

*Philopatris*

1. μή που Τρικάρανον τεθέασαι ἡ Ἐκάτην ἐξ Ἑιδου ἐληλυθυῖαν, ἢ καί τι θεῶν ἐκ προνοίας συνήνηκας; These questions are asked because Kritias is looking pale and disturbed. In his edition<sup>1</sup> Anastasi rightly rejects such translations as *ex dei providentia* or *consulto*, as «dando così alla frase un senso diverso da quello, che essa richiede», and meets the problem by inserting <οὐ> before ἐκ. But «have you met some god unintentionally?» implies that a mortal could meet one by appointment, and in any case does not provide an expected alternative to the sight of Cerberus or Hekate. A better contrast would be with one or more of the Olympians. Such a sense could be restored by changing ἐκ προνοίας to <τῶν> ἐκ προνάου. *LSJ* helpfully tells us who such gods might be: Athene, Hermes, Poseidon, Apollo. For this use of ἐκ one may consult K-G l. 546. 448a, adding to the list there Soph. *OT* 1051. Alternatively one could insert <τῶν ἄνω> in front of θεῶν. In that case one would have to assume that the πρόνοια belonged to the gods and not to Kritias, and at first sight comparison with Timarion 2 might make such an explanation colourable: θεία τις ἐπικουρήσασα πρόνοια τήν τε ὁδὸν εὐμάρησε. But that intervention was benevolent, and the language is unambiguous in telling us whose πρόνοια is being referred to.

6. τὸν Ποσειδῶνα δὲ τίς δς οὖν τρίαιναν ἐν ταῖν χερσὶν κρατῶν καὶ διάτορόν τι καὶ καταπλήκτικον βοᾶι ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ὅσον ἐννεάχιλιοι ἀνέρες ἢ δεκαχίλιοι, ἄλλα καὶ σεισίχθων, ὧ Τριεφῶν, ἐπονομάζεται. Such is Anastasi's text. The later edition of Macleoud in the Oxford text series relieves us of the necessity of dwelling at length on the impossibility of δς οὖν, though it does mention something in Vat. gr. 1322 which could not be accounted for if the true text were simply ὅς followed immediately by τρίαιναν. With that in mind we confront the problem of how to justify the «but also» of ἀλλὰ καί. The simplest way out of our difficulty is to write δς οὐ <μόνον> τρίαιναν.

29 πλοῦτος γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἐκλείψει καὶ ἔθνος ἡμᾶς οὐ καταπτοήσει. There is some doubt over the second verb, but apparently none over its subject: «l'infedele». However, the use of this noun to denote «pagans» seems, to judge from the evidence in Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, to be confined to the plural. Ambiguity would be banished, and palaeography gratified, by καὶ <ὄθνεϊον> ἔθνος.

<sup>1</sup> Incerti auctoris, Φιλόπατρις ἡ διδασκόμενος, recensuit praefatus est Rosarius Anastasi, Roma 1968.

## Hippocrates *Epidem.* VII

3.3 λήθη δέ τις τοιαύτη· ἐρώτησας ὃ τι πύθοιτο, μικρὸν καὶ διαλιπὼν, πάλιν ἠρώτα καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῖς ὡς οὐκ εἶη εἰρηκῶς. «... et pretendait après cela qu'il n'avait pas parlé». So Jouanna in the recent Budé edition, who reviews (p. 185) all possible interpretations, rightly protesting that the traditional 'as though he had not spoken' «ne correspond pas au texte». True, but faced with the choice of acquiescing in such elaborate explanations as «le malade disait qu'on ne lui avait pas répondu», or, even more elaborately, «l'idée est que quand il répétait sa question, on le lui faisait remarquer; à quoi il répondait qu' il n'avait rien dit» or emending the text to give the more obvious, traditional sense, I should prefer the latter: ὡς οὐκ ἤδη εἰρηκῶς.

