

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

ISOCRATES AND ISAEUS: *LESEFRÜCHTE*

I

A passage in Plato's *Laws* poses an interesting problem: ἥλιον εἶπερ ἄγει ψυχή, τριῶν αὐτὴν ἐν λέγοντες δρᾶν σχεδὸν οὐκ ἀποτενξόμεθα (898E). Here, for εἶπερ ἄγει of the MSS, Eusebius gives in a citation εἰ περιάγει, which some editors have preferred. In *Studies in Greek Texts* ([Göttingen, 1976], p. 138), I conjectured εἶπερ <περι>άγει, not as a merely mechanical compromise between the two variants, but because the surrounding language of the Platonic context supported both εἶπερ (rather than εἰ) and the compound περιάγει (rather than the simplex). At that time I wrote: "To imagine, as some will, that a collocation such as εἶπερ περι- was offensive to the Greeks is idle." I did not document this statement. Compare now *Meno* 75C . . . ὡσαύτως ἀποροῖ ὥσπερ περὶ τοῦ σχήματος.

Certain passages in Isocrates, some of them themselves presenting textual uncertainties, will further illustrate such locutions:¹

- (a) 4. 178 . . . τὸν δὲ βάρβαρον ἀπάσης τῆς Ἀσίας δεσπότην κατέστησαν,
ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου πολεμῶντων ἡμῶν . . .
ὥσπερ ΓΕ : ὡς cett.
- (b) 5. 33 . . . οἷσπερ <περὶ> τῶν παλαιῶν πιστεύομεν
οἷσπερ <περὶ> Blass : οἷσπερ ΓΕ : οἷς περὶ cett.
- (c) 5. 127 . . . κινδυνεύειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ὁμοίως ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ ὧν μάλιστα
σπουδάζεις.
ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ ΓΕ : ὡς περὶ ΑΠ : ὥσπερ Θ
- (d) 6. 62 . . . ὁμοίως ἂν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμῖν συμφερόντων ὥσπερ <περὶ> τῶν
αὐταῖς βουλευσομένων
ὥσπερ <περὶ> Benseler : ὥσπερ ΓΕ : ὡς περὶ cett.
- (e) 6. 92 ὥσθ' ὁμοίως ἡμῖν φιλονικητέον ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐνθάδε ψηφισθη-
σομένων ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις ἀγώνων.
ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ ΓΕ : ὡς ὑπὲρ cett.
- (f) 7. 33. ἀλλ' ὁμοίως ἐθάρρουν περὶ τῶν ἔξω δεδομένων ὥσπερ περὶ τῶν
ἐνδον ἀποκειμένων
- (g) 8. 13 . . . προσῆκον ὑμᾶς ὁμοίως ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ τῶν
ιδίῳ σπουδάζειν . . .

I am grateful to the journal's anonymous referee for saving me from several errors and for some practical suggestions.

1. I report variant readings on the authority of the Benseler-Blass Teubner edition and the Budé edition of G. Mathieu and É. Brémond.

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

- (h) 8. 38 . . . πότερα χρήσωμαι ταῖς ἀληθείαις ὥσπερ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἢ κατασιωπήσω . . .
- (i) 10. 46 . . . ὁσσηπερ <περὶ> αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος ἐπιμέλειαν ἐποιήσαντο.
ὁσσηπερ <περὶ> Blass : ὁσση περὶ ΘΑ : ὁσσηπερ ΓΔΕ²
- (j) 15. 104 . . . ὁμοίως ὑπὲρ τῶν συγγεγεννημένων ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀναγκαῖον ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀπολογίαν . . .
- (k) 15. 160 νῦν δ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ πλουτεῖν ὥσπερ τῶν μεγίστων ἀδικημάτων ἀπολογίαν δεῖ παρασκευάζεσθαι . . .
- (l) 16. 15 . . . καὶ ὡς περὶ Σικελίαν ἐστρατήγησεν.
ὡς περὶ Γ : ὥσπερ περὶ Λ : ὡς εἰς vulg.
- (m) 19. 19 . . . ἡγούμενος ὁμοίως με δεῖν ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων κινδυνεύειν ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ ἑμαντοῦ.
- (n) 20. 21 . . . ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ δικάζων, οὕτως ἕκαστος ὑμῶν οἴσει τὴν ψῆφον.
ὡς ὑπὲρ Γ : ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ cett.

