Philopatris

1. μή ποσ Τρικάρσον τιθέσαι ε' Ἐκατόν ἔκλημπταν, ἢ καὶ τινὶ θεῶν ἐκ πρόνοιας συνήφασκοι. These questions are asked because Kritias is looking pale and disturbed. In his edition Anastasii rightly rejects such translations as ex dei providentia or consultat, as dando così alla frase un senso diverso da quello, che essa richiede, and meets the problem by inserting σού before ἐκ. But shave 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 πρόνοιας to τῶν ἐκ πρόνοιας. LXV' helpfully tells us who such gods might be: Αthéna, Hermes, Poseidon, Apollo. For this use of ἐκ one may consult K.-G. 546. 448a, adding to the list there Soph. OT 1051. Alternatively one could insert τῶν ἀνθρώπων 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 Timaeus 2 might make such an explanation colourable: θεία τις ἐπικορύφωσα πρόνοια τὴν τῇ ὁδῷ εὐμέτρησε. But that intervention was benevolent, and the language is unambiguous in telling us whose πρόνοια is being referred to.

6. τὸν Παρθένου δὲ τίς ὅσον τρίαναν ἐν ταῖς χεροῖς κρατῶν καὶ διατόριας καὶ καταπλήκτηκον βοηθεῖν ταῖς πολέμιας ὑπὸν ἔκβλησιν ἀνέρθη δέ δεκαχλικὰ, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφίτσην, ὅ ἦσθαι, ἐπενοικεῖται. Such is Anastasii's text. The later edition of Mouloud in the Oxford text series relieves us of the necessity of dwelling at length on the impossibility of ὅσον, though it does mention something in Vit. gr. 1332 which could not be accounted for if the true text were simply δόκειον followed immediately by τρίαναν. 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 δόκειον τρίαναν.

29 πλούσιος γὰρ ἄμας οὐκ ἐκλέξαι καὶ ἐθνος ἡμᾶς οὐ κατατηρήσει. There is some doubt over the second verb, but apparently none over its subject: 'it's indelible.' However, the use of this noun to denote 'agogo' seems to judge from the evidence in Lamp's Parodic Greek Lexicon, to be confined to the plural. Ambiguity would be banished, and phonography gratified, by καὶ ἐθνον ἐθνος.
81 γέννεις δὲ ἐννημέραν· καὶ ἐστώσις ὁδόντος πλανὸν ἢ μήλην παρέφειν ὡς ἢν. «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 sèche». So Jouanna, who explains that the subject of παρεφεῖν is ὁδόντος, adds ἐστώσις is «complexe d'objet direct de παρεφεῖν». This is a valid attempt to deal with the Greek, but it strained one. We might have expressed the sentence to begin γέννας: δὲ ἐννημέραν ἐστώσις: «The jaws were clamped together, and it was not possible for the teeth to let more than a sèche get past them».

110.1 Αριστεύτω, διακότερος πολύς ἡλικιωμένος ζέν πορετεῖ, ὀσφαλεία. «Come Arisien, then that dog of pride was added with feet, it was pore of netted in the pasture. Jouanna rightly comments «du point de vue medicaie, the "pore of netted dans la parole" is assez surprenante; on ne voit pas le lien avec la gangrene du pied». True: but incoherence and fever go well enough together. Repunctuate as ἡλικιωμένου: ζέν πορετεῖ ὀσφαλεία.

117.1 καὶ ποτὲ καὶ ἡμὰς δὲ αὐτὸς ἡθηνεὶ αἰρή· καὶ ἔφη, ὅτε πορεία, χοάδες ὡς καὶ αὐτὰ ταυτά ταυτὶ διῇσε, ἀλέιπος ἀπὸ πορείας ἐστο ἀπὸ τὰς δύο συνείς. ἕφη should not be followed by γὰρ, nor do patents in Hipponrates give an account of their own symptoms like this. We may add that «whenever he had fevers is a curiously causal first mention of fever, and the operative, presumably of a repetetive action, is also very difficult to account for following, as it does, the ποτὲ ... ὑπέρθεν once more comes. We might begin by replacing πορείας with πορές ἀπὸ, describing the movement of the worm, and as for ἔφη, read ἐγκαταστάσεως. The translation will be «Once every a sizeable worm came through it, and as it emerged billous matter was seen because that too came out this way» (or
possibly ταυτή, in the same way, by the same route). The word order χωλίδεξαν δὲν is now normal.

George Pachymeres

The following notes relate to Boissoneaud’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 μένος; p. 143 Χαρδέα; p. 147 Σώλονος; p. 157 Ἐροφονίζευς; p. 196 τὸ αμμέλημα; p. 202 ἄνθρωπον; p. 213 καὶ for καὶ, and this seems applies particularly to the first note below.

p. 8 καὶ δὴ μὲν ἄτο τυραννὶς λέγει, καμοὶ προειστεί τὸ ἔγκλημα τὶ δὲ τὸ παρατυποῦ με τὰ τῶν τυραννῶν φονεῖν οὐκ ἦρμεν παρατῦπων, κἂν διαφωτισθη λέγων ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος. ἤπαται τι δὲ, τὸ παρατυποῦν ...

