

MUSING ON THE NEW TEXT OF PHILOSTRATUS'  
*LIFE OF APOLLONIUS OF TYANA*

Gerard Boter: Critical Notes on Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2023 (Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare). VII, 317 pp. € 119.95/£ 109.50/\$ 131.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-124365-8.

Following his recent critical edition of Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii Tyanei* [henceforth Ap.],<sup>1</sup> based on a new, almost integral collation of all the surviving manuscripts, this complementary volume by Gerard Boter of "Critical Notes on Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*" offers a generous set of text-critical observations which aim to explain controversial passages and justify his subsequent editorial choices. The two books are the summa of decades of work on this text, formally begun in 2009 with a preparatory article (see note 2) on the textual tradition of Ap.

As for the book's content, the main corpus ("Critical Notes", pp. 27–282) is preceded by a brief introduction (pp. 1–21) which repeats in English the same select information about the textual tradition of Ap. (manuscripts, the indirect tradition, the modern editions) found in the Latin preface to the critical edition; both are firmly anchored in a couple of former preliminary studies published by the editor himself,<sup>2</sup> as regular references to, and repetitions from, these works show. There is a list of *sigla* (pp. 23–25) that repro-

- 1 G. Boter (ed.): Flavius Philostratus: *Vita Apollonii Tyanei*. Berlin/Boston 2022 (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana 2043). For clarity's sake I indicate with <1> those chapters of the Ap. which are not further divided into sub-paragraphs.
- 2 Id.: Towards a New Critical Edition of Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*: The Affiliation of the Manuscripts. In: K. Demoen/D. Praet (eds.): *Theios Sophistes. Essays on Flavius Philostratus' Vita Apollonii*. Leiden/Boston 2009 (Mnemosyne. Supplements 305), pp. 21–56; id.: Studies in the Textual Tradition of Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. In: RHT 9, 2014, pp. 1–49; id.: Editing Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. In: L. Ferroni (ed.): *Tempus quaerendi. Nouvelles expériences philologiques dans le domaine de la pensée de l'Antiquité tardive*. Paris 2019, pp. 35–57. The author also relies on the unpublished doctoral dissertation of E. Crisci: *Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta della Vita di Apollonio di Tiana di Filostrato*. Diss. Roma 1983.

duces the list in the critical edition.<sup>3</sup> The volume is completed by a bibliography (pp. 283–291), which is more select than that in the edition,<sup>4</sup> a summary Index of Subjects (pp. 292–293), of select Greek words (p. 294), of the passages discussed (pp. 295–299), and of other authors mentioned (pp. 300–316). A page of “Addenda et Corrigenda to the Teubner Edition of the *Vita Apollonii Tyane*” closes the work (p. 317).<sup>5</sup> The book is printed painstakingly.<sup>6</sup>

The editor knows twenty-nine manuscripts plus – indirectly – one, the formerly lost Vratislaviensis (Crac.VIII.16.2 = V, p. 1, n. 2).<sup>7</sup> Among these, he individuates six *conferendi* of a “primary status” (p. 1), which empower him to reconstruct the two hyparchetypes (x<sup>1</sup> and x<sup>2</sup>) through which the tradition and the Medieval history of the text developed (x<sup>1</sup> = A [S] and x<sup>2</sup> = E F C Q); quotations from Photius’ *Bibliotheca* and Suidas’ *Lexicon* belong to the

3 Boter: Vita (note 1), pp. LVI–LXIII. The *sigla* of the non-primary manuscripts are omitted (see note 21 below). Some inconsistency arises from the divergent abbreviations of “X<sup>ac1</sup>” = *X ante correctionem, a prima manu correctus* and “X<sup>1pc</sup>” = *X post correctionem, a prima manu correctus* (p. LVII): if there is a reason for the different collocation of the *manus* before and after the “ac/pc”-indication, this is not explained.

4 Ibid., pp. XXX–LV.

5 With a minor misprint of *προ* instead of ‘pro’.

6 I only noted a few typos: p. 59, sixth line from above, for 2.2 read 2.2.2; p. 71, eighth line from below, for “be a thirteen year old boy” read ‘by a thirteen-year-old boy’; p. 78, ninth line from above, for βούλη (twice) read βουλῆ; p. 80, twelfth line from below, for *adulteraverit* read *adulteraverit* (so correctly in C. G. Cobet: *Annotationes ad Philostratum. I. Ad vitam Apollonii Tyanensis*. In: *Mnemosyne* 8, 1859, pp. 117–181, p. 158); p. 218, third line from below, if I am not missing something, read ἐδεῖτο (which is the word *in textu*) for ἐδεήθη; p. 233 on 7.14.11 (p. 234.25–26), the quoted passage is deprived of the subject ἡ ζύνεσις (l. 20), necessary for the understanding of the sentence; p. 275, sixth line from below, for “we are suppose to infer” read ‘we are supposed to infer’. – P. 221 on 6.40.2 (p. 220.1) τροχῶ: according to Boter, “[t]he transmitted τροχῶ εἰκασμένος means ‘just like a wheel’”, but this is not accurate (as it is printed, the phrase means ‘just like a racing course’). In the apparatus(es) and in the discussion τροχός and τροχός are mistakenly confused: in Boter: Vita (note 1), p. 219 (= pp. 219.25–220.1) app. ad 23 τροχῶ εἰκασμένος A must read τροχῶ (as in fact in A; so F and Musurus, too; Q has no clear accent; I cannot check E); at p. 221 app. ad loc. <ἐν> τροχῶ Cobet must read <ἐν> τροχῶ Cobet (so correctly in Cobet [note 6], p. 140).

7 With Boter: Vita (note 1), p. LVI. On V see also G. Boter: The Codex Vratislaviensis of Philostratus’ *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. In: *Mnemosyne* 73, 2020, pp. 132–137.

second branch.<sup>8</sup> Of all these witnesses, only A and F preserve the text in full (the F-scholia are purported to derive from an annotated copy of Arethas, but Boter does not enquire into them in his work).<sup>9</sup> F “has all the appearance of a learned edition” (p. 101); likewise, A and E (*ibid.*).<sup>10</sup> E stops at 8.30.2 (p. 294.23) Κρή[τη]. Q starts at 4.25.3 (p. 128.1) ἔξωγράφει, but it originally contained the whole Ap.;<sup>11</sup> the value of S, a descendant of F (but not visible as such in the stemma), is limited to a small portion of text (8.7.10 [p. 265.17]–8.15.2 [p. 287.9] κ'Αργόθεν, where it breaks off), for which it becomes a brother of A (p. 2);<sup>12</sup> C contains three *excerpta* from the first book (1.1.1 [p. 1.1 οἱ τὸν Σάμιον]–1.3.1 [p. 4.9 καὶ αὐτός φησι]; 1.3.1 [p. 4.8 τε αὐτοῦ γέγραπεν (*sic*)]–1.9.2 [p. 9.21 ἔφη τοῦ ποιήσοντος]; 1.14.1 [p. 14.8 ὕμνος αὐτῷ τις ἐς]–1.16.1 [p. 16.15 ἀφώνους τε καί], p. 4, n. 18).<sup>13</sup> Conjectures in these manuscripts are abundant; often they are explained as emendations in the com-

- 8 Boter: Vita (note 1), pp. XIII–XV = p. 9–10, cf. Boter: Studies (note 2), pp. 38–45. As for the two main ‘indirect’ sources (Photius and Suidas), some of the statements are ambiguous and cause confusion if compared with other phrases and the stemma (p. 4): unless there is a mistake, “the source of Photius’ quotations from *VA* can be regarded as a gemellus of the lost common source of **F** and **Q**” (p. 9, cf. *ibid.* n. 29: “the source of Photius and the source of **FQ** ( $x^4$ ) are gemelli”) and “the source of the quotations in Suda is a gemellus of **C**” (p. 9) correspond to the simpler “Photius” and “Suda” in the stemma (p. 4 ~ Boter: Vita [note 1], p. XI), but the reader could get the ‘source’ confused with resp.  $x^3$  (source of Photius) and  $x^6$  (source of Suidas), given that at p. 3 the editor states “[t]he second branch of the second family is represented by the lost source ( $x^3$ ) of the excerpts in Photius” and that at p. 4 he says “( $x^6$ ) [...] was the source of the quotations in Suda”. Why not use a coherent and uniform phraseology? (The Latin *praeformatio* [Boter: Vita (note 1), p. IX] contains the same ambiguity). Moreover, the phrase “**F** (a gemellus of **C**)” (p. 9, n. 31) seems in contradiction with the stemma (Suda is a gemellus of C according to Boter’s stemma); Q is said to be “**F**’s gemellus” (p. 152), but the stemma shows a different relationship.
- 9 Boter: Vita (note 1), p. IX, cf. Boter: Studies (note 2), pp. 13–14 (following previous scholarship).
- 10 Cf. p. 2: “**A** has numerous variant readings [...] added by the scribe himself. [...] they are either due to comparison with other branches of the tradition [...] or to conjecture”; p. 4: “**E** and **F** have been intensively corrected by later hands (see Boter: Studies [note 2], pp. 4–8 and 12–14 respectively)”; p. 5: “[i]n **F(Q)** we regularly find probably authentic readings which appear to be due to deliberate change by the scribe”. See note 14 below.
- 11 Boter: Studies (note 2), p. 23.
- 12 Cf. Boter: Affiliation (note 2), pp. 43–44; Boter: Studies (note 2), pp. 8–9.
- 13 Note that “[c]omparison of **Q** and **C** is impossible” (p. 3, n. 17).

ments, but they are not explicitly pinpointed as such in the edition.<sup>14</sup> The (curiously Bédier-an) bipartite and constantly binary stemma<sup>15</sup> represents the relationships between these primary manuscripts, including Photius and Suidas; in it one would at least expect to find P and M, too, otherwise apographs of E but – as the editor himself states – necessary witnesses to retrieve the readings of E after its interruption (p. 3).<sup>16</sup> It must be noted that the stemma, as it stands, offers a false picture of the textual history of Ap.: aside from not exhibiting a chronological placement of the manuscripts, it fails to make explicit that the majority of the manuscripts are incomplete. On a more concrete level, the stemma drawn by the editor is not applicable