Inspection of these passages permits us to state at once that a careful Greek stylist did not find the repetition of *περ*, in such collocations as *ὥσπερ περὶ/ὑπὲρ*, an offensive sound. Even when full account is taken of the variant readings in some of these passages, the evidence in the aggregate leaves no reasonable doubt of this. Isocrates' usage is particularly significant here. He is an exceptionally "fussy" writer; if such sounds were not avoided by him, it is a priori likely that less pains-taking Greek authors would not have been troubled by them. We have seen above that such in fact was the case with that other most careful writer of Greek prose, Plato.

Remark next how very susceptible to mechanical corruption (haplography, dittography) these letter sequences are. In the majority of the examples given above there are variants (examples *a, b, c, d, e, i, l, n*); these variants clearly represent unintentional slips, not conscious changes. Note especially item *l*, where the variant *ὥσπερ* must be a dittography, since it makes no sense in context (*ὡς* here is the conjunction). Nor is corruption confined to the preposition *περὶ* with its exact correspondence of letters (*ὥσπερ περὶ* ~ *ὡς περὶ* ~ *ὥσπερ*). *ὑπὲρ* in such phrases also readily creates confusion (*ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ* ~ *ὡς ὑπὲρ* ~ *ὥσπερ*); see items *a, e, n*.

These examples provide a minor, but striking, illustration of the folly of blind reliance on the MSS. My conjecture at *Leg.* 898E, whether correct or not, remains a conservative proposal, despite its abandonment of the MSS. I consider now several of the passages from Isocrates listed above.

(1) 6. 62 (= example *d*). Read . . . ὁμοίως ἂν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμῖν συμφερόντων ὥσπερ <ὑπὲρ> τῶν αὐταῖς βουλευσομένων. Benseler correctly saw that a preposition had fallen out, but his <περὶ> seems a mechanical choice based on the *ductus litterarum*

2. *Sic* the Budé editors; Blass records the reading of Γ as ὁσση περὶ. For my purposes here it suffices to demonstrate that (1) such locutions do propagate variants and (2) what form such variants regularly take. The particular distribution of variants among MSS in a given case does not affect the argument.

of the variants (ὥσπερ:ὡς περὶ). The reason that περὶ would be incorrect here is not that this preposition is objectionable in itself. It is not.³ But with ὥσπερ Isocrates repeats the *same* preposition; see examples *c*, *e*, *g*, *j*, *m* (ὑπέρ) and *f* (περί).

(2) 15. 160 (= example *k*). Read νῦν δ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ πλουτεῖν ὥσπερ (ὑπὲρ) τῶν μεγίστων ἀδικημάτων ἀπολογία δὲ παρασκευάζεσθαι. . . . Compare especially 15. 104 (= example *j*).

(3) 20. 21 (= example *n*). Read, against Γ and recent editors, . . . ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ δικάζων. . . . Not ὡς, but ὥσπερ, "as it were," "just as if," is the effective word here. For ὥσπερ *cum participio* in Isocrates compare 4. 178 (= example *a*) ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου πολεμησάντων ἡμῶν; 4. 86 ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίαις ψυχαῖς μέλλοντες κινδυνέσειν; 4. 179 ὥσπερ πρὸς τὸν Δία τὴν χώραν νεμόμενος ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους τὰς συνθήκας ποιοῦμενος; 10. 49 οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες οὕτως ἡγανάκτησαν ὥσπερ δὴς τῆς Ἑλλάδος πεπορθημένης. Note that in these passages a judgment on the part of the subject is involved, as in 20. 21 (ὥσπερ . . . οὕτως ἕκαστος ὑμῶν οἴσει τὴν ψῆφον). For an explicit instance of this sequence (ὥσπερ *cum part.*—οὕτως—judgment) see 6. 106 ὥσπερ οὖν ἐν κοινῷ θεάτρῳ τῶν Ἑλλήνων διδοὺς ἔλεγχον ἕκαστος ὑμῶν [same subject in 20. 21] τῆς αὐτοῦ φύσεως, οὕτω διακείσθω τὴν γνώμην; similarly 9. 29; 15. 71.

The preference of the editors for ὡς rather than ὥσπερ in 20. 21 seems based on the *auctoritas* of Γ, an undeniably valuable codex. It has, I hope, become apparent what manuscript *auctoritas* is worth in dealing with this set of stylistic problems.