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 neglected part of the guards. ἀλλ’ οὖν, δύονοι ἐκεῖνοι ταῦτα ποιῶν οὐκ ἦν τυραννικὸς φονεῖς τοῦ βήματος, ἢ παναιστή βοῶν βεβαίων ὑπὸ 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 ἑορτῆς εὐνοιας the question whether he is δύονοι in so watching has already been answered. Read δύονοι ἐκεῖνοι ὑπὸ ταῦτα ποιῶν. I am no more δύονοι than that person. Thereafter ἐγκληθήναι γὰρ, subject to the reservations expressed below in the note on p. 225.

p. 11 ἀλλά τι ἐν ὁλᾶ τὸ ἐπιμέρχος ἢ πρὸς τυραννίδος ἐπίθετον. «Νυν ἐν εἰσὶ» asks Boissoneaud. 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 ἐν ἑν. 

p. 13 εἰσάχθεται τοῦτο, ἀλλ’ ἢ ἡ καὶ καὶ δομοφόρων καὶ τοῦ πλαστῶν τέρανων, Boissoneaud eloquently remarks τὰ γεγονότα, σινεκτά, ως διάφορον, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπίθετον γὰρ, ἐπίθετον. Better would be ἠμοίος, which gives a contrast with ἠμοίοις in the next sentence, and is what you might expect from a tyrant: cf. Plat. Gorg. 477 c. 
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p. 85 καὶ ὀδὴ μαν λόγον λέγων, ὅτι οὔθ ὑμᾶς πνευ καταδείκται ὑμᾶς ἔστω τοῦτο. Σε ναλικ ουκελίκειν ελλάδας τοῦτον τῆν πράξεν (presumably double accusative if sound) ἐπιτελοῦ τὴν διδασκαλίαν, διὸ ὀκνὴν τὴν αἰθήν μετέχεσθουν. The plain statement ἐπιτελοῦ is contrary to the whole tenor of the prosecutor's speech. Either we must write ἐπιτελοῦ, or else just content ourselves with a question mark after μετέχεσθουν.

pp. 126-27 ἐξεχειροῦν γὰρ τῶν κληών ἕκαστος οὐκ ἀνεμιμένως καὶ μάθηταν. ἀλλὰ ἐξίκεισκε στερεός κατάδρακτος, καὶ δόρῳ καὶ καὶ μέλειαν Ἀρη, καὶ φόβῳν ἀναβαίνειν ἵππον. Boissoande is unsurprised by the plural verb with ἕκαστος, but wonders why the following participles are singular. But would not ἕκαστος ... κατάδρακτος be stronger still? If change is called for, it costs little to write ἐξεχειροῦν. But what of φόβῳν? Boissoande neatly notes «Codelex sic.» Now the word ὁσμαῖρων would suit the context, and is used of horses; so we might think of ὁσμαῖρων ... ἵππον or ὁσμαῖρον ... ἵππον. But it is also used of song (LSJ s.v. II. 2), and this opens up a more attractive line of restoration: καὶ μέλειαν Ἀρη ὁσμαῖρον, καὶ ἀναβαίνειν ἵππον. At this point it might be objected that, if the words καὶ φόβῳν are to be reversed, we might as well keep φόβῳν. But observe that the printed note being struck by a ὁσμαῖρον is an excellent introduction to the words which follow, καὶ τὸν γενναίον καὶ διερχάιον φρονήματι, and if there had been an any time confusion in the text between ὁσμαῖρον and φόβῳν, 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 εἶ καὶ ἄνωθεν συγγε γάρ τὰ μεταφέραμεν, καὶ ὁφεύχον κατά κράτος, καὶ τοι καὶ τῶν δικαιώματα 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 τοι καὶ τῶν δικαιώματων.

p. 152 καὶ τὰ ἑνώθεν τις ἣν ἐξεκέρειν ἱέγουτον. If the form is permissible in this author, who commonly uses -ετε terminations, read ἱέγουτον. Alternatively ἱέγουτον: «Cum futuro ἐν non repulsissnus» - Boissoande p 81 n. 2.
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p. 183 τί γονιμόν εἶναι ἐκλαμβάνειν, καὶ, φαίνεται εἰς νυμφηρίαν. 

p. 219 ἢ ὅπου ἔμεθος ἔρρητος ἦν τὴν συμβολὴν. ἀναλύεται μὲν ἔμεθος καὶ τὴν ἀνάκεισιν τῆς φύσεως ἀναλύουσα δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀνάκεισιν τὸν στήνει τὰ ἀξίωματα. ἔμεθος cannot be construed, surrounded as it is by imperatives. The addition of an iota will do the trick: εἰς ἔμεθος.

p. 221 ἢ ἡμεῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ζῶσαι, ἵνα τὸ παράδειγμα ἡθος ἑκατέρων μημηθήσεται. ἀλλ' οὐ προσέχειν οὖν ἄλογον ἀλλ' ἵνα κρίνοις ἐκείνος φανεῖν. ἀλλ' εἰ τὸ σκοτεινὸν ἐκεῖθεν ἔφθασαμεν... There is no justification for the optative. A subjunctive or parallel μημηθήσεται will give us ینثِثِثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُθ
to the Persians is contrary to historical fact, and what we need is an expression of the Sparta’s motives, we might follow the same course as we did just above, and write ἐπιτρέπετον ἔχειν. That would in turn assist us in finding the right answer to the inscrutable μὴ ἔχειν, namely μὴ ἔχειν.

*

It looks as though George Pachymeres was familiar with something like the ‘Jena Recension’, to use Tyrwhit’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 3 alludes to Ajax 1280; p. 145 line 5 to v. 534; p. 227 line 3 to v. 1039 (welcome confirmation of the wisdom of accepting νεῖτεν as in the Teubner text. Then on p. 148 n. 2 Boissonade sees the source of Pachymeres’s expression as Eur. Id 917. It was plainly Soph. El. 771.
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