

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05681-6 - The Journal of Philology: Volume 21

Edited by William Aldis Wright, Ingram Bywater and Henry Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S 'ETHICA.'

THE 'Ἠθικά proper of Plutarch, i.e. the first 21 treatises in the so-called Corpus Planudeum of the '*Moralia*,' exist, as is well known, in a far greater number of Manuscripts than the remaining 48 treatises of the Corpus. They occur (1) as a whole and by themselves, e.g. in the two Moscow MSS 352 and 387 (see Diels *Doxographi*, p. 33: the former (352) also contains the *Placita*), and in Cod. Vindob. Philosoph. 73 (see Treu, *Zur Geschichte der Ueberlieferung von Plutarch's Moralia*, III. p. 1); (2) at the commencement of the Corpus Planudeum, the most important complete MSS of which are Par. Gr. 1672 and 1671 (see Treu, *Zur Gesch. &c.* I), Ambr. Gr. C. 126 inf. (described by Treu, *ibid.* III. p. 10) and Vatic. Gr. 139 (known to me from Treu's personal communication)¹; (3) at the commencement of several other distinct collections of Plutarch's writings, of which the most noteworthy is that represented to us by Ambros. C. 195 inf. and the New College MS. Here No. 55 of the Corpus Planudeum '*An Virtus doceri possit*' is inserted between nos. 6 and 7 (see for the Ambrosian codex Treu, *Zur Gesch. &c.* III. p. 15: the New Coll. codex seems to be not a copy from it but a much later copy from the same source).

¹ Used by Sintenis in the lives of Galba and Otho.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05681-6 - The Journal of Philology: Volume 21

Edited by William Aldis Wright, Ingram Bywater and Henry Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Representative of other distinct collections of more or less extent, opening with these ἠθικοί λόγοι, are Paris 1955 (Wytttenbach's C), Harleianus 5612 (see *Class. Rev.* III. p. 443), and Paris 1956 (Wytttenbach's D). As this MS and Cod. Vindob. 73 are both at least as early as the XIIth century and may belong to the XIth, the ἠθικά already at this date formed a distinct Corpus. Some or all of them also occur intermixed with other writings in a considerable number of codices, and other MSS contain a selection from the ἠθικά alone. It is or was Treu's opinion (and he is the best authority on the subject) that for the text of the ἠθικά both the Planudean Corpus and the Ambrosian Corpus may be dispensed with (*Zur Gesch.* &c. III. p. 28). This, I have no doubt, will prove to be the case¹, but at least they should not be dispensed with in favour of Paris 1956 (D), as has been done by the last editor of the *Moralia*, Bernardakis. D belongs to a class of very audaciously interpolated Manuscripts of which the (lost?) Codex Xylandri and Venetus 511 seem also to be examples (see Wytttenbach's critical note to 167 A)². D is an early MS and has its value in so far as it is a good representative of the

¹ It is impossible for scholars to form from published sources any independent judgment on this point. On the one hand the Planudean Corpus is only represented in our texts by Paris 1672 and 1671, whereas the two Ambrosian and Vatican codices are independent of, and very possibly better than, these, and for the Ambrosian Corpus we have only the imperfect collation of Coll. Nov. which was at Wytttenbach's disposal; on the other hand the Moscuenses and Harleiensis are known to us only from the collations made for Wytttenbach (if we except Matthaei's full collations of the Moscuenses in one or two treatises); and we are in entire ignorance as to the readings of the very early and important Vienna MS (73) except in so far as they reach us through Hercher's and

Bernardakis' collations of the Riccardianus which is a copy of it. If Mr Bernardakis is to make the critical edition which he promises us of real value, he will have to consult all these MSS for the ἠθικά. I find recently, on collating parts of Harleianus 5612, that it corresponds very closely with Mosc. 387.