II

καίτοι δεξαίμην ἂν . . . ἤδη τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον . . . μᾶλλον ἢ ζῆν πολυπλασίῳ χρόνον, ἐφορῶν οὕτως αὐτὴν [sc. τὴν τῶν λόγων μελέτην] ὥσπερ νῦν παρ' ὑμῖν φερομένην.

[Isoc. 15. 177]

"πολυπλασίῳ Γ *Bk.*: πολὺ πλείω *cett.* *Malim* πολλαπλάσιον, *sicut exstat* 6. 8." Blass. The same change occurred to me; the evidence for it is more than Blass indicates:

3. 34 . . . αἰροῦμαι μετὰ δικαιοσύνης τὴν ἑμαντοῦ [sc. χώραν] μόνον ἔχειν μᾶλλον ἢ μετὰ κακίας πολλαπλασίαν τῆς ὑπαρχούσης κτήσασθαι.

6. 8 . . . ἐλοίμην ἂν ἀποθανεῖν . . . μᾶλλον ἢ πολλαπλάσιον χρόνον ζῆν . . .

12. 58 . . . Σπαρτιάτας δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἦτταν μὴδ' ἐν πολλαπλασίῳ χρόνῳ δυνηθέντας καταστῆσαι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ξενίαν . . .

These parallels are supportive, but, of themselves, naturally not decisive. What tips the scales is the fact that πολλαπλάσιος is a common word in the classical period (also attested for Herodotus, Thucydides, Antiphon, "Hippocrates," Alcidas, Xenophon, Aristotle), whereas, apart from the MSS at Isoc. 15. 177, πολυπλασίῳ is not found before the end of the second century B.C. (*SIG*, 711 L 11); the only other example cited in LSJ is from Themistius. The by-form πολυπλασίος is also late; LSJ s.v. cite *Anth. Pal.* 6. 152 (Agis), LXX 2 Matt. 9: 16, Alex. Aphr. *De an.* 123. 33, Them. *Or.* 6. 74C. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Gram-*

3. Contrast, for example, 5. 127 (example *c*) ὑπὲρ ὧν . . . σπουδάσεις with 12. 235 περὶ ὧν ἂν σπουδάσωσι and 15. 177 περὶ ὧν ἡττόν μοι σπουδάσαι προσήκεν. On the increasing interchangeability of ὑπὲρ and περὶ "from the fourth century B.C. onwards," see K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968), p. 14, n. 13. For a number of examples of ὑπὲρ and περὶ confused in MSS see Wyse on Isaeus 3. 55.

*matik*², vol. 1 (Munich, 1960), p. 446, specifically contrasts such forms with *πολλαπλάσιος*, remarking “erst spät *πολυπλ-*.”

πολυπλάσιω in Isoc. 15. 177 should therefore be recognized for what it is—a scribal trivialization. Such also is the variant *ad loc.* *πολὺ πλείω* (not a mechanical confusion of uncial ΠΛΑΙΩ and ΠΛΕΙΩ: at Isoc. 6. 8 the comparable trivialization *πολὺ πλείονα* occurs as a variant to *πολλαπλάσιον*).

III

. . . τὴν δὲ πόλιν τηλικαύτην τὸ μέγεθος ἐποίησαν καὶ τῇ δυνάμει καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις κατασκευαῖς ὥστε τοὺς φάσκοντας αὐτὴν ἄστυ τῆς Ἑλλάδος εἶναι καὶ τοιαύταις ὑπερβολαῖς ἐθισμένους χρῆσθαι δοκεῖν ἀληθῆ λέγειν.

[Isoc. 16. 27]

“τὸ μέγεθος *add.* Γ Bs. *Sed praeterea ante* καὶ τῇ (*propter* ὁμοιοκἀταρκτον) *excidisse* *pulo* καὶ *τοσοῦτον* ὑπερβάλλουσιν *vel simile quid.*” Blass. Presumably Blass found the collocation of accusative of respect (τὸ μέγεθος) and dative of respect (καὶ τῇ δυνάμει καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις κατασκευαῖς) offensive. Hence his proposed supplement. Blass rightly avoided the facile solution of printing the shorter text of the other MSS, which omit τὸ μέγεθος. Even though Γ alone preserves these words, they are guaranteed by the fact that the adjective *τηλικαύτος* is often qualified by τὸ μέγεθος in Isocrates: 3. 23; 4. 26, 136; 5. 98, 151; 9. 19, 29; 11. 5; 12. 68, 70, 117, 196; 14. 33; 15. 3, 115, 257. Note also that in 4. 26 the words *τηλικαῦθ’* . . . τὸ μέγεθος and καὶ τῆς ἄλλης κατασκευῆς occur in the same paragraph.