- 14 Some examples (I do not quote Boter's apparatus in the following): **1.1.1 (p. 1.4)** θῦσαι] <τοῦ> θῦσαι Suda ("obvious conjecture"); **1.16.1 (p. 16.15)** ἀφθόνους] ἀφθόνους A E FC, corr. A<sup>1mg</sup>; **1.28.1 (p. 29.8)** μαθών] παθών coni. A<sup>1sl</sup> ("conjecture by the scribe [...] or one of his predecessors", p. 2); **1.39.2 (p. 38.11)** δυοῖν ἡμέραι] ἡμερῶν A E, corr. F ("possibly the result of conjectural emendation"); **2.37.1 (p. 68.23)** ὑποκρινοῦνται] ὑποκρίνωνται A E: Boter, ὑποκρίναιντο F (it "may well be due to conjecture"); **3.18.<1> (p. 85.13)** προσέλθοι] <ἄν> προσέλθοι F (according to the editor, it is a conjectural normalization in this "learned edition" of F); **3.35.3 (p. 98.26)** αὐτό] αὐτό<ν> F ("a conscious correction of the type we find so often in F"); **4.13.1 (p. 117.2)** ἐτέραν μείζονα] μείζω ἐτέραν coni. F (an instance of F's "tendency at regularization", cf. 4.13.3 [p. 117.13] ὑπογέγραπτο E: ὑπεγέγραπτο fort. coni. F; **4.20.1 (p. 122.25)** ἀμαζῶν ᾄσμα] ἀναζώνασμα A, ἀμαζῶν ᾄσμα E<sup>ac2</sup>: Bentley, ἀμαζ<όν>ων ᾄσμα F, ἀμαζ<ών>ων ᾄσμα E<sup>2pc</sup> ("a conscious attempt to arrive at a text which gives intelligible Greek"). Further: 5.7.4 (p. 152.4) ἀναχωρήσειν] ἀναχωρήσαι A E, corr. FQ (it "may very well be a conjecture by the scribe of FQ"); 5.42.1 (p. 177.8) ἤτεν] ἤγεν A E, corr. FQ (one of the "most felicitous interventions" in FQ); 6.21.2 (p. 206.10) δικαιοσύνην] δικαιοσύνην <εῖναι> FQ ("a conscious attempt at improving the text"); 6.27.3 (p. 212.1) ἀπέχεσθαι] ἀπέχεσθε A E, corr. FQ ("FQ [...] accordingly conjectured" it); 7.14.8 (p. 233.21) κακὸν εἰπὼν ἐς [εἰπόντες A E FQ, corr. P] τὸ Ταντάλειον γεγόνε<ναι> [γέγονε A FQ, corr. E] πόμα ("[t]he correction of the latter is due to (a predecessor of) the scribe of E while the credits for the first correction go to Joannes Catrares, who made the majority of the corrections in Par.1696"). One should infer that "FQ" is the equivalent of x<sup>4</sup>, according to Boter's stemma.
- 15 Boter: Vita (note 1), p. XI = p. 4 (= Boter: Studies [note 2], p. 49): the stemma (p. 4) adds a numeration of the lost manuscripts (x<sup>1</sup>–x<sup>6</sup>) absent in Boter: Vita (note 1), p. XI. See J. Renart: *Le Lai de l'Ombre*. Ed. by J. Bédier. Paris 1913, pp. XX–XXVI; id.: *La tradition manuscrite du Lai de l'Ombre*. Réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes. In: Romania 54, 1928, pp. 161–196, with P. Maas: Textkritik. 4th edition. Leipzig 1960, p. 30 and J. Grier: Lachmann, Bédier and the Bipartite Stemma: Towards a Responsible Application of the Common-Error Method. In: RHT 18, 1988, pp. 263–278.
- 16 Cf. Boter: Vita (note 1), p. IX. The relationship EMP was totally revised and changed in Boter: Studies (note 2), pp. 45–48.

to even a single portion of the entire work: there is in fact no passage that is simultaneously transmitted by the totality of the witnesses. Moreover, a cursory hypothesis of contamination “between the primary witnesses” (p. 5) is proposed<sup>17</sup> without properly delving into the matter – as if this were a negligible fact (since the author quite surprisingly states that “the times of strict application of stemmatics are long gone” [ibid.], it is worth remembering that rigorous stemmatics is powerless vis-à-vis a contaminated tradition);<sup>18</sup> the lines of contamination are not signalled in the stemma on purpose.<sup>19</sup>

The remaining manuscripts U M B T [S] G L Y Z H P R V + 11 manuscripts with excerpts<sup>20</sup> are designated *descripti eliminandi*. “*Hic illi*” some of them (V, G, S, L, M, Y, P, R, U) are taken into consideration and reported in the apparatus for their supposedly correct or good (conjectural) readings.<sup>21</sup> The

17 Cf. Boter: Vita (note 1), pp. IX–X; see also T. Fernández: Review of Boter: Vita (note 1) in: BMCRev 2023.01.14, <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2023/2023.01.14/>.

18 Maas: Textkritik (note 15), p. 31.

19 Boter: Vita (note 1), p. X: *Contaminationes in stemmate lineolis interruptis, ut saepe fit, indicare nolui*.

20 Boter: Studies (note 2), pp. 27–37.

21 Boter: Vita (note 1), pp. LVI–LVII = pp. 23–24. These manuscripts are mentioned in the apparatus throughout by their full designation, which reduces the easy usability of the apparatus itself; the corresponding *sigla* (used in Boter: Affiliation [note 2] and Boter: Studies [note 2]) would have been more helpful: Crac.VIII.16.2 = V; Laur.plut. 69.26 = G; (Laur.CS.155 = S, see the main manuscripts); Lugd.73D = L; Marc.XI.29 = M; Marc.391 = Y; Par.1696 = P; Vat.1016 = R; Urb.119 = U. Accepted readings/conjectures found in the *descripti* are e.g. **1.21.3 (p. 23.2)** ζυμύτας R V (ζυμήτας A EF); **4.13.1 (p. 117.1)** ξυ<νε>μβάλειν] ξυμβάλειν E F: conl. S (“a correction by a later hand” in S); **7.2.2 (p. 222.23)** Αἰνίω] ἀνίω E FQ, νεάνια A, Αἰνίω P; **4.21.3 (p. 125.2)** ὑμῶν] ἡμῶν A E F, corr. M P (“in all probability a conjecture”; **8.26.2 (p. 293.6)** τὸ μὲν {μῆ} θύειν U V probb. Olearius et edd. (“omission”, or rather a deletion?). Among the readings not adopted in the text we find **1.25.2 (p. 27.23)** Ὀρφεῖς] ὀρφέως A E F, Ὀρφέας P, Bentley 679g1314: Bentley 678h8, Huet apud Kayser, *alii alia* (the editor accepts Bentley’s Ὀρφεῖς, but P anticipates the possibly correct text, later proposed by Bentley, too: the variation Ὀρφεύς + πολλὰ γὰρ is not wholly unwelcome, since it acts *pluralis instar* by varying the plurals Ἀνδρομέδαι καὶ Ἀμυμῶναι). Other conjectures in these manuscripts are found at e.g. **3.19.1 (p. 86.1)** ἥς] ἥσ<θον> A, ἥσ<θα> S (“in all probability a conjecture”, cf. 5.31.1 [p. 169.20]); **4.36.3 (p. 136.23)** ἔτι πλείον] ἐπὶ πλείον A E FQ: Boter, ἐπὶ πλείον<ι> S probb. Kayser et edd. (“a correction by a later hand” in S); **6.10.6 (p. 189.19)** Νέσσους] νέσους A E FQ, Νέσσους R Y (I think this is a conjecture); **6.11.5 (p. 191.5)** ἀνηρῆσθαι πᾶσαν] ἀνηρῆσθαι πᾶσαν <ἔλοιτο> P<sup>2sl</sup> unde ἀνηρῆσθαι πᾶσαν <ἄν> ἔλοιτο Kayser (“[t]he addi-

other manuscripts are altogether *comburendi, non conferendi*: the reader cannot but infer they offer no reading worthy of examination. No definitive stemma is given for all these manuscripts; since in the editorial process the stemma has undergone significant changes (we have already seen EMP [note 16], but the relationship between F and Q has also been reconsidered), a recapitulation – if not in the edition, at least in this book – would have been a welcome and useful addition.<sup>22</sup>

The few quotations of Ap. in Eusebius' *Against Hierocles* are to be retained *extra stemma* and exhibit valuable readings;<sup>23</sup> along with the collection of

tion of *ἔλοιτο* in Par.1696<sup>2sl</sup> is an obvious conjecture"); see also 7.14.10 (p. 234.14), 8.7.14 (p. 267.6), 8.7.17 (p. 268.11–12).

- 22 We find the relationships of some secondary manuscripts described in the relevant list (pp. 23–24).