² I am here speaking of the 'Ethica' only. In the *De Ei Delphico* and *De Defectu Oraculorum* D is not interpolated. It is our oldest and best authority for the text of these treatises, but even here Bernardakis has relied too exclusively on it and treats it with more deference than it deserves; e.g. p. 392 d ὁ τεχθής is the reading of the Corpus Planudeum; D gives ὁ τεχθής. The editor correctly writing ὁ τ' ἐχθής gives ὁ τεχθής as the MS reading.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05681-6 - The Journal of Philology: Volume 21

Edited by William Aldis Wright, Ingram Bywater and Henry Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S 'ETHICA.'

3

text where not interpolated, but this text does not very essentially differ from the text of the Corpus of the Ἠθικά as it reaches us through a different channel in the two large collections, the Ambrosian and Planudean Corpora. The acceptance by Bernardakis of D's interpolations 'en masse' has of course involved his attaching a fictitious value to its genuine variants. I have collated the New Coll. MS (representative, as I have said, of the Ambrosian) in some of the treatises, and in one or two cases it gives us a text free from those corruptions which have caused the interpolations of D (see below note on *De Adul. et Am.* xi. 55 f); but all the more serious corruptions which D professes to correct are common to the tradition of the two Corpora, and, as far as I can make out, to all other traditions. A future editor of the 'Ethica' will not be able to dispense with D, but he will only use it to reconstitute that Vulgate text on which its interpolations are grafted. I will here give one striking instance illustrating the merits of D; of its demerits we shall see only too much. It is a fragment of Sappho (fr. 27 Bergk) in the *De cohibenda Ira*, p. 456 e. The Vulgate is οὔσης οὐκ ἄμφω παραινεῖν δυναμένης ἐν στήθεσιν ὀργῆς πεφύλαχθαι γλῶσσαν μαψυλάκταν. D and the Codex Xylandri give ὡς ἡ Σαπφὼ παραινεῖ σκιδναμένης ἐν στήθεσιν ὀργῆς πεφ. γλ. μαψυλάκαν. This sounds right enough, but the reading of Coll. Nov. shows that σκιδναμένης is a correction of something which came nearer the original than the Vulgate δυναμένης. Coll. Nov. gives οὔσης ἄμφω παραινεῖν δυναμένοις ἐν στήθεσιν πεφύλαχθαι γλ. μαψυλάκαν. We should restore to Sappho σκυσοδομένοις ἐν στήθεσιν (vel στήθεσσι) πεφύλαχθαι γλῶσσαν μαψυλάκαν (I do not attempt to restore to metrical form; the fragment as it stood before could only be made metrical by transpositions). ὀργῆς is an interpolation older than D. We can trace the stages of corruption, παραινεῖ σκυσοδομένοις corrupted to παραινεῖ σκιδναμένοις—this corrupted in one instance to παραινεῖν δυναμένοις, corrected in another to παραινεῖ σκιδναμένης ὀργῆς. How the Vulgate παραινεῖν δυναμένης ὀργῆς arose I would not venture to suggest without further information as to the readings of the MSS. This passage as a whole shows D at its best.

1—2

It was my intention to go through the whole of the 'Ethica' and show that the interpolations of D have not only vitiated Hercher's and Bernardakis' texts, but have seriously affected the texts of Wytttenbach and Dübner, both of whom have, however, fought very shy of them; but the task of demonstrating the untrustworthiness of this MS has already been performed by a Danish scholar, Mr Larsen, in his *Studia critica in Plutarchi Moralia* (Copenhagen, 1889). At present, I would offer some remarks and suggestions relating to two of the treatises with which he there deals, the *De Adulatore et Amico* and the *De Amicorum Multitudine*. Of these two, the latter is in much the most unsatisfactory condition. It lent itself more readily to corruption, as it is obviously an immature work, in which the argument does not glide smoothly but takes rather awkward turns and jumps, perhaps necessitated by considerations of space or time. There are, however, no actual hiatus in the argument which would warrant us in supposing that an epitomator had been at work.