The fuller text may seem to some awkward Greek, but it certainly can be rendered into English without violence: “. . . and they made the city so great in magnitude both in respect to its power and in respect to its other assets. . . .” In similar passages elsewhere Isocrates exhibits comparable fullness and variety of expression:

9. 47 . . . πρὸς τοῦτοις καὶ χώρον πολλὴν προσεκτήσατο καὶ τεῖχῃ προσπεριεβάλετο καὶ τριῆρεις ἐναυπηγήσατο καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις κατασκευαῖς οὕτως ἤρξησε τὴν πόλιν ὥστε μηδεμιᾶς τῶν Ἑλληνίδων ἀπολελεῖσθαι, καὶ δύναμιν τοσαύτην ἐνεποίησεν ὥστε πολλοὺς φοβεῖσθαι τῶν πρότερον καταφρονοῦντων αὐτῆς.

4. 136 ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τῶν Κυκλάδων νήσων ἀμφισβητοῦμεν, τοσαύτας δὲ τὸ πλήθος πόλεις καὶ τηλικαύτας τὸ μέγεθος δυνάμεις οὕτως εἰκὴ τῷ βαρβάρῳ παραδεδώκαμεν.

See also 4. 26–27. Blass’ proposed supplement shows that he understood Isocrates’ tendency to *amplitudo* in such contexts. Obviously, he disputed not the fullness of the language here, but its correctness.

The question thus is whether the text preserved in Γ, with its juxtaposed accusative and datives, is idiomatic Greek. That can be answered in the affirmative. The collocation of an accusative of respect with a dative of respect is found from Homer onward; failure to recognize this usage has caused more than one passage to be misunderstood. I give some examples:⁴

(1) ἀμφότερον, γενεῇ τε καὶ οὐνεκα . . . (Il. 4. 60)

(2) ἀμφότερον, φιλότῃ καὶ αἰδοῦ . . . (Od. 14. 505)

4. See further my *Greek Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 107–12, where this usage is illustrated and some of these passages discussed.

- (3) *χερσίν τε σπεύδου χρήμασί τ', ἀμφότερα* (Theog. 980)
- (4) *εἰ δ' ἄρετᾴ κατὰκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν, / ἀμφοτέρων δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις . . .* (Pind. *Isthm.* 1. 42–43)
- (5) *πῶς ἅπαντα καὶ χερσὶ καὶ λόγοισι . . .* (Eur. *Phoen.* 312–13)
- (6) *ἡ . . . ἀνία . . . ἡ βλάβη ἡ ἀμφότερα* (Pl. *Grg.* 477D)
- (7) *ἡ δώροις ἡ χάρισιν ἡ ἀμφότερα* (Pl. *Lach.* 187A)
- (8) *κατὰ πάντα με ἀνέπαυσαν σαρκί τε καὶ πνεύματι* (Ignatius of Antioch *Ep. Trall.* 12. 1)
- (9) *. . . ἵνα πάντα, ὅσα ποιεῖτε, κατευοδωθῇτε σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι, πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ . . .* (Ignatius of Antioch *Ep. Magn.* 13. 1)

Granted that not all of these examples are close parallels (especially the *ἀμφοτέρων/ἀμφοτέρα* phrases, which are a set idiom), nevertheless the general principle that accusatives and datives of respect may be collocated in Greek seems adequately established. Isocrates 16. 27 should now be regarded as an additional example of this. In further support of the fuller text there compare the comparable specimen of *amplitudo* in Lysias 13. 95:

ἀποδεδεικται δ' ὑμῖν ἅπαντα καὶ ἐκ τῶν ψηφισμάτων καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων Ἀγόρατος ὧν αὐτοῖς αἴτιος τοῦ θανάτου.

In this passage the accusative *ἅπαντα* is collocated with the *ἐκ* prepositional phrases (which are analogous in function to the datives in Isocrates); note, as in Isocrates, the repetition of *καὶ* and even the similarity of phrasing: *καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ~ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις*. Here too the text has been wrongly questioned: Taylor, perhaps deceived by taking *ἅπαντα* as a nominative, deleted the word; he was followed by Cobet and others. They thereby failed to detect the truly Greek flow of the language.