- 23 Boter: Vita (note 1), pp. XII–XIII = p. 6, with Boter: Studies (note 2), pp. 37–38 ("it is quite possible that the ultimate source of our medieval tradition [...] is a *gemellus* of the manuscript used by Eusebius"). At 1.2.1 (p. 2.15) Eus. φιλοσοφία for σοφία of the archetype is convincingly defended by Boter; he also accepts Eusebius' reading κακία at 7.15.3 (p. 236.3–4), later found by conjecture in P, too: the archetype is corrupt (κακίω in E is probably inherited), as the different conjectural emendations in A <ὥς> κακίω and FQ κακίω<ν> suggest. At 1.7.2 (p. 7.13–14) the choice of διήκουε instead of διήκουσε in ω, also well argued by Boter, improves the meaning: the impf. διήκουε indicates a continuous and habitual process of learning; to this Epicurean learning Apollonius kept paying attention because he found it rather good – οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτους ἀπεσπούδαζε – until he finally found the best teaching for himself, that of Pythagoras; in τούτοις δέ γε Πυθαγορείους the strongly adversative combination δέ γε immediately highlights the philosophical breakthrough, in turn underlined by the 'effective' aor. (R. Kühner/B. Gerth: Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre. 2 vols. 3rd edition. Hannover/Leipzig 1898/1904, vol. 1, p. 157, n. 1) ξυνέλαβε: "and *he used to hear* Epicurus' words, too, for in fact he did not despise them, but it is those of Pythagoras that *he ended up grasping* by a certain unutterable wisdom", whereby the impf. stylistically and linguistically improves the text by means of the contrast with the aor. Eusebius offers a better text than ω at 2.29.1 (p. 62.2). A reading worthy of examination recurs at 1.20.3 (p. 21.16) ἔστι γὰρ τῶν Ἀραβίων ἥδη κοινὸν [κύκλων ἥδη Eus.] καὶ τῶν ὀρνέθων ἀκούειν μαντευομένων, ὅποσα οἱ χρησμοί, which must mean "it is by now an ordinary thing for the Arabs to understand the birds, too, which prophecy as many things as the oracles do" or, as Ch. P. Jones: Philostratus. Apollonius of Tyana, 2 vols. Cambridge, MA 2005 (Loeb Classical Library 16–17), vol. 1, p. 81 translates, "all Arabs share the ability to hear birds predicting everything that oracles do". ἥδη raises some difficulty and Boter does not explain precisely how he interprets it. The typical combination ἥδη καὶ normally stresses the correlation of a couple of similar aspects and the temporal adverb loses its force (cf. 1.22.2 [p. 24.3], 1.40.1 [p. 38.24], 2.5.3 [p. 43.8–9], 2.23.1 [p. 58.24],

4.44.2 [p. 143.12–13], 6.11.15 [p. 194.18], 6.26.1 [p. 210.12], 7.14.11 [p. 234.26]; among these cases one can also count 1.21.2 [p. 22.12] πρὸς θεῶν, εἶπεν τίς εἶ; λιπαρῶς [λιπαρῶν P<sup>1</sup>PC<sup>L</sup>] ἤδη καὶ μεταβαλὼν τοῦ τόνου, “‘Good gods, who are you?’, said he in a placid way and having changed a bit of [or: something in] his tone, too” [the gen. is partitive and is used instead of the acc. to suggest that the verb affects only a part of its object and not the whole of it: E. Schwyzler/A. Debrunner: Griechische Grammatik. Vol. 2: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik. München 1950 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2,1,2), pp. 102–103, with N. Basile: Sintassi storica del greco antico. Bari 1998 (Femio 4), pp. 237–240 and E. van Emde Boas/A. Rijksbaron/L. Huitink/M. de Bakker: The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek. Cambridge/New York 2019, § 30.25]; see by contrast, with temporal ἤδη and adverbial-emphatic καί, 6.11.14 (p. 194.8–9) and **2.15.2 (p. 52.19–20)** διελθὼν δὲ ὁ σμικρότατος {τὸ} ἄλυστον ἤδη καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνεύει (deletion mine), “as soon as the smallest [of the elephants] has crossed it [the river], he *immediately* interprets it [τὴν περᾶσιν] as without risk for the others, too”, i.e. “he signals it by now [from that very point onwards] as being safe for the others, too”). Eusebius’ text is corrupt, but the Medieval archetype seems also deficient; I wonder whether the original reading can be obtained by *combinatio*: ἔστι γὰρ τῶν Ἀραβίων κοινὸν <τῶν> κύκνων ἤδη καὶ τῶν ὀρνίθων ἀκούειν μαντευομένων, ὅποσα οἱ χρησμοί (the whole passage has to be compared with 3.9.<1> λέγονται δὲ καὶ ζώων ξυνιέναι φθεγγομένων τε καὶ βουλευομένων σιτούμενοι δράκοντος οἱ μὲν καρδίαν, οἱ δὲ ἥπαρ; the couple ‘swans and birds’ is thus composed by similar, yet not totally identical objects, and it cannot be excluded that ὀρνίθων is an intruded gloss or a simplification in the place of a series of specific oracular birds [e.g. τροχίλων, πελειᾶδων]; μαντευομένων seems odd with ἀκούειν and it ought to be attributive [cf. 6.27.1]: “for it is common for the Arabs to hear and understand [the cry of] the swans as also [of] the birds, which prophesy as many things as the oracles” [i.e. ‘to hear and understand the prophecies of the swans’]; for the oracular role of the birds, see e.g. Aristoph. Av. 716–724, with N. Dunbar: Aristophanes Birds. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Oxford 1995, ad loc.; for the divinatory, “musical”, and Apollinean nature of the swans, see e.g. Plat. Phaid. 84e–85b, with W. G. Arnott: Birds in the Ancient World. From A to Z. London/New York 2007, pp. 182–184; a connection with Libya is found at Aristot. hist. an. 615b). At **3.3.<1> (p. 74.9–10)** Eus. ὁσφύν for the transmitted μαζούς may represent the original: in the sentence γυναῖκα [...] τὰ μὲν ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἐς μαζοὺς μέλανι, τὰ δὲ ἐκ μαζῶν ἐς πόδας λευκά πάντα, the reading ὁσφύν is more subject to be altered into μαζούς in order to create symmetry between the upper and lower part of the woman’s body; who tells us black and white were distributed so symmetrically? And why should a very obvious phrase (ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἐς μαζοὺς [...] ἐκ μαζῶν ἐς πόδας) be altered into a more complex description with yet another anatomic region which is, incidentally, at almost the same body height? Her back may have been totally black, but the front already white from below the breast. See also 8.7.47 (p. 281.6) with Boter’s note.

Apollonius' *Epistles*,<sup>24</sup> they allow to cast but a little glance at an earlier stage of the transmission; other minor later quotations<sup>25</sup> are a tiny clue of the

- 24 Pp. 6–8 (p. 8: “[t]he source of the collection must be considered a gemellus of the archetype of the medieval mss. of *V<sub>A</sub>*”) = Boter: Vita (note 1), p. XIII. See e.g. p. 41 on 1.15.3 (p. 16.7), p. 124 on 3.51 (p. 106.16), pp. 151–153 on 4.27 (p. 130.5–6).
- 25 P. 10 with pp. 24–25 = Boter: Vita (note 1), p. XV with pp. LVIII–LIX (the reference editions are quoted here). A list:
- [Aristot.] mir. **1.6.1 (p. 6.7–12)** τοῦτο εὐόρκοις μὲν ἱλεῶν τε καὶ ἡδὺ ὕδωρ, ἐπιόρκοις δὲ παρὰ πόδας ἢ δίκῃ τοῦτο εὐόρκοις μὲν ἡδὺ τε καὶ ἱλεῶν κατέ [Aristot.] is actually good Greek: the word order is not decisive for ω and the archetype’s ὕδωρ is superfluous: τοῦτο is clear enough alone after the emphatic ὕδωρ at the beginning of the paragraph, in the sentence right before; there ὕδωρ states the topic of the digression and one cannot misunderstand; here ὕδωρ (perhaps a pedestrian, explanatory gloss or addition) may well have intruded into the text.
- Kedren. 1.13.2 (p. 13.4–6), **8.5.3 (p. 261.4–5),\*** 8.8.1 (p. 282.21–284.15), 8.27.1 (p. 293.12–19) (Boter uses Bekker’s edition, but see now Georgii Cedreni *historiarum compendium*. Ed. L. Tartaglia. 2 vols. Roma 2016 [Bollettino dei classici. Supplemento 30]).
- Alex. c. Julian. 6.9.1 (p. 187.13–14), 6.10.3 (p. 188.3–6), 6.23.1 (p. 209.2–4).
- schol. in Aristoph. Ran. 2.2.2 (p. 41.1–2).
- schol. in Lykophr. **5.11.1 (p. 153.22–23)** χαλεπήν] δεινήν schol. Lykophr.: the scholion quotes Ap. by giving Χάρυβδις its common Homeric epithet δεινή (Od. 12.260, 430, 23.327, Eur. Tro. 432 with Od. 12.235, A.R. 4.789): Boter credits it in the app. (“fortasse recte”), but the influx of the literary tradition may be the cause of the alteration. Albeit attractive, δεινήν seems a predictable error.
- Synk. 7.35.1 (p. 250.26–251.1), **8.5.3 (p. 261.4–5),\*** 8.27.1 (p. 293.12–19).
- Thom. Mag. 1.1.3 (p. 2.2–3), 1.21.2 (p. 22.16–17), 2.4.1 (p. 43.1).
- Tzetz. chil. 1.25.1 (p. 27.6–7) (Boter uses Ioannis Tzetzae *Historiae*. Ed. P. L. M. Leone. Napoli 1968 [Pubblicazioni dell’Istituto di Filologia Classica 1]; see now Ioannis Tzetzae *Historiae*. Ed. id. 2nd edition. Galatina 2007).



rather limited interest in the Ap. if compared to the many copies of the fifteenth century; the editor admits that “too occasionally [they] provide valuable information on the text” (p. 10).

No reconstruction or historical contextualization of the archetype ( $\omega$ ) is attempted.<sup>26</sup> We are only told that “the transmitted text of *V*A often is in need of correction” (p. 17). Some corruptions belong in the days of old, as we infer from errors shared by  $\omega$  and (the archetype of) the *Epistles*.<sup>27</sup> From Boter’s stemmatic reconstruction,  $\omega$  seems to be anterior to the ninth century: if we trust the stemma he assembled, we are induced to divine that  $x^3$  and  $x^2$  had been written before Photius’ death in 891; that  $x^6$ ,  $x^5$ ,  $x^4$ , in turn, predate Suidas; hence, that several manuscripts circulated (and two, one the father of the other, possibly in majuscule handwriting) at a time in which the

Tzetz. Ex.	3.18.1 (p. 85.17–18), 3.29.1 (p. 94.5), 4.16.6 (p. 120.17–19), 8.5.1 (p. 260.3–4), 8.31.3 (p. 296.8–11).
Tzetz. Schol. ad Exeg. in Il.	1.25.1 (p. 27.6–7), 1.16.1 (p. 16.16–18).
[Zon.]	1.7.1 (p. 6.16–17), 1.7.2 (p. 7.13), 1.13.3 (p. 13.16), 4.39.2 (p. 139.20–140.1).