De Adulatore et Amico.

Ch. I. 49 *e—f*: ἀλλ' αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν αὐτῆς ἢ δὲ καὶ ποθοῦμενόν ἐστί. The article τὸ offends here and has been excluded by Vulcobius. The context shows that we should restore ὠφέλιμον for τὸ σεμνόν. The corruption is due to the occurrence of σεμνὸν immediately above and the similarity of uncials ωφέλιμον—τοσεμνον. Above I cannot understand why Reiske's τὸ φίλον for τὸν φίλον has not been accepted.

Ch. v. 51 *b*: ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ μάλιστα φιλίας ἀρχὴν συνέχον καὶ συνιστᾶνον ὁμοιότης ἐστίν. Is there any MS authority for banishing καὶ συνιστᾶνον with Hercher and Bernardakis? It should seemingly be corrected to συνιστᾶν. It is by no means equivalent to συνέχον, but a much stronger word συνέχον καὶ συνιστᾶν might be rendered 'holding together and solidifying.'

Ch. v. 51 *d*: τῶν θηρίων ὅσα πεφυκότα τὴν χροᾶν τρέπεσθαι συναφομοιοῦται τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ὑλήμασι καὶ χωρίοις. D for

NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S 'ETHICA.'

5

ὕλημασι substitutes χρώμασι which makes absolute nonsense ; for χρώμασι καὶ χωρίοις could only mean 'colours and colourless spaces,' and how can a beast, by change of colour, imitate a colourless background? it could only do so by making itself absolutely invisible. ὕλημασι καὶ χωρίοις is correct and apt. The beasts imitate the colours of the objects (leaves &c.) and spaces (the sky) behind them.

Ch. VI. 51 e: εἰδὼς οὖν ὁ κόλαξ ὅτι τῷ χαίρειν τοῖς ὁμοίοις καὶ τὸ χρῆσθαι καὶ ἀγαπᾶν ἐμφυτόν ἐστι ταύτη πρῶτον ἐπιχειρεῖ πλησιάζειν ἐκάστω καὶ παρασκηνοῦν, ὥσπερ ἐν τισὶ νομαῖς θηρίῳ, τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι—παραβάλλον καὶ προσαναχρῶννύμενος. The MSS give τὸ χαίρειν: the alteration of τὸ to τῷ is necessary, and I have made it. Larsen correctly restores θηρίῳ for θηρίου, and for ἐν τισὶ νομαῖς proposes ἐν ταῖς νομαῖς, but 'in pascuis' or 'in pascuis ejus' seems to me here to have very little, if any, meaning. We require some phrase which, in the case of the beast, corresponds to the τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι κτλ. in the case of the man. The most probable change which I can think of is ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ συννέμεσθαι θηρίῳ. The cause of the corruption is the loss of θαι before θη. συννόμαις was then written for the unintelligible συννέμες and τῷ συννόμαις got corrected to τισὶ νομαῖς.

Ch. VII. 52 f: πλείστοις ὁμιλήσαντες ἀνθρώποις καὶ πόλεσι καὶ βίοις τὸ προσήκον ἥθος αὐτοῖς πανταχοῦ καὶ στολῇ καὶ διαίτῃ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ βίῳ διεφύλαττον. Here βίῳ 'manner of life' cannot stand, as the στολή, διαίτη &c. are parts of the βίος. We should at least require καὶ τῷ σύμπαντι βίῳ or καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ βίῳ. It is more probable that βίῳ should be replaced by some other word such as πράξει or ἔργῳ, καὶ βίῳ being merely an echo of καὶ βίοις above.