Some may regard the repetition *ἅπαντα . . . ἀπάντων* as suspicious. Rather, it too is a sign of deliberate *amplitudo*; compare Dinarchus *Contra Aristogitonem* 1:

πάνθ', ὡς ἔοικεν, ὧ Ἀθηναῖοι, προσδοκῆτέα ἐστὶ καὶ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ ἰδεῖν ἐν ταῖς γεγενημέναις ἀποφάσεσι: θαυμασιώτατον δὲ πάντων, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, τὸ νῦν γιγνόμενον. ὁ γὰρ πονηρότατος τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, Ἀριστογείτων διαδικασόμενος ἦκει κτλ.

Note how, after the repeated *πάνθ' . . . πάντων*, the orator avoids the commonplace *πάντων ἀνθρώπων* with *ὁ πονηρότατος* by further expansion: *τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει—ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων*. This whole phrase is an emphatic periphrasis for *πάντων ἀνθρώπων*; K. Fuhr, who suggested *ἀπάντων* for *ἄλλων* here (“Excuse zu den attischen Rednern,” *RhM* 33[1878]: 574), does not seem to have understood this. Compare also Plato’s technique in *Symp.* 220A: *. . . πάντας ἐκράτει, καὶ ὁ πάντων θαυμαστότατον, Σωκράτη μεθύοντα οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἑόρακεν ἀνθρώπων*. For another possible avoidance of *πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, see the next section.

IV

ἐκ τοίνυν τούτων, ὧ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος ῥᾷδιόν ἐστι γινῶναι ὅσον ἀναισχυντότατοι ἀνθρώπων εἰσὶν οὗτοι.

[Isaeus 3. 72]

Here one ought perhaps to have considered *〈πάντων〉 ἀνθρώπων*. The fuller, and more usual, expression is found already in Homer, *Il.* 8. 17 *γνώσεται ἔπειθ' ὅσον εἰμι θεῶν κάρτιστος ἀπάντων* (adduced by Wyse ad loc. to illustrate the use of *ὅσον* in Isaeus—which, incidentally, he wrongly questions). For parallels in Isaeus, see

8. 13 οὗτος δ' ὁ πάντων ἀναισχυρότατος ἀνθρώπων κτλ.; frag. 28 καὶ οὗτος ὁ πάντων ἀνθρώπων σχετλιώτατος; frag. 4 νῦν δέ μοι πάντων πραγμάτων λυπηρότατον συμβέβηκεν. Omission of πάντων before ἀνῶν (the normal abbreviation of ἀνθρώπων) would have been easy. Compare Isoc. 17. 23 . . . θρασυτάτος ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐγένετο; here, in fact, ἀπάντων has fallen out in the majority of MSS (preserved in Γ and Ε). There are, to be sure, passages where the simple genitive without πάντων occurs: *Il.* 11. 248 ἀριδείκετος ἀνδρῶν; *Ar. Pax* 736–37 ἄριστος . . . ἀνθρώπων; *Pl. Phd.* 77A καρτερώτατος ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν. So possibly *Dem.* 24. 124 (see the app. crit. and compare 37. 49). The question is particularly complicated by *Isaeus* 5. 35: ἅμα δὲ καὶ πλοῦσιον καὶ πονηρότατον αὐτὸν ὄντα ἀνθρώπων ἀποδείξω καὶ εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς προσήκοντας καὶ εἰς τοὺς φίλους. This may well be confirmation of the MSS in 3. 72. But here too omission of πάντων before ἀνῶν (and after ὄντα) cannot be excluded.