\* As for **8.5.3 (p. 261.4–5)** οὐ γὰρ με κτενέεις, ἐπεὶ οὗτοι μὀρσιμός εἰμι, repeated at 8.8.1 (p. 282.20–21) and partially at 8.12.4 (p. 285.6–7) – along with Suda  $\mu$ 1262 μὀρσιμος: τοῦτο ἔφη Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Τυανεύς πρὸς Δομετιανὸν βασιλέα δεσμευθεὶς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ· οὐ μὲν με κτενέεις, ἐπεὶ οὗτοι μὀρσιμός εἰμι. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπόν ἄδηλος ἦρχετο, Synk. and Kedren. – see esp. Suda  $\delta$ 1352 τότε φασὶ καὶ τὸ πολυθρύλητον ἔπος εἰπεῖν τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον· οὐ μὲν με κτενέεις, ἐπεὶ οὗτοι μὀρσιμός εἰμι· ἄφαντον γενέσθαι παραχρῆμα (Synk. and Kedren. have nearly the same text) and Tzetz. chil. 2.60.296 καὶ ποτε πάλιν κρατηθεὶς σὺν ἄλλοις ἀστρολόγοις | πρὸς Δομετιανὸν εἶπεν εἰπόντα τοῦτον κτείνει· | οὐ μὲν με κτενέεις, ἐπεὶ οὗτοι μὀρσιμός εἰμι. These sources paraphrase Apollonius’ story (Suda  $\delta$ 1352, Synk., and Kedren. betray a lost common source – or do Synk./Kedren. derive from Suda  $\delta$ 1352 itself?). All these sources might quote Homer by heart, or from yet another source (an edition?); the same can be stated for any scribe who knew the “famous line” (πολυθρύλητον ἔπος). They bear no probative value for the reconstruction of the Homeric line in the three Ap. passages; corruption and inconsistency in the Homeric quotation was but to be expected in these late, quite erudite sources: as for γὰρ/μὲν, the *Iliad* paradosis is unanimous on the latter, which is by all means genuine, whereas Ap. requires the former to introduce the explanatory grand-finale of Apollonius’ speech (Kedren. may know and inherit some kind of Homeric gloss like μὲν = μὴν / μάν).

26 Boter: Affiliation (note 2), pp. 26–27 shows no attempt of a historical reconstruction.

27 Boter: Vita (note 1), p. XIII = p. 8, cf. **1.15.3 (p. 16.7)** ἑάσει] ἑάσω A E FC (=  $\omega$ ) Ap. Ty. Ep.: Reiske.

use of the minuscule letters was in its earliest stages. In conclusion, one would yearn for more historical information about this surprisingly intense interest in the Ap. in Constantinople in the ninth and tenth century CE (which would at least in part justify the contamination between the primary manuscripts). More attention is, instead, devoted to the editorial history of the text, i.e. to the predecessors of this new edition (the Aldine, Frédéric Morel, Gottfried Olearius, Karl Ludwig Kayser, Anton Westermann, Frederick C. Conybeare, and Christopher P. Jones editions, pp. 10–17).<sup>28</sup>

Elucidation of the textual choices followed in the critical edition of Ap. is given in the present book, ultimately devoted to the *examinatio*. The “Critical Notes” reproduce the text of Boter, Vita (note 1) and its apparatus (in a few instances with minor variations due to the presentation of the necessary manuscript material).<sup>29</sup> One delicate matter they face is Philostratus’ very personal and cultivated Greek: the editor declares himself ready to accept criticism in this regard (p. 17). In a cultural period such as the Imperial Sophistic, in which the degree of strictness towards the ideal of pure Attic language varied considerably from one author or work or genre to another – to such an extent that each exponent individually and creatively construed a personal Atticist attitude,<sup>30</sup> in a lively clash between a cultural debt towards the illustrious predecessors and the anxiety brought about by contemporary pressures –, “proper Greek” always remained “a mirage”.<sup>31</sup> The desire to elevate the ‘depraved’ Greek language to the highest level of beauty and ele-

28 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. XV–XIX (same material in brief).

29 I noted that at 3.1.1 [p. 73.3] Jackson’s excellent emendation βλῦζουσ<α>ι for βλῦζουσι is reported in the app. in Boter: Vita (note 1), but it is not discussed here: I would have introduced it into the text, since it balances προῖοῦσαι δέ and makes ναυσίποροι ἀντὶθεν (scil. εἰσὶν) the obvious predicative. At 3.24.3 (p. 90.4) ὑπόργγησα, for “ὑπουργῆσαι <ὑπεσχόμεν> Kayser” read ὑπουργῆσα<ι ὑπεσχόμεν> Kayser’.

30 E. L. Bowie: Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic. In: P&P 46, 1970, pp. 3–41; L. Kim: The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic. In: E. J. Bakker (ed.): A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language. Malden, MA/Oxford/Chichester 2010 (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), pp. 468–482 (at pp. 478–481); and G. Miles: Philostratus. In: D. S. Richter/W. A. Johnson (eds.): The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic. Oxford/New York 2017 (Oxford Handbooks), pp. 273–289 (at p. 275).

31 Kim (note 30), p. 478; see also Th. Schmitz: Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit. München 1997 (Zetemata 97), pp. 112–127.

gance of the classical prose writers<sup>32</sup> was in sum subordinate to the individual Atticist's eloquence determined *κατὰ τέχνην*, “by the rules of art”, and acquired by *παιδεία*.<sup>33</sup> Philostratus is an eminent figure in this panorama, but his skills as a writer have not yet been delved into as they deserve. It goes without saying that a modern study on the multifaceted and opulent Greek of Philostratus remains a *desideratum*: it is a thorough analysis of form that lays the solid foundations of a profitable, responsible, and reliable text-critical work which does not want to risk an aleatory or ephemeral result.

The peculiarities of Philostratus' language are purported to be dealt with in the specific introductory chapter on “Philostratus' *Graecitas*” (pp. 17–21);<sup>34</sup> de facto, this is a shortish compilation which – in the light of what has now been observed – cannot satisfy, nor can one condone these meagre five pages (in comparison with a book of 300 pages) on the basis of Wilhelm Schmid's monumental yet ultimately unsatisfying work on the *Atticismus*, a useful but largely untapped collection of linguistic material.<sup>35</sup> We are not given the modern scientific means to verify that “so und nur so kann der [Schriftsteller] geschrieben haben”.<sup>36</sup> Photius' (Bibl. 241.331a25–37, 44.9b21–24) and Schmid's<sup>37</sup> pictures of the writer's Greek are quoted by Botter insofar as they “have been of primary importance [...] when studying and establishing the text of *VA*” (p. 17). Karl Ludwig Kayser's introduction<sup>38</sup> is also quoted for its convenient yet insufficient catalogue of recurring syntactic features; a laconic list of examples from Philostratus' works, mainly

32 Kim (note 30), p. 471.

33 Schmitz (note 31), pp. 136–159; see also R. Webb: Schools and *Paideia*. In: Richter/Johnson (eds.): Handbook (note 30), pp. 139–153.

34 Cf. Botter: Vita (note 1), pp. XX–XXIV (almost the same material, but shorter).

35 W. Schmid: Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern, von Dionysius von Halicarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus. Vol. 4. Stuttgart 1896. See also L. de Lannoy: L'atticisme de Philostrate II. Atticisme linguistique et admiration pour le passé grec. In: H. Hokwerda (ed.): Constructions of Greek Past. Identity and Historical Consciousness from Antiquity to the Present. Groningen 2003, pp. 69–77.

36 P. Maas: Grammatische und metrische Umarbeitungen in der Überlieferung des Romanos. In: ByzZ 16, 1907, pp. 565–587, at p. 565 [= id.: Kleine Schriften. Ed. by W. Buchwald. München 1973, pp. 327–349, at p. 327], adapted.

37 Schmid (note 35), p. 597, with pp. 8–9.

38 Flavii Philostrati quae supersunt. Philostrati junioris imagines. Callistrati descriptiones. Ed. K. L. Kayser. Zürich 1844, pp. VII–VIII.

drawn from Kayser himself, serves to illustrate those peculiarities (p. 18, nn. 54–70); given the importance of novel morphology and, even more meaningfully, syntactical features, the Index of Subjects could have been richer in key-terms<sup>39</sup> and subcategories.<sup>40</sup>

The starting point of Boter's exegeses is his assertion that "we should be reluctant about rejecting the transmitted text in passages where we are bewildered by irregular syntax" (p. 20); as a consequence, the transmitted text is

39 For instance, different types of ellipsis leap out at the reader as a main feature, but they are not catalogued; 'ellipsis' does not appear in the Index of Subjects at all, nor does the category "omissions" (p. 292) refer to these. One often encounters a specific kind of ellipsis of the preposition before the relative pronoun in the relative clause when the antecedent already has the same or an analogous preposition ('Attic ellipsis', p. 81 on 2.30.1 [p. 62.21] and p. 84 on 2.35.1 [p. 66.24]). The same is true for the syntactical 'transitions' or changes of construction ('transition' does not appear in the Index of Subjects): the "transition to the accusative and infinitive construction without a verb of saying" is referred to at 2.2.2 (p. 40.21) ποτε ἐν codd., ποτέ φασιν ἐν Phot., but it is not mentioned as a feature of Philostratus' *usus scribendi* in the relevant section; the passage is aptly compared with 3.15.4 (p. 83.2–5); to this category seems to belong e.g. 3.24.2 (p. 89.25) λέγουσι δὴ μελεδωνοὶ μὲν εἶναι ληστῶν, δεῖσθαι δὲ μου μὴ ἀφελέσθαι αὐτοὺς τὸ τὴν ναῶν εἶναι. The transition from the direct to the indirect speech and vice versa is discussed at 6.12.1 (p. 197.2), where the indirect speech is in the infinitive (depending on the previous φάναι), and 8.31.1 (p. 295.20), where the optative of the indirect speech depends on an implied ἔφη ὅτι (see Index s.v. "direct/indirect speech", p. 292). At 2.28.2 (p. 61.22) ἀμαρτῶν τι ex ἀμαρτῶν τι A E scripsit Boter, ἀμαρτόν τι F (F is perhaps an attempt to regularise the faltering syntax; the construction is explained as "absolute nominative" instead of abs. gen. (cf. p. 19, n. 55 and Schmid [note 35], p. 114; in the Index of Subjects, it is listed as "syntax" [p. 293] without further specification). The Index does not mention the peculiar construction of the "Apposition in einen Adjektivsatz verwandelt" discussed at 7.20.1 (p. 238.24) on the basis of Kühner/Gerth (note 23), vol. 1, p. 286, n. 9.