Ch. IX. 53 f: ὁ δὲ βουλόμενος εἶναι καὶ δοκεῖν ὁμοίως ἡδὺς ἅμα καὶ πιστὸς [τοῖς χείροσι μᾶλλον ὑποκρίνεται χαίρειν] ὥς ὑπὸ τοῦ σφόδρα φιλεῖν οὐδὲ τὰ φαῦλα δυσχεραίνων κτλ. The words in brackets are the interpolation of D and need not be considered. It is evident that there is no lacuna between πιστὸς and ὥς which explains it, and the remedy must lie in the emendation of the preceding words. Far the simplest

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05681-6 - The Journal of Philology: Volume 21

Edited by William Aldis Wright, Ingram Bywater and Henry Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

change is to write ὅμοιος for ὁμοίως. "The man who is trying to be and seem like his model, is agreeable to the model and at the same time commands his confidence." This emendation has, I find, already been proposed by Schellens, *De hiatu in Plutarchi Moralibus* (1864), p. 38.

Ch. x. 54 c: ὑφίεται τῇ ὁμοιότητι τῆς ἰσότητος. I do not think that the phrase is impossible, as Larsen argues. τῇ ὁμοιότητι does not depend on ὑφίεται, but is equivalent to τῷ ὁμοιούσθαι or τῷ ὅμοιος εἶναι. "It is by his very resemblance, that he renounces his claim to equality." Larsen's suggested transposition of ὑφίεται and τῇ ὁμοιότητι gives a very weak sentence.

Ch. xi. 55 b: ἐφ' ἐν δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον ἄγων τὸν θεραπευόμενον. I cannot understand why ἐπὶ should here remain.

Ch. xii. 55 f: ἂν καὶ αὐτοὶ ταῦτὰ βουλόμενοι καὶ ζηλοῦντες μὴ μόνους ἡμᾶς ἀλλὰ πάντας ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις [ἐπαινῶσιν, ἂν] μὴ νῦν μὲν ταῦτα νῦν δὲ τὰναντία πράττοντες καὶ λέγοντες [φαίνονται]. The words in brackets are the interpolations of D (with the exception of ἂν before μὴ νῦν μὲν, which is, as we shall see, right, but may or may not have been found in his text by the interpolator). The remainder is the Vulgate text on which these interpolations are grafted. This is a very crucial instance of interpolation in D and sufficient in itself to discredit that MS. The passage is also of importance for the value of the New Coll. MS and its fellow or original, the Ambrosian. The correct text is given in Coll. Nov. and doubtless also in the Ambrosian. It is ἂν καὶ αὐτοὶ ταῦτὰ βουλόμενοι καὶ ζηλοῦντες, ἂν μὴ μόνους ἡμᾶς ἀλλὰ πάντας ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις, ἂν μὴ νῦν μὲν ταῦτα νῦν δὲ τὰναντία πράττοντας καὶ λέγοντας. It will be seen what nonsense D has made of the passage.

Ch. xii. 56 e: καὶ κρίνων καὶ τυμπάνων ἐγχαράξεις. καὶ κρίνων is given by Coll. Nov. and the Aldine and it would seem by F, Harl. 5660 and the Vossianus (at least I gather so much from Wyttenbach). It is absent from all the other MSS of which he had collations. As it is unintelligible, it is not likely to be an interpolation and should be retained or re-

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05681-6 - The Journal of Philology: Volume 21

Edited by William Aldis Wright, Ingram Bywater and Henry Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S 'ETHICA.'

7

formed, not excluded. There is no doubt that the juxtaposition of *κρίνα* (lilies) and *τύμπανα* in the Epigram of Dioscorides (*Anth. Pal.* VII. 485) is a mere accidental coincidence, and there can be equally little doubt that *κρίνων* here, associated as it is with *τυμπάνων*, should be corrected to *κέρνων*. Cp. *ἐκ τυμπάνου ἔφαγον, ἐκ κυμβάλου ἔπιον, ἐκερνοφόρησα* in Clem. Alex. p. 14 and Schol. in Plat. Gorg. 238, 46 (of course, as Lobeck has shown, referring not to the Eleusinian mysteries but to those of Rhea; see Hesychius s.v. *κέρνεα*). But we have not got much further; for a *κέρνος* was not an instrument but a vessel of some kind, and we cannot have *κέρνων ἐγχαράξεις*. I see no way out of the difficulty but to suppose a lacuna, e.g. *καὶ κέρνων <περιπομπὰς, καὶ κρούσεις κυμβάλων> καὶ τυμπάνων ἐγχαράξεις*.