8.1 γένυες δὲ ξυνηγμέναι· καὶ ἑωτοῦς ὀδόντας πλέον ἢ μήλην παρεῖναι οὐκ ἦν. «Les mâchoires étaient serrées et il n'était pas possible que les dents se relâchent d'une distance plus grande que l'épaisseur d'une sonde». So Jouanna, who explains that the subject of παρεῖναι is ὀδόντας, and ἑωτούς is «complément d'objet direct de παρεῖναι». This is a valiant attempt to deal with the Greek, but a strained one. We might have expected the sentence to begin γένυες δὲ ξυνηγμέναι ἑαυταῖς. «The jaws were clamped together, and it was not possible for the teeth to let more than a spatula get past them».

110.1 Ἀρίστωνι, δακτύλου ποδὸς ἠλκωμένου ξὺν πυρετῶι, ἀσάφεια. «Chez Ariston, alors qu'un doigt de pied était ulcéré avec fièvre, il eut perte de netteté dans la parole». Jouanna rightly comments «du point de vue médicale, la "perte de netteté dans la parole" est assez surprenante; on ne voit pas le lien avec la gangrene du pied». True: but incoherence and fever go well enough together. Repunctuate as ἠλκωμένου, ξὺν πυρετῶι ἀσάφεια.

117.1 καὶ ποτε καὶ ἔλμις δι' αὐτοῦ διῆλθεν ἀδρή· καὶ ἔφη, ὅτε πυρέξειε, χολώδεα ὅτι καὶ αὐτὰ ταύτη διήιει. «L'emploi de πυρέξειε est tout à fait singulier». ἔφη should not be followed by ὅτι, nor do patients in Hippocrates give an account of their own symptoms like this. We may add that «whenever he had fever» is a curiously casual first mention of fever, and the optative, presumably of a repetitive action, is also very difficult to account for following, as it does, the ποτε ... διῆλθεν «once there came». We might begin by replacing πυρέξειε with πάρεξ ἦι, describing the movement of the worm; and as for ἔφη, read ἐφ<άν>η. The translation will be «Once even a sizeable worm came through it, and as it emerged bilious matter was seen because that too came out this way» (or

possibly ταύτηι, in the same way, by the same route). The word order χολώδεα ὅτι is now normal.

### George Pachymeres

The following notes relate to Boissonade's Paris edition of 1848, reprinted by Hakkert, Amsterdam 1966. At times it may be that what are here advanced as emendations are no more than minor corrections of misprints, such as we find on p. 113 (last line) μένος for μόνος; p. 143 Χαρδία; p. 147 Σώλωνι; p. 157 ἔσοφρονιζόμεν; p. 196 πλαμμέλημα; p. 202 ἄνθρωπον; p. 213 παὶ for καὶ, and this *caveat* applies particularly to the first note below.

p. 8 καὶ ὅτι μὲν ἐστὶ τυραννὶς λέγει, κάμοι προσάπτει τὸ ἔγκλημα· τί δὲ τὸ παριστῶν με τὰ τῶν τυράννων φρονεῖν οὐκ ἔχει παράγειν, κἂν διαρραγείη λέγων ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος.. Punctuate as τί δέ; τὸ παριστῶν ...

p. 9 It is as if you were to accuse of treason one who, from great good will, kept watch over the city at night in case the enemy got in unobserved through the negligence of the guards. ἀλλ' οὐτ', οἶμαι, δύσνους ἐκεῖνος ταῦτα ποιῶν· οὐτ' ἐγὼ τυραννικοῦ φρονήματος ἐγκλειθείην, ὅτι πανοπλίας ἐκτώμην ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως. The person who watches over the city is a theoretical, not a real, figure, and since his actions have already been described as originating ἐξ πολλῆς εὐνοίας the question whether he is δύσνους in so watching has already been answered. Read δύσνους ἐκεῖνος <ὁ> ταῦτα ποιῶν. I am no more δύσνους than that person. Thereafter ἐγκλείθην <ἄν>, subject to the reservations expressed below in the note on p. 225.