It is relevant to direct attention to two different meanings of πάντες ἄνθρωποι. The literal sense, “all human beings,” *omnes homines*, needs no elaborate documentation. Suffice to quote the opening of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: πάντες ἄνθρωποι τοῦ εἶδέναι ὀρέγονται φύσει. What seems little recognized, and apparently missing from the lexicæ, is a secondary meaning which πάντες ἄνθρωποι developed. This expression came to signify simply “everybody” in a much looser, narrower sense, which by no means included all mankind.⁵ *Plato Symp.* 179A is a good illustration of how the literal meaning came to acquire a less precise force: . . . καὶ μαχόμενοι γ' ἂν μετ' ἀλλήλων οἱ τοιοῦτοι νικῶν ἂν ὀλίγοι ὄντες ὡς ἔπος εἰπὲν πάντας ἀνθρώπους. The Attic orators themselves offer the best evidence. In *Dem.* 23. 61 the vaguer use is followed almost immediately by an example of the phrase employed in its strictest sense: . . . τίνα γὰρ οἶσει ἡ ἄξι βία ἀδίκως Χαρίδημος; πάντας ἀνθρώπους. ἵστε γὰρ δῆπου τοῦθ' ὅτι πάντες οἱ στρατεύμ' ἔχοντες, ὧν ἂν οἴωνται κρείττους ἔσεσθαι, ἄγουσιν καὶ φέρουσι χρήματ' αἰτοῦντες. εἴτ' οὐ δεινὸν . . . καὶ φανερώς παράνομον, οὐ μόνον παρὰ τὸν γεγραμμένον νόμον, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τὸν κοινὸν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων. . . . Demosthenes provides some clear instances of πάντες ἄνθρωποι used where the literal meaning “all human beings” would be nonsensical in context. 34. 29 . . . προσήκέν γε τοσούτο χρυσίον ἀποδιδόντα, καὶ πλεόν τοῦ δανείσματος, περιβόητον ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ ἐμπορίῳ, καὶ παρακαλεῖν πάντας ἀνθρώπους, πρῶτον δὲ τὸν παῖδα τὸν τούτου καὶ τὸν κοινῶν. 34. 31 σὺ δ' ἀντὶ τοῦ πολλοὺς μάρτυρας τούτων ποιεῖσθαι πάντας ἀνθρώπους λαμβάνειν ἐπείρω, ὥσπερ ἀδίκων τι. 55. 6 ἐπιδείξαι γέ σ' ἔδει πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις χαράδραν οὖσαν, ἵνα μὴ λόγῳ μόνον, ὥσπερ νῦν, ἀλλ' ἔργῳ τὸν πατέρ' ἀδικοῦντ' ἀπέφαινες. See further 23. 156, 211; 45. 64. Lysias also employs this idiomatic turn of expression: 12. 60 μισθωσάμενοι δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ πόλεις ἐπάγοντες καὶ τελευτῶντες Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ὁπόσους ἐδύναντο πείσαι κτλ.; 16. 15 . . . ὕστερος ἀνεχώρησα τοῦ σεμνοῦ Στειριῶς τοῦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις δειλίαν ὀνειδικτός. *Isaeus* himself uses it: 1. 40 οὐκ ἄρα δίκαια οὐδ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς συμφέροντα οὐδὲ τοῖς νόμοις ὁμολογούμενα ψηφιεῖσθε εἰ τῶν μὲν συμφορῶν τοὺς ἐγγυτάτω γένει κοινωνεῖν ἀναγκάσετε, χρημάτων δὲ καταλειφθέντων πάντας ἀνθρώπους κυριωτέρους ἢ τούτους ποιήσετε.

There is a paradoxical consequence of this frequent occurrence of weakened,

5. The only allusion to this usage known to me is to be found in J. E. Sandys' commentary on Demosthenes' *Leptines* (Cambridge, 1890), section 33: “πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, an exaggerated expression, meaning simply ‘all the world’ so far as immediately connected with the Greeks. *Chers.* 5, 42; *De cor.* 72; 51. 13; *Lys.* 12. 60. Similarly *De cor.* 48, πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη.” Even this definition, as will appear, is too comprehensive to fit some contexts. The phrase really was capable of a remarkably narrow meaning.

nonliteral, *πάντες ἄνθρωποι*. The genitive plural *πάντων ἀνθρώπων* (and *πάντων* alone, also very common) in conjunction with a superlative probably was not so strong a hyperbole in Greek as it seems to us (*ἀναισχυντότατος πάντων ἀνθρώπων* *vel. sim.*). Curiously, the simpler type, with *πάντων* unexpressed (*ἀναισχυντότατος ἀνθρώπων*), quite possibly came to be felt as a stronger, more emphatic expression, precisely because it was the less common and less trite locution. That does not prove that *πάντων* has not dropped out in Isaeus 3. 72; it does tip the scales of probability in favor of retaining the MS reading.