Ibid.: ἥδη for ἦθη is given by Coll. Nov. *τηλικαῦτα* for *τηνικαῦτα* may or may not have MS authority, but there is no doubt that it is right: we require, however, *τὰ Ῥωμαίων ὄντ' ἥδη τηλικαῦτα*.

Ch. XIII. 57 b: *ἀλλοτρίῳ προσχρώμενος προσώπῳ*. This is no doubt correct, but the reading of Coll. Nov. *προσχώμενος* is noteworthy, suggesting, as it does, *ἀλλότριον προισχόμενος πρόσσωπον*.

Ch. XIV. 57 e: *ἂν δ' ἢ τις οἶόμενος πολλὸν ἔχειν νοῦν καὶ βουλόμενος αὐστηρὸς εἶναι—ἀεὶ προβάλλεται*. Coll. Nov. has *δή τις. καὶ* must couple *οἶόμενος* and *βουλόμενος*, not *ἢ* and *προβάλλεται*. We should, I think, read *ἂν δέ τις*.

Ch. XVI. 59 a: see Larsen p. 63. I would suggest that the passage should be written thus:—*εἴ τις ἀγρὸν ἐμελλεν ἐγκωμιάζων εἴφορον ποιεῖν καὶ εὐκαρπον, οὐκ ἂν δὴ ἀμαρτάνειν ἐδόκει τοῦτο ποιῶν μᾶλλον ἢ σκάπτων καὶ πράγματα ἔχων; οὐ τοίνυν οὐδ' ἄνθρωπον ἄτοπος ἂν εἴη ἐπαινῶν, εἰ τοῖς <ἐπαινοῦσιν ὁ> ἐπαινούμενος ὠφέλιμός ἐστι καὶ πᾶμφορος*. I substitute *τις* for *τὸν*, *δὴ* for *δὲ* (Coll. Nov.), *ἄνθρωπον* for *ἄνθρωπος*, and suppose that *ἐπαινοῦσιν ὁ* has dropped out before *ἐπαινούμενος*, which has, of course, in consequence been changed to *ἐπαινουμένοις*. *τις* supplies the subject for *ἐμελλεν* and for *ἂν εἴη*. We are relieved from the necessity of correcting *πᾶμφορος*, a word inapplicable to the praiser or his praise, but

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05681-6 - The Journal of Philology: Volume 21

Edited by William Aldis Wright, Ingram Bywater and Henry Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

very much to the point when applied to the object of praise. Finally, only by this means does Plutarch's criticism of Bion's cynical remark become intelligible. Mr Larsen had proposed a different restoration, but I am pleased to learn from him that he approves of that here proposed, with the insignificant exception of the *δὴ*, which he thinks objectionable owing to the hiatus. As however the passage is a quotation I have not withdrawn the *δὴ*, but of course it is not required.

Ch. xvii. 60 *a*: ὥσπερ οὖν εἴ τις ἀνθρώπου φύματα καὶ σύριγγας ἔχοντος κτλ. ἀνθρώπου is not given by Coll. Nov. and may well depart.

Ch. xviii. 60 *c*. Coll. Nov. gives, for παρρησιάζεσθαι, παρρησίᾳ χρῆσθαι, and omits φανερώς below—in both cases, as I think, rightly.

Ch. xix. 60 *d*: τῶν πλουσίων τινὰ ἀνελευθερώτατον καὶ φιλαργυρώτατον Ἀθήνησιν. Should we not restore τῶν πλουσίων τὸν ἀνελευθερώτατον καὶ φιλαργυρώτατον τῶν Ἀθήνησιν? [τινὰ τὸν Hercher.]