p. 11 ἀλλὰ τί γε ἄλλα τὸ ἐπιρκοῦς ἂν πρὸς τυραννίδος ἐπίθεσιν. «Num ἂν εἶη?» asks Boissonade. Past tenses follow explaining that the speaker had in fact no such aspirations. That being so, we might prefer to settle for the palaeographically easier ἂν <ῆν> .

p. 13 εἶδετέ ποτε, βέλτιστοι, δίχα βουλής καὶ δορυφόρων καὶ τοῦ πλουτεῖν τύραννον; Boissonade eloquently remarks «Tyrannus, sine senatu, quid mirum?». Less eloquently he suggests ἐπιβουλής. Better would be λώβης, which gives a contrast with ἡμερον in the next sentence, and is what you might expect from a tyrant: cf. Plat. *Gorg.* 473 c.

p. 18 καὶ ὑμεῖς μὲν ταῦτα συνοίδατέ μοι, καὶ ἐπὶ καιροῦ μαρτυρήσατε. Perhaps just a misprint, but in any event read μαρτυρήσετε, agreeing with the idea in the previous paragraph, πάντας ὁμοῦ παραστήσομαι μάρτυρας.

p. 34 καὶ οὐκ ἐπεψηφίζεσθέ μοι τὰ γέρα καὶ δωρέας οὐ μικράς; ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἶμαι πολλῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἔργων με ἐκαλεῖτε ἄν εὐεργέτην. Boissonade conjectured οὐκ οἶμαι πολλῶι δέω (did he mean πολλοῦ?) or οἶμαι πολλῶι μᾶλλον, ἀλλά, giving a strange «much more, but». Let us give our indignation freer rein, and write οὐκ οἶμαι μὰ Ἄπόλλω, ἀλλά...

p. 41 πρῶτως σχεδὸν ὄρω δικαστήριον καὶ δικαστὰς καθημένους καὶ συνηγόρους καὶ κατηγορούς, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς τάξεως, οὐς οὐκ ἐξεγένετό μοι βλέπειν συχνάκις. It is close to nonsense to say that he is seeing as for the first time a court which he had not seen often before; but it would not be nonsense to say that he had seldom seen so many people in court (or the reference may be solely to τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς τάξεως) as now. Not οὐς then, but ὄσους.

p. 44 οὐ ξενόν μοι δέ τι γενήσεται, εἰ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐπαινοίμην παρ' ὧν πολλάκις εἰδόντων ἐδεχόμην τὸν ἔπαινον. Boissonade suggested ἰδόντων. I would prefer εἰκότως, which suits οὐ ξένον as well as the ἀγάσσονται ὡς εἰκός which is shortly to come. The very last words of this speech (p. 58) are καὶ τὸν ζωγράφον, ὡς εἰκός, ἐπαινήσετε.

p. 59 οὐκ οἶδα ποίαις προφάσεσι κινηθεῖς καὶ τί παθῶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἦν πάντες θρυλλεῖτε νίκην καὶ ἐλευθερίαν τῆς πόλεως, καὶ οὐκ οἶδα εἰ δάκνει τοῦτον αὐτή. The demonstrative αὐτή is called for.

p. 80 The speaker declares he is willing to die, with honour, for his country. τί φατέ; γνώμης ταῦτα κακῆς; γνώμης δολίας πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα; καὶ εἰ ψυχῆς ἐθελοκάλου ταῦτα, σχολῆι γ' ἄν ἕτεροί τινα καλοκαγαθίας ἔσται γνωρίσματα. The rhetoric, and logic, plainly require ἐθελοκάκου.

p. 83 In the strange world of these declamations there is a law requiring three days deliberation before going to war. But the news is bad, and the need pressing. καὶ δὴ πάντες μὲν πρὸς τὴν δεινὴν ταύτην ἀγγελίαν τεθήπασι ... περὶ δ' αὐτοῦ πότε καὶ πῶς ἡμῖν ἐξιτέον εἰς πόλεμον there is dispute. What is αὐτοῦ? Either we must have αὐτοῦ τοῦ «but as for the actual when and how...», or more simply just redivide as περὶ δ' αὐ τοῦ...