40 For example, in the Index s.v. "particles" (p. 292) different uses of ἄν are listed indiscriminately: the 'Wiederholung' of ἄν discussed at 2.13.2 (p. 49.19); the very rare (and still very debated) ἄν + fut. inf. at 2.21.1 (p. 55.26) (reading of A) and 2.37.1 (p. 68.23) (Boter's conjecture); the treatment of ἄν + aor. subj. at 2.21.1 [p. 56.2–3], and esp. aor. subj. of γίγνομαι; at 3.2.1 (p. 73.23) the nom. + inf. pro acc. is even more interesting for the noteworthy ἄν + inf. = ἄν + opt. *potentialis*; the opt. *potentialis sine ἄν* is discussed at 3.18.<1> (p. 85.13) and 3.45.1 (p. 103.11); see also the *optativus urbanitatis sine ἄν* at 8.18.2 (p. 288.21); for the omission of the expected ἄν see also 3.44.<1> (p. 103.7); 7.21.1 (p. 239.14) ἄν + opt. in the conditional clause is a solecism supported by 4.38.2 (p. 138.4) ἔάν + opt. Other examples: the exceptional use of δὲ καὶ ~ δὲ αὖ at 3.1.1 (p. 73.3) is unmentioned in the Index; the "dominant participle" at 1.28.1 (p. 29.16) (Jackson's conjecture) is only signalled under "word order" (p. 293) in the Index.

always defended “as long as it seems to be possible to make sense of the syntax” (ibid.) and of the morphology (p. 17). Methodologically, Boter is wisely guided by the principle of anomaly against analogy – we should none the less bear in mind that both have their own right. He tends not to “run the risk of correcting the author”, who in terms of language “takes up a position of his own, by deliberately straining the rules of syntax” and introducing “deviant morphology” (ibid.).<sup>41</sup> By contrast, the editor is willing to adopt a number of conjectures (the most recurring names are Josephus Justus Scaliger, Richard Bentley, Johann Jacob Reiske, Friedrich Jacobs, Carel Gabriel Cobet, and John Jackson) with the idea that “[t]here are also cases where the transmitted text is grammatically and semantically possible but where a conjecture is far superior” and with the intent not to “save the transmitted text at all costs when a convincing conjecture is available”; he thus keeps “a middle course between conservatism and audacity” (p. 20).<sup>42</sup> In general, these assertions are by all means acceptable, but they remain on the surface and on a rather subjective level.

The editor of the Ap. has to cope with a refined literary work, linguistically complex in itself and accordingly subject, in its transmission, to any sort of

41 Peculiar phrases and solecisms are considered acceptable: **1.1.1 (p. 1.4)** καθαρεύου βρώσεως, ὁπόση ἐμψύχων, καὶ θῦσαι [<τοῦ> θῦσαι Suda, θυσίας Kayser] fits in with Philostratus’ idiosyncratic syntax; **1.19.1 (p. 19.14)** τὸ ἄγον εἰς ‘the road to’ “need not surprise us in an author like Philostratus”. **2.36.3 (p. 68.15)** καταδαρθέντες καταδαρθόντες Cobet, Jackson: the transmitted form can be acceptable, since this seems not to be isolated (cf. Schmid [note 35], p. 33 with G. N. Hatzidakis: Einleitung in die neu-griechische Grammatik. Leipzig 1892 [Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken 5], p. 178), but A.R. 2.1227 κατέδαρθεν (aor. ind. 3rd plur.) does not support it. **3.24.2 (p. 89.25)** ὁπότε ἐκείθεν ἄροιμι ἄροιμι Cobet: the manuscripts’ ἄροιμι is defended as a Philostratean intentional innovation; it might easily be a scribal error – perhaps a quite early one – due to a scribe’s limited knowledge of optative forms; other regular forms of the aor. opt. in Philostratus invite emendation, but the editor does “not dare to print” it “for fear of correcting the author” (he even proposes the attractive fut. opt. ἄροιμι, not recorded in the app. of Boter: Vita [note 1]; cf. Kühner/Gerth [note 23], vol. 1, p. 183; van Emde Boas et al. [note 23], § 41.9). **4.15.2 (p. 118.14)** δίδεις δίδης A : δίδει P<sup>2pc</sup>, cf. 4.32.1 (p. 133.6) περίεις παρίης A E F<sup>1sl</sup>, παρίεις FQ, corr. L (et coni. Reiske, Jacobs, περίει Cobet). **4.31.1 (p. 132.16–17)** Olearius’ ἔφη<σαν> is accepted as a hapax against the recurring ἔφασαν because “this [i.e. ἔφησαν] makes it easier to explain the corruption into ἔφη; if it is true that “the change was made (consciously or unconsciously) by a scribe who thought that the Corinthian addressed Apollonius and not the Spartans”, that alteration was equally likely to happen in both cases (ἔφησαν / ἔφασαν).

42 Cf. Boter: Vita (note 1), pp. LX–LXIII.

*Entstellungen* (here included not only the commoner scribal errors, but also clever conjectures and more trivial attempts at normalisation). Throughout the work the following crucial questions recur: to what extent are we inclined, to what extent and on what grounds are we allowed to justify, explain, and accept Philostratus' "experimental", "capricious", "deviating" Greek as such (p. 100, p. 126, p. 229 respectively),<sup>43</sup> and when – on the other hand – is a given trait "too harsh" even for him and it is thus likely due to a flaw in the textual transmission?<sup>44</sup> In a work in which the spectre of contamination hovers undisturbed and form is far from being secure(d), criticism can only be eclectic; good readings in the older quotations, as also the conjectures found in the manuscripts, corroborate this feeling. Even Paul Maas had to deviate from the *via ac ratio* when faced with a similar case:<sup>45</sup>

Gewisse Differenzen im Wert der einzelnen Hss sollen damit nicht bestritten werden. Zweifellos ist z. B. P weniger durch Korruptelen entstellt als etwa M und freier von Umarbeitungen als etwa Δ. Doch diese Differenzen verschwinden, sobald mehrere Hauptzeugen zusammengehen; in solchen Fällen liegt (*ceteris paribus*) die größere Wahrscheinlichkeit bei der durch die meisten Zeugen empfohlenen Lesart; bei Stimmgleichheit wird dann jede Wahl zur Willkür.

This seems to me to describe Boter's approach. It is a truism that we are not dealing with the text of Herodotus or Thucydides or Isocrates; in the case of Philostratus the answers that ensue from the aforementioned issues cannot be univocal: single textual choices cannot always find consensus, subject as they are to personal linguistic-stylistic sensibility and responsibility. The editor himself wavers at times,<sup>46</sup> wisely guided by the principle of not "im-

43 On the basis of 7.33.1 and 8.7.32, at 7.8.1 (p. 225.24) the last word of the sentence αἰ τι ὑπὲρ σωφροσύνης ἐπέστελλε τοῖς ἀνδράσι προσποιῶν αὐτοῖς τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ὡς χρηστοῖς should be changed into χρηστούς (with A and Scaliger, Reiske).

44 See e.g. pp. 54, 59, 163, 189, 196.

45 Maas: Umarbeitungen (note 36), p. 566, n. 2 [= id.: Schriften (note 36), pp. 327–328, n. 2].

46 Apart from the troublesome form of the name θεσπ<εσ>ίων = Thesp(es)ion (see pp. 203–205), a telling example is **5.10.1 (p. 153.7) σπουδάσαντες] σπουδάσαντας** A E FQ, corr. A<sup>1st</sup>: transition from acc. + inf. construction to *oratio recta* is a common feature of Philostratus' Greek (see note 39 above); here we find the same structure with σπουδάσαντας, *fortasse recte*, remarks the editor; but "because here the transition would be very harsh" the editor opts for the nom. σπουδάσαντες (probably a conjecture in A), "albeit with some doubt". At **7.19.<1> (p. 238.17–18) εἰ** + subj. is purported to be "strange even for Philostratus", but it is not altered into an opt. because "the change from an authentic φύγοιμι to a corrupt φύγω is very hard to

pos[ing] strict regularity on Philostratus” (p. 172).<sup>47</sup> He sifts the variants of the main manuscripts without adhering to stemmatic inflexibility,<sup>48</sup> which is

explain”; actually, the sequence ΦΥΤΟΙΜΙΜΕΝ can be easily misread or misremembered and ΦΥΤΩΜΕΝ would not be too a distant reading – but the editor is right to keep it: see Kühner/Gerth (note 23), vol. 2, p. 474, n. 1 for the possibility of its use as a genuine, perhaps poetically pathetic and archaising construction in prose (Thuk. 6.21.2 εἰ ξυστώσιν). At 8.7.31 (p. 274.5) σὲ γοῦν ἐπαινέει μὲν σώματος, ἐπαινέει δὲ γνώμης, εἰκὸς μὲν, οἶμαι, τι πράττων προθυμοτέρᾳ δ’ [γὰρ A<sup>1st</sup>] ὄντως [ὅς τως G, ἄλλως Jacobs, πως Reiske, αὔτως dubitanter Boter] ἢ ἀνθρωπείᾳ φύσει ἐπαινέειν, ἃ μὴ αὐτὴ ἔρρωται the editor is right in following the paradosis: γὰρ “may well be a conjecture” (or rather a simple explanatory gloss); the particle δέ, by contrast, is not a mere “additional explanation”; it nicely pairs μὲν by adding a further, more objective consideration (the commonplace, ὄντως) which is only remotely antithetical to the first, subjective thought (the personal opinion, εἰκὸς, οἶμαι); “it is reasonable, in my opinion [...], and actually / it is a matter of fact that [...]”. Modern conjectures are attractive (Boter does not comment on his idea at all), but they all seem to bleach the rhetoric of Apollonius’ apologetic and persuasive discourse.