Ch. xix. 60 *f*: οὐ γὰρ αἰσθάνησαντο; καὶ σὺ τούτων αἷτιος κτλ.' The words should, I think, be thus written: γὰρ is quite graphic and appropriate, when used thus interrogatively in a lively protest. There is no reason for quarrelling with it as we might do (like Larsen), if we put no mark of interrogation. Below, on the contrary (p. 61 *a*), in ἡ μὲν γὰρ γυνή, γὰρ is probably due to the interpolator of D.

Ch. xxi. 62 *c*: καὶ τὸ οἰκεῖον ἐνδοθεν δοὺς ταῖς ὕψεσι. δοὺς here is given by Hercher and Bernardakis from some MS, and an aorist is required. The Vulgate is διδοὺς. Coll. Nov. gives διαδιδούς, from which we get the certain restoration διαδοὺς.

Ch. xxii. 62 *e*: Ἔστι μὲν οὖν καὶ ταῦτα δηλώματα τοῖς νοῦν ἔχουσιν οὐκ ἀληθινῆς φιλίας οὐδὲ σώφρονος ἀλλ' ἐταιρούσης καὶ περιπλεκομένης ἐτοιμότερον τῶν δεομένων. For τῶν δεομένων I should suggest τὸν δυνάμενον, i.e. 'potentem.' This at least gives the right sense: see Larsen's note on the passage.

Ch. xxii. 63 *c*: καὶ συναισθανόμενον, νῆ Δία, καὶ συνοργίζόμενον. D's *συνηδόμενον* for *συναισθανόμενον* is evidently

NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S 'ETHICA.'

9

a mere interpolation. There is a very large number of words which would be quite appropriate here and might be restored with some approach to plausibility if we regard *συναισθανόμενον* as a corruption in the uncial text, e.g. *συνακονόμενον*, *συνεκκαίόμενον*.

Ibid. 63 *e*: *ἦν δὲ ὁ ἔλεγχος ἐν ἐκείνῳ*, the Vulgate is right, and D's *γὰρ* (given by Hercher and Bernardakis) is wrong. The clause completes the narrative and makes it intelligible; if we read *γὰρ* it must refer to *ἐπέκρυψεν* and give the reason for Lakydes' action, but *ἦν γὰρ τὸ ἔλεγχος ἐν ἐκείνῳ* would certainly imply that Lakydes knew the importance of the ring from the outset, and this spoils the narrative.

Ch. XXIII. 64 *d*: I should re-write this passage thus: *οὕτως ὁ φίλος ἔσται τοιοῦτος <οἶος>, ἂν μὲν τις ἡ δαπάνην ἢ κίνδυνον ἢ πόνον ἔχουσα χρεία καταλαμβάνη, πρῶτος ἀξιούν καλεῖσθαι, καὶ μετέχειν ἀπροφασίστως καὶ προθύμως, ὅπου δὲ πρόσσεστιν αἰσχύνη μόνον, ἔαν καὶ φείδεσθαι παραιτούμενος. ἔσται* is Larsen's very neat substitute for *καὶ* of the MSS. *ἀξιούν* is my own substitute for *ἀξιῶν*. It does not seem to have been observed that *ἀξιῶν μετέχειν ἀπροφασίστως καὶ προθύμως* is an exceedingly awkward, if not unintelligible, phrase. We can say that a man bears another's burden *ἀπροφασίστως καὶ προθύμως*, but not that he asserts his right to bear it or thinks he should be allowed to bear it *ἀπροφασίστως καὶ προθύμως*. *παραιτούμενος*, as I read the sentence, means 'with apologies.'

Ch. XXIV. 65 *b*: *ὁ δὲ ψευδὴς καὶ νόθος καὶ ὑπόχαλκος ὦν. ὦν*, given by D alone, is again an interpolation and ruins the sentence, for we should, of course, understand *φίλος* here.

