical failure (ἀψάμενος . . . ἔδυνήθη), to the stigma that the philosopher will never escape from or live down. ἄφυκτος of what one is already caught up in (this distinction between 'avoiding' altogether and 'escaping out of' is not made in LSJ) occurs also in Plut. *Mor.* 614D (*Quaest.conv.*1.4); *Mar.* 422C τῷ Μετέλλῳ ἀπάτην περιτιθεὶς ἄφυκτον; cf. 433D ὡς ἦν ἄφυκτα . . . , αὐτὸς αὐτὸν ἀπέκτεινεν; *Ant.* 927E ἀφὴν δ' εἶχεν ἢ συνδιαίτησις ἄφυκτον (as one would not discover until already captivated).¹

UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

April, 1977

¹ While investigating instances of ἄφυκτος and related words, I found that LSJ cite ἀνεκφεύκτους, ἀναποδράστους and ἀναποστάτους (*s.vv.*) from Plut. *Mor.* 166E (*De superst.* 4), taking them as passive (wrongly, in my view) and giving no proper indication that the text and interpretation (precisely whether the words in question are active or passive in force, *i.e.* refer to slaves or masters) are in serious doubt.