The complex exegesis of 2.4.<1> (p. 42.1) φάσμα δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐμπούσης ἐνέπεσε τὸ δεῖνα γιγνομένη καὶ τὸ δεῖνα αὖ καὶ οὐδὲν εἶναι is not persuasive (the assumed “change from the construction with finite verbs into the infinitive construction” is said to be “harsh even for Philostratus because there is no verb of saying involved”, but it “need not bother us” because the “several meanings” it contains “seem to do justice to Philostratus’ elusive style”); a sentence governed by γιγνομένη, with the supplement of καὶ <οἷα> οὐδὲν εἶναι (a quasi-haplography from the original ΟΙΑΟΥΔ; see 5.11.2 [p. 153.9–10] Βίνδιξ ἀνὴρ οἷος ἐκτεμεῖν τὰς νευράς), “and which was one thing and again another and was able to be nothing”, or alternatively, although less easily, καὶ <ώστε> οὐδὲν εἶναι, “and which became now one thing and now another thing and/ even so as to be nothing”, seems not too haphazard a solution (for the elegant, perhaps poetically inspired, construction *kata synesin* at 2.2.2 (p. 40.21) φάσμα [...] ἐμπούσης [...] γιγνομένη see Kühner/Gerth [note 23], vol. 1, p. 58.5).

47 Cf. also p. 247. The transmitted text is defended at all costs against any normalizing conjecture at e.g. 3.31.3 (p. 95.26).

48 E.g. 2.24.<1> (p. 59.1) μαρμαρίτιδος A against μαργαρίτιδος E F, is very attractive and might well represent the archetype’s reading (it is hard to believe that it is due to conjecture), cf. [Phil. Byz.] Sept. orb. spect. 2.3.11 ἡ πέτρα λευκὴ καὶ μαρμαρίτις, 4.3.15 βάσιν ἐκ λευκῆς καὶ μαρμαρίτιδος πέτρας. Conversely, see 8.7.6 (p. 277.6) τῇ θρυλουμένη σοφίᾳ (not discussed in Boter 2023): Boter follows A F against θρυλλουμένη S E Q: θρυλλουμένη ought to be the archetype’s reading on the basis of his stemma; it is perfectly satisfactory, as confirmed by the manuscripts of e.g. Iul. c. Heracl. 15 (p. 34.3 Nesselrath) θρυλλουμένης θρυλου- Hertlein, p. 20 (p. 40.23 N.) θρυλλοῦσιν, In matr. deor. 9 (p. 66.17 N.) θρυλλουμένη, c. cyn. 6 (p. 87.2 N.) θρυλλοῦμεναι, 16 (p. 100.2 N.) θρυλλοῦντες, Caes. 4 (p. 111.1 N.) θρυλλοῦντες (θρυλλ- VM: θρυλ- A); Iambl. vita Pyth. 31.199 (p. 142.19 Nauck = 109.11 Deubner-Klein) θρυλλοῦμεναι FC seq. D.-K.: θρυλ- Westermann seq. Nauck, 32.227 (p. 158.9 Nauck = 122.6 D.-K.) θρυλλοῦμεναι FC seq. D.-K.: θρυλ- Westermann seq. Nauck. At 5.16.1 [p. 157.14] θρυλλοῦσιν A F seq. Boter, θρυλλοῦσιν E Q, we can be less certain, especially because the lines of con-

here acceptable not because stemmatics is a surpassed thing, but because the text of Philostratus and its history invite to do so. The editor's conservative approach leads him to defend the reading of the archetype against previous conjectures as far as possible – often appropriately;<sup>49</sup> the emendations, in

tamination are not explained and A seems to be involved in this process (its *θρυλῶσιν* can even be a banal scribal alteration).

- 49 A very ingenious and convincing exegesis of the transmitted text (A E vs. FQ and modern conjectures) is found at **5.7.3 (p. 151.3)**: the remark in the apparatus that the locus is *valde obscurus* does not do justice to the nice interpretation. Equally worth mentioning is the *Deutung der Überlieferung* at **6.13.4 (p. 198.18–20)** *εἰπέ* *εἰπέ* A, *εἰπε* E FQ, corr. Boter, with the attribution of the following words until *ὑπὲρ τοῦ ψεύδους* to Thespesion, which restores incisiveness to the dialogue between Apollonius and Thespesion without positing a gap (as happened from Kayser onwards). Some remarks about the defence of the paradosis: **1.10.1 (p. 10.4)** *καὶ λίθους ἐν αὐταῖς τῶν Ἰνδικωτάτων* [*Ἰνδικῶν* Reiske] *καὶ θαυμασίων* [i.e. *ὄντας*] is worth defence (Kühner/Gerth [note 23], vol. 1, p. 24, n. 2): it offers a very fine description which the positive adj. would obscure (the gen. is partitive); the superl. *θαυμασι<ωτάτ>ων* proposed by Boter seems, however, not fully necessary: “and on these golden plates [*αὐταῖς* = *χρυσίσαι*] (there were) precious stones which belonged to the most authentically Indian ones, and to the marvellous ones” makes good sense (Kühner/Gerth [note 23], vol. 1, pp. 371–372). **2.35.1 (p. 66.25)** *ἤρετο αὐτόν, ὃ τι ἐνεθυμῆτο* *ἐνθυμοῖτο* Kayser: the impf. is retained in the *oratio obliqua* instead of an opt. to avoid confusion between the corresponding *τί ἐνθυμῆ*; and *τί ἐνεθυμῶ*; in the *oratio recta* (Kühner/Gerth [note 23], vol. 2, p. 547, n. 1). **4.16.2 (p. 119.1–2)** *δεινός τε ὁρώμενος οὐκ ἐξηλλάττετο* [*ἐξήλαττε* Kayser] *τοῦ φαιδροῦ*, “although terrible, he experienced no changes in his beaming aspect”: for the meaning of the middle, cf. Soph. Aj. 474. At **6.16.1 (p. 199.23–200.2)** Boter's *ἔστ[α]ι* is not fully necessary: the “reference to a well-known concept” [namely Plat. rep. 10.617e4–5 *αἰτία ἐλομένου*, which Boter translates “if (as we know from Plato) there is the onus of responsibility by the one who makes it”], may not only be expressed as a statement of fact, but it can also be adapted to, and embedded in, the receiving context (“If – as wrote Plato – there must/can be some degree of guilt if one chooses, probably there is also guilt if one does not choose”, whereby the fut. indic. expressing expectation [Kühner/Gerth (note 23), vol. 1, pp. 173–176] goes well, and perhaps better than the pres. indic., with the indefinite *τις* and the subsequent dubitative adverb *τάχα*). At **7.2.2 (p. 222.20)** *ὁ μὲν τύραννος [...]* *αὐτὸν ζῶντα προσήγαγε τοῖς τέχεσιν, ὡς μὴ βάλλοιεν* [*βάλλοιεν* E : *βάλοιεν* A FQ] *οἱ Πηγῖνοι τὸ μηχανήμα* the archetype's reading can be retained if rephrased into fut. opt. *βαλοῖεν* [Kühner/Gerth (note 23), vol. 1, pp. 183–184, vol 2, pp. 372–374 (esp. n. 2)]; in the following sentence (*ὁ δὲ ἐβόα βάλλειν*, “but he kept shouting: ‘strike!’”), the pres. inf. appropriately indicates the simultaneity between the two actions. At **7.14.11 (p. 234.25–26)** the text seems sound: *τοῦ φόβου* is gen. *causae*, i.e. it states the reason from which or for which a feeling (*πτοίας*) arises: “but [their conscience] makes their faint and fantastic terror(s) true and plausible because of the fear [they provoke in these people]” (cf. 6.11.1 *ὁ δὲ ἐπαινέσας αὐτὸν τῆς εὐροίας καὶ τοῦ τόνου*, “and he praised him for his fluent eloquence and his vigorous tension”).



turn, are selected with fine discernment throughout, both when they are printed in the text and when they bear a diagnostic value.<sup>50</sup> All in all, although