Ch. XXIV. 65 *e*: *τῶν μὲν γὰρ τόπων τὰ ὑψηλὰ δυσπρόσοδα—γίνεται τοῖς ἐπιβουλεύουσι τὸ δ' ἐν ψυχῇ νοῦν ἐχούσῃ δι' εὐτυχίαν ἢ δι' εὐφύϊαν ὕψος—τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ ταπεινοῖς μάλιστ' αἰσχύνην ἔστιν*. This, the reading of Coll. Nov., is, I have no doubt, right. The Vulgate is *νοῦν οὐκ ἐχούσῃ*. Plutarch has been citing the examples of Alexander and Demetrius. *τόποι* 'strong places' are compared and contrasted with *ψυχαι νοῦν ἔχουσαι* 'souls fortified by the presence of νοῦς.'

Ch. XXV. ad fin. 66 *e*: The reading of the Moscow MSS, Venet. 250, and Coll. Nov. is *αὐτὸς ἔοικεν ὁ λόγος [ὁ] τὸ ἐφεξῆς*

ἀπαιτῶν ὑποτιθέναι τῇ κορωνίδι τοῦ συγγράμματος, and this gives a good sense. 'Our argument itself, demanding, as it does, the examination of what is meant by *παρρησία* which follows, suggests this to our peroration as a suitable topic.' The remainder of this treatise—its *κορωνίς*—is a dissertation *Περὶ Παρρησίας*, which might have formed a separate work. Every *σύγγραμμα* necessarily had a *κορωνίς*, so we need not (with Larsen) make a difficulty about the mention of the *κορωνίς* as an already existing thing. It is, however, necessary, if we render the passage so, to omit the *ὁ* before *τὸ*. The reading peculiar to D, which will be found in Hercher's and Bernardakis' editions, is certainly more elegant and simple, and probably correct; but the Vulgate (omitting *ὁ*) is possible, and perhaps, considering the credentials of D, preferable.

Ch. xxvii. 68 *b*: αἰτίαν φιλίας ὥσπερ σόφισμα λαιδορίας προσφερόμενος. 'Nil in libris subsidii,' says Wyttenbach, who offers an explanation of the passage in his Annotations. Paris 1211 has, however, *προφερόμενος*, which Reiske had suggested, and Wyttenbach (in his critical notes) approved (Coll. Nov. has *ἐπιφερόμενος*). But, even with *προφερόμενος* 'making a pretext of,' what does the whole mean, and what is a *σόφισμα λαιδορίας*? It can only mean 'a dodge for introducing abuse,' and how can anyone be said to act under cover of the privilege of remonstrance allowed by friendship (*αἰτία φιλίας*), as if this privilege were a *σόφισμα λαιδορίας*? I should write the passage as follows:—ἐλευθέρα μὲν οὐδέποτε φωνῇ χρησάμενοι, ἐν δὲ τοῖς συμποσίοις καὶ τοῖς περιπάτοις ἐκάστοτε, πρὸς οὐδ' ἡντινοῦν σπουδὴν 'ἀλλ' ὅτι οἱ εἴσαιτο γελοῖον Ἀργείοισιν,' αἰτίαν φιλίας, ὥσπερ σόφισμα, λαιδορίᾳ συμποσφύροντες. This is probably not right, but the context below requires something of the kind. The sense at least is good. An *αἰτία*, a legitimate remonstrance, does not, like a *σόφισμα*, require abuse to support it. We might write *συμφύροντες*.

Ch. xxxii. 71 *d*: Ἀριστοφάνης δέ τινα τὸν Κλέωνα τοῦτ' ἐγκαλεῖν φησιν ὅτι 'ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγει' καὶ παροξύνει τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. Larsen corrects τοὺς Ἀθηναίους to τούτους Ἀθηναίους. It might be simpler to read