V

ἐν ἔτι λοιπόν· ἂν ἄρα δόξη τι τούτων ὑμῖν πράττειν, Ἀγήνορι τε δηλώσατε καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὅτι μέρος τι καὶ δι' ἐμὲ τυγχάνουσιν ὧν ἐπεθύμουν.

[Isoc. *Epist.* 8. 10]

Isocrates is here writing to the authorities at Mytilene urging the restoration from exile of the musician Agenor *and his family*. Perhaps read . . . καὶ (τῷ πατρὶ καὶ) τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. Compare above, c. 1: οἱ παῖδες οἱ Ἀφαρέως, νιδεῖς δ' ἐμοί, παιδευθέντες ὑπ' Ἀγήνορος τὰ περὶ τὴν μουσικὴν, ἐδεήθησάν μου γράμματα πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὅπως ἂν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τινὰς κατηγάγετε φυγάδων, καὶ τοῦτον καταδέξησθε καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς. Note that the word order would be identical: Name-Verb-καὶ-Noun-καὶ-Noun. The lipography would be of the easiest sort (καὶ τῷ ~ καὶ τοῖς).

VI

ἐπισκηψαμένων δ' ἡμῶν ἡ μὲν λῆξις τοῦ κλήρου διεγράφη . . .

[Isaeus 5. 17]

“διαγράφειν ausstreichen ist im athenischen Verkehr entstanden, als die Anwendung der Schrift um sich griff, zuerst wohl διαγράφειν δίκην, die Klageschrift durchstreichen, wenn sie zurückgezogen oder sonst nichtig gemacht ist, Wolk. 774, später daher mit ἀκυροῦν glossiert. Auf einen Menschen, der nicht zählt, kühn übertragen. Eurip. *El.* 1073 eine gefallsüchtige Frau διάγραφ' ὡς οὖσαν κακὴν. Da reicht *notare* hin, wie man später auch παραγράφειν sagt.” Wilamowitz at Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 676, with his customary succinctness. Wyse illustrates the use of the verb, in all three voices, in his note to Isaeus 5. 17. He adduces there the *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense*, s.v. διάγραπτος δίκη· ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ διεξυσμένη λέγεται, καθ' ἧς ἴσχυσεν ἡ παραγραφὴ, οἷον ἦρθη ἡ δίκη· οὐ γὰρ εἰσαγωγίμος ἐστίν, ἡκυρωμένη ὑπὸ τῆς παραγραφῆς. Wyse does not cite Hesychius s.v. διάγραπτος δίκη· ἥτις καὶ ἐξεσμένη ἐλέγετο. No one has questioned this entry, but it is clearly corrupt (and probably abridged). Comparison with the *Lex. Rhet. Cant.* entry shows that ἐξεσμένη is doubly erroneous; not only is it a simplex, where a compound is wanted, it is not even from the correct verb. ξύω and ξέω have been confused; read (δι)εξυσμένη. The omission is due to an uncial (?) haplography, ΔΙ falling out after ΑΙ. For further proof, see Hesychius, s.v. διαγράφειν. διαξύνειν. ἀπαλείφειν. ἀκυροῦν. *Anecd. Bekk.* 1. 238. 26 διαγράψαι τὸ διαξύνειν εἰώθασιν λέγειν. *El. Magn.*, s.v. διαγράψαι· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνελεῖσθαι τὸ ἐγκλημα. λέγεται δὲ διαγράψαι καὶ τὸ διαξύνειν. This meaning of διαξύνειν = διαγράφειν has been missed by LSJ. For a different compound of ξύω with the same meaning see the Σ on Ar. *Nub.* 774 διαγέγραπται· κατέξυσται κτλ. (where, incidentally, some MSS show the false variant κατέξεσται). καταξύνω in this sense is

also missing from LSJ. By contrast, *ἐξεσμένος* (and *διεξεσμένος*), of careful speech, means “polished,” as we learn from Pollux 6. 140–41. Correct LSJ accordingly s.vv. *ξέω*, *διαξέω*.