- 50 One example of a beautiful conjecture by Boter is **5.17.<1> (p. 158.2)**. Johannes Pierson's conjecture at **2.32.2 (p. 65.13)** εἰλξαν] εἶρξαν (sic) A F, ἥρξαν (sic) E, which recovers a plausible meaning, is hardly "palmary": this form of the aor. [= εἰλκυσ-], as also the equivalent form εἰλξ-, is rare (only found in [Hom.] Batr. 115) and late (Galen, otherwise in Byzantine works); εἶρξ- is far more common: the corruption seems to be more complicated than shown (perhaps due to a lacuna, or to a wrong reading of e.g. τὸν δὲ εἶσω κηφῆνα περιτετεῖχ<ισμέν>ον, "they shut the drone up inside walled all around", i.e. he was immured alive) and the text bound to remain dubious: ἥπερ τὸ τεῖχος εἶρξαν†. In place of Jackson's deletion at **1.33.1 (p. 32.17)** ὥκησας ἄν {ἄρα}, Kayser's transposition ἄρ' ἄν ὥκησας has the merit to preserve the patent rhetorical tone of the question: Apollonius implies the obvious "of course not!"-answer from the king, who in fact does not make his "no" explicit (ὥκησας ἄρα; οὐ Salmasius, Gruter), but catalogues the many necessary conditions ("εἰ μὴ [...] γὰρ" for him to dwell the place. Apollonius' reply to the king's invitation could easily have been a "no, it is too lavish for me"; the brief conversation now leads him to explain the reason of his unuttered no to the king by contrasting and capsizing the case (ὁ αὐτὸς οὖν [...] καὶ παρ' ἐμοῦ λόγος). The passage thus results as highly rhetorically composed. At **2.36.2 (p. 68.4)** ἄλλοσέ ποι μάλλον εἶναι ἢ οὐπὲρ εἰσι δοκοῦσιν (εἰσιν ἢ οὐπὲρ εἶναι δ. AEF) "[t]he corruption is easily explained as an attempt to remove the hyperbaton εἶναι ... δοκοῦσιν" – or rather as a mnemonic error in a 'tongue-twist' string of text. Boter's conjecture at **4.14.<1> (p. 117.20)** "χρᾶν scripsi praeunte Jacobs qui 'geweissagt' vertit (χαίρειν A E F) seems not necessary and its explanation ("the circumstances under which Orpheus prophesied were far from joyful") weak: the oracle could be seen as an honour to rejoice in (the same phrase recurs – in a different yet quite illuminating passage – at 3.42.1 [p. 101.24] οἱ μαντικῇ [...] χαίροντες [...] θεοὶ τε ὑπ' αὐτῆς γίνονται καὶ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀνθρώπων πράττουσι); χρᾶν is, if ever, diagnostic. Boter's correction at **4.38.1 (p. 137.23)** ἔπειθ' ἡγεμόνας αὐτοὺς ποιῆσθαι, ὥνπερ ἴων γὰρ A E FQ: Boter, <θε>ων γὰρ Jacobs| χωρὶς οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐσμέν, is less convincing than Jacobs' conjecture, by no means less easy to explain: -ΘΑΙΘΕ /θεθε/ was easily subject to haplography; the final gnomic sentence is appropriately introduced by θεῶν in emphatic position.

Some food for thought: **1.13.3 (p. 13.20)**. The fact that "it seems a statistical anomaly that the word should have been corrupted in three of its five occurrences in *VA*" is no text-critical criterion and proves nothing about the correctness of a reading or a conjecture (admittedly, at p. 72 Boter refers to a similar "remarkable" phenomenon, i.e. the loss and the subsequent conjectural restoration of the preverb ἀν(α)- in three close-range passages, without hesitation). There are three verbs at play (ἀπο-σκόπτειν εἰς/πρὸς τινα "jeer at one", ἐπι-σκόπτειν τινα "make fun of one", and ἐπι-κόπτειν τι/τινα "cut down", "cut short", "reprove, censure") in seven occurrences. I am ready to defend the paradosis at **4.44.3 (p. 144.1–2)** ταυτὶ δὲ πρὸς Τιγίλλινον ἀπο-σκόπτων ἔλεγεν, "he said so by *ironically alluding* to Tigellinus", and **8.22.<1> (p. 290.24–26)** διαβαλλόντων δ' αὐτὸν ἐνίω, ὅτι [...], καὶ τινος ἀποσκόψαντος μετελάνειν αὐτὸν τὰ πρόβατα, "some people accused him of the fact that [...], and one guy *made ironical allusion* to the fact that he used to drive the cattle to fresh pasture [...]" – in both cases there is analogy at work in the "allusive" words of the speakers –, but not

one may every now and then prefer a different solution, no textual choice appears unfounded or absurd; notwithstanding, room is left for more doubts and discussion: even if one may concur with the editor in the face of what may be called Philostratean eccentricities, a group of aberrations or unclear phrases could still instil the reasonable doubt of a corruption; a number of faltering sentences printed in the text but signalled as ‘dubious’ or ‘suspect’ in the apparatus suggest that anomaly in all probability conceals a fault in the transmission. In these instances the editor opts not to condemn them optically by *obeloi* for a “‘principle of charity’” (p. 20), but on occasion one actu-

as peacefully at 4.25.5 (p. 128.19–20) καὶ που καὶ ἀπέσκωπτε [ἐπέσκωπτε *vel* ἀπέσκωπτε <εἰς> Reiske] τοὺς φιλοσόφους, ὡς αἰεὶ ληροῦντας, “and she *scoffed*, I think, at the philosophers, believing that they always talk foolish nonsense”, where I would be more confident to adopt Reiske’s ἐπέσκωπτε (no allusive discourse; but see Lukian. Herm. 51); there seems to be no irony nor mockery at all at 5.26.1 (p. 163.12) τοῦτοις ἐπέσκωπτε [ἐπέκοπτε Reiske, Cobet] τὸν Αἰγύπτιον ὡς ἀμαθῆ τῶν θεῶν, “with this argumentation he [Apollonius] *scoffed at* the Egyptian [minister of the cult] considering him unlearned in the divine things” (Apollonius rather seems to be “censuring” and “cutting him down to size”, “deeming him unlearned in theology”); an analogous situation is found at 5.35.5 (p. 171.19–20), where ἐπικόψας is supported by 4.44.3; ἐπικόπτειν = “cut short” fits for 8.7.26 (p. 271.24), ἐπικόπτειν = “cut down” (the concrete, corporal mutilation becomes metaphorical, i.e. “cut down to size”, “stop”) for 7.14.11 (p. 234.22–23) more than the transmitted ἐπισκώπτειν (οὐδὲ γὰρ χεῖρα αἶρειν ζυγῶραι ἐς τὰ ἀγάλματα, ἀλλ’ ἐπισκώπτει [ἐπικόπτει conl. P<sup>pc</sup>, Salm., Btl., Cobet] αἶροντας, ὥσπερ τοὺς ἐπανατεινομένους οἱ νόμοι, “it [= ἡ ζῆνσις, their conscience] does not tolerate that they raise their hand to the statues of the gods, but it *cuts them down* as soon as they lift them, just like the laws *do* with the rebels”), especially because of the comparison with the laws, where a concrete ἐπικόπτειν, “cutting down”, is to be understood; 1.13.3 seems to me to require Reiske’s and Cobet’s ἐπέκοπτε, too, for the same reason I regard it as necessary at 5.26.1 (“he [Euphrates] was at a variance with Apollonius because this man *reproved* him [tried to *cut him down to size*] for doing everything for money and tried to divert him from transacting business for himself and selling his wisdom by retail”), cf. e.g. 2.26.2. At 7.23.2 (p. 241.27–28) Boter accepts Reiske’s deletions πλούτος [...] τοὺς ἄρχοντας παλεῖ δουλούμενο {υ}ς τοῖς χρήμασιν ἢ ὑπερορῶν {τας} αὐτῶν διὰ τὴν ἰσχὺν τοῦ πλούτου, which may well be correct (cf. 4.40.3 δεσπόται μὲν ὑπερορῶντες δούλων), although the phrase τοῦ πλούτου seems too excessively redundant, unpleasant, and unnecessary a repetition (perhaps διὰ τὴν ἰσχὺν or διὰ τὴν ἰσχὺν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ was glossed and later expanded or replaced; “wealth well-nigh slaps the governors [...], enslaving them to the goods or despising them by reason of its own (brutal) might”). At 8.25.1 (p. 291.26) Olearius’ conjecture hits the mark and restores the historical truth; corruption of ἀδελφιδῆν into ἀδελφὴν can be “easily explained” (n. 233), but the question arises whether this is a proper scribal error or, rather, Philostratus’ blunder due to the homonymy of the two figures (the mother, Flavia Domitilla Minor, and her daughter, resp. Domitian’s sister and niece).

ally has the impression that he only managed to reach a temporary, unsatisfactory compromise.<sup>51</sup>