p. 85 καὶ οἶδα μὲν λόγον λέγων, ὃν οὐδ' ὑμῶν τινες καταδέξαντο· ὅμως ἔστω τοῦτο. It seems unlikely that «some of you» have *already* refused to accept the arguments now being voiced shortly after the receipt of bad news. καταδέξαιντ' ἄν was more to be expected or just καταδέξαιντο: see on p. 225.

p. 106 The subject of the declamation is to be the prosecutor's speech in a case where a hero of the state, having solicited and been granted as his reward the death of a citizen, is revealed as having already taken advantage of this peculiar privilege, ὅθεν οὐκ ἔχων ἐπαινεῖν τοῦτον τὴν πράξιν (presumably double accusative if sound) ἐπαινῶ τὴν διάνοιαν, ὅτι οὕτω τὴν αἴτησιν μετεχείρισεν. The plain statement ἐπαινῶ is contrary to the whole tenor of the prosecutor's speech. Either we must write <πῶς> ἐπαινῶ, or else just content ourselves with a question mark after μετεχείρισεν.

pp. 126-27 ἐξεκέχυντο γὰρ τῶν κλισιῶν ἕκαστος οὐκ ἀνειμένως καὶ μάτην, ἀλλ' ὄπλοις στερροῖς κατάφρακτος, καὶ δόρυ κινῶν, καὶ μέλπων Ἄρη, καὶ φοβερὸν ἀναβαίνων ἵππου.

Boissonade is unworried by the plural verb with ἕκαστος, but wonders why the following participles are singular. But would not ἕκαστος ... κατάφρακτοι be stranger still? If change is called for, it costs little to write ἐξεκέχυντο. But what of φοβερὸν? Boissonade grimly notes «Codex sic». Now the word σοβαρόν would suit the context, and is used of horses; so we might think of σοβαροῦ ... ἵππου or σοβαρόν ... ἵππων. But it is also used of song (*LSJ* s.v. II. 2), and this opens up a more attractive line of restoration: καὶ μέλπων Ἄρη σοβαρόν, καὶ ἀναβαίνων ἵππου. At this point it might be objected that, if the words καὶ φοβερὸν are to be reversed, we might as well keep φοβερὸν. But observe that the spirited note being struck by a σοβαρόν is an excellent introduction to the words which follow, καὶ σὺν γενναίῳ καὶ ἀρεϊκῶι φρονήματι, and if there had been at any time confusion in the text between σοβαρόν and φοβερὸν, writing one word above the other by way of correction could easily have led to a subsequent confusion of word order.

At the end of the paragraph we read, as a conclusion to an account of a rout of their own troops, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἦν ἄνωθεν συχνὰ τὰ ριπτούμενα, κἄν ὑπερέσχον κατὰ κράτος, καὶ τι καὶ τῶν δεινοτάτων ἐγένετο. The text may be sound, but what has already been described qualifies as «very terrible». The author may have intended to convey that even worse things might have happened: i. e. καὶ τι καὶ τῶν δεινοτέρων.

p. 152 καὶ τὰ ἐντεῦθεν τίς ἂν ἐξειπεῖν ἰσχύσοι. If the form is permissible in this author, who commonly uses -ειε terminations, read ἰσχύσαι. Alternatively ἰσχύσει: «Cum futuro ἄν non repudiandum» - Boissonade p. 81 n. 2.

p. 183 τί γοῦν σαυτὸν οὐκ ἔλλεβορίζεις, καί, φοιτῶν ἐς νομοτρίβων, μανθάνεις νόμον ἀκρίβειαν. It is not possible to construe the double accusative, so therefore read either νόμου or, more likely, νόμων.