- 51 Along with 1.30.<1> (p. 31.3–4), 3.20.2 (p. 86.25–87.1), 3.54.<1> (p. 107.12), 4.16.6 (p. 121.2), 5.7.3 (p. 151.3), 5.7.3 (p. 151.5–6), 6.11.5 (p. 191.1), 6.16.3 (p. 200.11), 7.2.2 (p. 223.3), 8.30.2 (p. 295.3), which I cannot discuss in more depth, the following dubious or suspect passages will suffice as examples: **1.23.1 (p. 24.11)** for ἐλεεινοὶ ὄντες Reiske proposed ἐλεαίνοντες (Boter finds the passage “suspectus” without clarifying the reason of his doubt: actually, the transmitted phrase is quite poetic and pathetic, cf. Hom. Il. 24.309, 504, Od. 6.327, 19.257, Aischyl. Prom. 246, as also Plat. and the orators: ἐλεεινοὶ ὄντες, ὥσπερ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ ἐν τῇ ξένῃ κλαίοντες, “who are to be pitied / who are piteous like those men who cry in a foreign land”). **1.23.2 (p. 25.1)** μόνου suspectum: τοῦτου Allan; Boter has “no suggestions for emendation”, but μόνου might simply mean “without others near”, “the only one”, “alone”, cf. 1.24.1 ἡ χώρα δὲ ἀπολις· ἡ γὰρ Κισσία κῶμαι πᾶσα and ἡ δὲ τῶν Ἐρετριέων οἰκεῖται μὲν τῶν ἄλλων μέση, περιβέβληται δὲ ποταμοῦ τάφρον. **3.12.<1> (p. 79.26)** τοῦτο μὲν οὐπω θαυμαστόν δόξει διὰ τὸ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ κώμῃ πάντας ἀπὸ Ἑλλήνων φθέγγεσθαι (ἀπὸ Ἑλλήνων φθέγγεσθαι *suspectum habet* Jones, ὅπα Reiske, <τὰ> ἀπὸ Jackson): “the meaning [...] is clear, ‘to speak Greek’, but the use of ἀπὸ in this sense seems to be unparalleled. [...] I think we will have to accept the phrase as one of the numerous linguistic innovations by Philostratus” because the reported conjectures do not satisfy. One wonders here (as elsewhere) whether solecism is a synonym of innovation and viceversa; something like διὰ τὸ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ κώμῃ πάντας ἀπὸ <γλώσσης (vel στόματος) τὰ> Ἑλλήνων φθέγγεσθαι, “because of the fact that everyone in the village used to speak Greek by word of mouth” (i.e. without proper education, by oral learning, or simply orally, not in a written culture) could be restored (cf. Pind. O. 6.13 with G. O. Hutchinson: Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces. Oxford 2001, p. 382; Thgn. 265, Soph. Oid. K. 936, Anth. Pal. 9.571.4 with Ap. 6.4.2 [p. 183.15–16] ὅποσα τοῦ στόματος ὡς φθεγγόμενου and 5.36.5 [p. 173.23–27] ἐλληνίζοντας μὲν Ἑλληνικῶν ἀρχεῖν, ῥωμαίζοντας δὲ ὁμογλώττων καὶ ξυμφώνων [...] ἡ γὰρ τοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀνθρώπος οὐκ εἰδὼς τὰ Ἑλλήνων, καὶ οὐδ’ οἱ Ἑλληνέες τι ἐκείνου ξυνέεσαν). At **3.15.4 (p. 83.1–2)** μαλακώτερον δὲ τίκτει the editor is “far from happy” with the text printed; the alternative punctuation (μαλακώτερον δὲ τίκτει) and interpretation creates a syntax that “strains even Philostratus’ experimental syntax”. Boter concludes that “the text may well be corrupt”, as it in fact is, probably to a greater degree than posited. As it stands, the text is unsatisfactory and should probably be signalled as such more bravely by *obeloi*. As for ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ λείβεσθαι see 8.7.17 (p. 268.8–9) τοῦ λειβομένου ἀπ’ αὐτῆς [scil. κόμης] μύρου, on dripping plants see 5.5.1 (p. 148.21) [δένδρα] λείβεσθαι δὲ αἶματι. At the beginning, in ἡ δὲ ὕλη τῆς ἐσθῆτος, ἔριον αὐτοφυές ἡ γῆ φύει the phrase ἡ γῆ φύει seems to me an intruded gloss for αὐτοφυές: for the word, see 5.7.2 (p. 150.14) and 8.18.3 (p. 289.5–6). One could write ἡ δὲ ὕλη τῆς ἐσθῆτος ἔριον αὐτοφυές {ἡ γῆ φύει}, λευκὸν μὲν ὥσπερ τὸ Παμφύλων, μαλακώτερον δὲ τίκτει ἡ πιμελὴ οἷα ἔλαιον ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ λείβουσα [λείβεσθαι codd.], “the material of their clothing is a sort of naturally self-grown wool, white like the Pamphylian one, but the greasy substance which drips from it and resembles olive oil produces it softer [scil. than the Pamphylian]”. The transmitted τοῦτο ἱερὰν ἐσθῆτα ποιοῦνται, “this they make a sacred clothing for themselves”, sounds like a bare repetition of the initial sentence; something more

meaningful is obtained by assuming a pregnant meaning for the middle of ποιέω (s.v. III ποιέω. In: LSJ, pp. 1427–1429), “this they consider a sacred clothing”, whence “because of this [white, soft, and natural wool] they deem their clothing sacred”, <διὰ> τοῦτο ἱερὰν <τὴν> ἐσθῆτα ποιοῦνται, or even τοῦτο ἱερὰν <τὴν> ἐσθῆτα ποιεῖται καὶ εἴ τις ἕτερος παρὰ τοὺς Ἰνδοὺς τούτους ἀνασπύη αὐτό, οὐ μεθίεται ἢ γῆ τοῦ ἐρίου, “this [natural wool with a vital lymph inside] makes their clothing sacred and in the case anyone beyond these Indians drew it up, the earth does not let go hold of the wool”. **4.39.1 (p. 139.17–18)** καὶ τινα καὶ νευράν τῶν ἐφαψαμένων τε καὶ προεντεταμένων ἐν κυτίδι εἶχεν: we would expect the string τῶν–προεντεταμένων to be put between *obeloi* since “it is difficult to see what the words can mean”; in fact the editor “would be happy to delete the phrase”, and he “cannot think of a plausible conjecture either”; one could boldly hazard a rewriting such as καὶ τινα καὶ νευράν τινος ἐφαψαμένου {τε} καὶ πρό<σθ>εν <ἐπι>τεταμένην ἐν κυτίδι εἶχεν, “and in a small trunk he had a certain string of a certain owner, too, which had already been stretched (to the uttermost) formerly” (cf. e.g. Aristot. probl. 920b3, Lukian. Nigr. 36 ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν σφόδρα τὰς νευράς ἐπιτείναντες εὐτονώτερον τοῦ δέοντος ἀφιᾶσιν, Joh. Chrys. hom. 4.2 ὁ κιθαριστής οὐτε ἐπιτείνει τὴν νευράν, ἵνα μὴ διαρρήξῃ) but it is clear that the text is far from being recoverable to a credible degree. The only passage *varie temptatus* but conveniently and explicitly deemed irrecoverable by *obeloi* is **6.3.1 (p. 181.3)** καὶ ναῦν δὲ ἡρῶν ἄτοπον ἔκκεκτο καὶ ἐναυκλήρει ἐν τῷ Νεῖλῳ (conjecturing ἡρῶν πρότερον [cf. And. 3.2, Pol. 3.30.1] = Lat. *iam ante*, would produce a simple text that makes good sense with the ppf. = impf. [he has acquired = he possessed], although its corruption can-not be very easily explained: “and [δέ] he already possessed a ship, too [καί], previously and [now] with it he used to do business on the Nile”, i.e. he was ἔμπορος, see e.g. Aristoph. Av. 594, 598 with Ap. 6.13.2). Other passages, although not marked as problematic in the edition, emerge as equally dubious from the editor’s comments: **2.29.2 (p. 62.14–15)** καὶ παιδίον εἴ τις παρεγγράφοι {το}, {ἦ} οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅ τι ἐπὶ τούτῳ, is maybe too optimistically reconstructed, as the comment itself betrays (p. 81): the emended text makes sense, but the editor seems not to be entirely convinced, especially because of the extant letters TOH/τοη (he suggests που, “perhaps”, “I suppose”, but we would expect this either to come earlier in the subordinate sentence, or to be presented with an alternative: καὶ παιδίον εἴ τις παρεγγράφοι που, ἢ οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅ τι ἐπὶ τούτῳ, “and [the same] if a kid is inscribed among the citizens, I suppose – or I do not know what in this situation”). The edition shows resolve on the text; more cautiously, I would write παρεγγράψοιτο, ἦ, thus suggesting to the reader that those letters contain a corruption so far unsolved (maybe <ταῦ>τό, ἦ, “the same – or I do not know what in this situation”, suggesting that false testimony, mendacity, or even perjury in the case of oaths such as the Ephebic Oath had several degrees of gravity, of which the speaker is not fully aware). **4.32.2 (p. 133.20)** εἰ δὲ ἡ ἐμπορία πρὸς τὰ χρέα μὴ ἀναφέροιτο, μεταβάντες εἰς τὰ ἐφόλκια προσαρτάττουσι τὰς ναῦς καὶ τὸν ἐτέρων {ναῦται} βίον θεοῦ ἀνάγκην εἰπόντες ἀθεώτατα καὶ οὐδὲ ἄκοντες αὐτοὶ ἀφείλοντο (among other conjectures, the editor decides to follow Kayser in deleting the puzzling word, but he “would be happy to find another solution”; perhaps a trivial correction into τὸν ἐτέρων ναυτῶν βίον, “the sustenance of other seamen”, or rather a transposition of ναῦται in order to obtain the meaning of “like seamen”, (i.e. as is typical of seamen) or “albeit seamen”; one could venture the following attempt: καὶ τὸν ἐτέρων {ναῦται} βίον θεοῦ ἀνάγκην εἰπόντες ἀθεώτατα καὶ <ναῦται (ὄντες)> οὐδὲ ἄκοντες αὐτοὶ ἀφείλοντο,

Choices made in textual criticism ultimately serve a contingent matter, namely the presentation of the tradition and the exegetical work done on it in a critical text. Dissent and criticism regarding single portions of a text is only to be expected in any work of ἔκδοσις. Boter's exegesis serves to interpret well, and better than analogy would do, the most controversial passages of a long, complex, and Protean work such as *Ap.*; in so doing, it paves the way for future treatments of this highbrow piece of literature and manifesto of Hellenising propaganda, written to promote the essential principles of Hellenism and to stimulate pondering over the genuine roots of Greekness.

“and [they] deliberately took away the sustenance of others (i.e. other sailors) – even though they themselves were sailors – saying, in the most unholy wise, it was necessity imposed by a god”. **7.42.3 (p. 256.26)** καίτοι τετραγώνως ἔχοντα [scil. τὴν ῥῖνα], καθάπερ τῶν ἑρμῶν οἱ γεγυμνασμένοι, meaning something like “herms of athletic form” (Jones) or “well-formed herms”, remains an “enigmatic” phrase. The word γεγυμνασμένοι is suspect, as various emendations demonstrate: I wonder whether τετυγμένοι, “well-wrought”, is a fitting term (see e.g. Hom. Il. 16.225 δέπας, Od. 22.335 βωμός, Mosch. 2.54 Gow χρυσοῦ δὲ τετυγμένος αὐτὸς ἔην Ζεὺς), which could in turn conceal an allusion to the famous Sim. PMG 542.1–3 = fr. 260.1–3 Poltera ἄνδρ’ ἀγαθὸν [...] τετράγωνον ἄνευ ψόγου τετυγμένον (quoted by Plat. Prot. 339b, 344a, and Iul. Caes. 34).

---

Antonio Tibiletti, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen  
Seminar für Klassische Philologie  
Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter  
antonio.tibiletti@uni-goettingen.de

**www.plekos.de**

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Antonio Tibiletti: Musing on the New Text of Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Rezension zu: Gerard Boter: Critical Notes on Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2023 (Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare). In: Plekos 26, 2024, S. 439–459 (URL: <https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2024/r-boter.pdf>).

Lizenz: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND

---