p. 219 ἄφες ἐπ' ἀδείας θρηνεῖν με τὴν συμφορὰν. ἀναλόγισαι μὲν ἐθέλεις καὶ τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς φύσεως· ἀναλόγισαι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀνάγκην τοῦ στήναι τὰ αἴσχιστα. ἐθέλεις cannot be construed, surrounded as it is by imperatives. The addition of an iota will do the trick: ε<ι> θέλεις.

p. 221 Ἴνατι τοίνυν οὗτος καὶ ζήσεται; ἴνα τὰ πατρὸς ἔργα περιῶν ἐκεῖνος μιμήσεται; ἀλλ' οὐ προσεῖχεν οὐδ' ὄλως. ἀλλ' ἴνα χρήσιμος ἐκεῖνος φανείη; ἀλλ' εἰς τοῦτο σκοποῦντες ἐνουθετοῦμεν... There is no justification for the optative. A subjunctive parallel to μιμήσεται will give us φανῆι.

p. 225 διὰ τοῦτο φθάνω τελέσας ἐγὼ ἃ πᾶς καὶ ἄλλος δικαίως κρίνων εἰργάσατο. «I did what any other father would have done» or «would do» is the sense expected, and this is confirmed by what follows: οὗτος οὐκ ἂν ἄλλως, εἰ μὴ διὰ τὰ πλημμελήματα, ἀξίως κολάσειε. So read κρίνων <ἂν> εἰργάσατο or <ἂν> εἰργάσαιτο. Although the question of whether George Pachymeres could ever use a potential verb without ἂν has not been resolved with certainty, his normal practice is to follow the classical model. A similar problem arises at the bottom of p. 248: ὡς ἐγὼ λέγω καὶ πάντες συμφήσαιεν. Here the simplest way of achieving respectable grammar would be to change the καὶ to κἂν. Boissonade himself had qualms («videtur deesse ἂν) but refers to his p. 225 as possible legitimation of the omission of the particle. There are a number of other *prima facie* instances, where, however, the insertion of ἂν is never any Herculean effort, as we shall see in a moment in the note on p. 243, and as we have seen already in the note on p. 9.

p. 243 The speaker cites cases where in the over-riding interests of the city established laws or conventions were ignored. τὸν τῆς πανσελήνου νόμον κατέλυσαν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἐπειδὴ φυλάττοντες ἐκεῖνον δόξης μακρᾶς τοῦ δόξαι κρείττους Περσῶν ἐστερηθήσαν· μύειν κελεύει Θεμιστοκλῆς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ πόλιν ἑᾶν τειχίρη καὶ μεταβιβάζεσθαι πρὸς τὰς ναῦς. On μακρᾶς Boissonade comments that the epithet is 'inexpectatum', and wonders if it is chosen by way of imitating a poetic source. If indeed a poetic source does lie behind these words we might be tempted by μακαρίας. Those of us who resist such a temptation will more prosaically favour ἄκρας. Since «they were deprived of the supreme glory of being seen to be superior

to the Persians» is contrary to historical fact, and what we need is an expression of the Spartans' motives, we might follow the same course as we did just above, and write ἔστερῆθησαν <ᾶν>. That would in turn assist us in finding the right answer to the inscrutable μύειν, namely ἀμύνειν.

\* \* \* \* \*

It looks as though George Pachymeres was familiar with something like the 'Jena Recension', to use Turyn's terminology, of Sophocles, i.e. an edition which contained only *Ajax* and *Electra*. On p. 48 n. 3 Boissonade's line reference should be corrected to *Ajax* 313. Boissonade leaves unnoticed three further quotations from the same play: p. 129 line 7 alludes to *Ajax* 1290; p. 145 line 5 to v. 534; p. 227 line 3 to v. 1039 (welcome confirmation of the wisdom of accepting κείνου as in the Teubner text). Then on p. 148 n. 2 Boissonade sees the source of Pachymeres's expression as Eur. *IA* 917. It was plainly Soph. *El.* 771.

Cambridge

Roger D. Dawe