In further illustration of *διεγράφη* in Isaeus 5. 17, Wyse also cites Pollux 8. 57: *ἄγραπτος δὲ δίκη ἐκαλεῖτο ἡ ὑπὸ τῆς παραγραφῆς ἀναιρεθεῖσα καὶ διαγραφείσα*. The *ἄγραπτος δίκη*, found only here, is clearly the same as the *διάγραπτος δίκη*—a suit which has been “stricken off” the list (*διαγραφείσα*) of cases pending by means of the technical legal procedure called *παραγραφή*.⁶ (The “*ἄγραπτος δίκη*” should not be confused with the *ἀγραφίου γραφή*, a public prosecution [*γραφή*], not a private suit [*δίκη*]; such *ἀγραφίου γραφαί* are absolutely irrelevant to the present issue.) Therefore, either the Athenians had two names for the same legal process (*ἄγραπτος δίκη* ~ *διάγραπτος δίκη*) or there is a corruption. The corresponding verb *διαγράφειν*, which is both technical in this sense and well-attested, settles the question. Read *⟨δι⟩ἀγραπτος* in Pollux. The error is another easy (uncial?) haplography: the preceding word in Pollux is *Παλλαδιῶι*.

VII

διὰ τί οὖν ἀξιώσεις σου τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀποψηφίσασθαι, ὦ Δικαιογένης; πότερον ὅτι πολλὰς λητουργίας ληλθούργηκας τῇ πόλει, καὶ πολλὰ χρήματα δαπανήσας σεμνοτέραν τὴν πόλιν τούτοις ἐποίησας; ἢ ὡς τριηραρχῶν πολλὰ κακὰ τοὺς πολέμιους εἰργάσω;

[Isaeus 5. 45]

Read *πολλὰ <καὶ> κακὰ*. The plural of *πολύς* is regularly used with a connective particle and the addition of *καὶ* is supported by Isaeus’ practice elsewhere: 6. 5 *πολλῶν δὲ καὶ δεινῶν ὄντων*; 6. 21 *πολλῶν καὶ κακῶν ἤρξεν*; 7. 4 *πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ ὑπὸ τούτων ἀδικηθεῖς*; 9. 23 *πολλὰ κάγαθὰ παθὼν ὑπὸ Θεοφράστου*; frag. 4 *πολλῶν μοι καὶ δυσκόλων συμπιπτόντων*. Note particularly *πολλοῖς καὶ καλοῖς κάγαθοις* in 3. 21; even such a collocation, which may strike the modern reader as a bit unusual, appears to have been normal: Isoc. 9. 51 *τῶν γὰρ Ἑλλήνων πολλοὶ καὶ καλοὶ κάγαθοί*. See also Isoc. 15. 128 *πολλῶν καὶ παντοδαπῶν καὶ δυσκόλων πραγμάτων*.

The causes of corruption in Isae. 5. 45 are obvious. Not simply a mechanical case of haplography with *καὶ* dropping out before *κα* (or *και*, if one wishes to count the downward stroke of the kappa). *πολλὰς λητουργίας* and *πολλὰ χρήματα* precede; a copyist (or even the *auctor ipse*, as is often forgotten) was conditioned to adjust unconsciously the syntax of *πολλὰ* and *κακὰ* to correspond. For parallels in other prose authors, compare the following (*pauca ex multis*): Lys. 13. 95 *πολλὰ κάγαθὰ ὑμᾶς ποιήσαντες*; Hdt. 7. 10. 2 *πολλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς*; Pl. *Euthphr.* 13E, 14A (*bis*) *πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ*; Grg. 521E *πολλὰ . . . καὶ κακὰ*; Meno 93A *πολλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοί*; 93D *πολλὰ καὶ θαυμαστά*; Xen. *An.* 7. 1. 33 *πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ*; Isoc. 7. 17 *πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ . . . πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ*. (Isocrates, incidentally, seems to prefer *πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ* to *πολλὰ καὶ κακὰ*; see 8. 79, 105; 12. 207; 15. 127.) Dem. 37. 57 (cited by H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*² [Cambridge, Mass., 1956], no. 2879) . . . *πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ πέπονθας . . . τὸν γε δεινὰ σε καὶ πόλλ’ εἰργασμένον* (on the inversion of the adjectives, compare below). Note that this normal usage is not confined to the positive degree, Isoc. 12. 60

6. On *παραγραφαί*, see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1971), pp. 106–24. On p. 108, n. 2, Harrison quotes Pollux 8. 57 in full without questioning the text.

τῶν πλείστων καὶ μεγίστων τοῖς μὲν βαρβάροις κακῶν, τοῖς δ' "Ἑλλῃσιν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίαν γε-
γεννημένην . . . ; 15. 79 πλείστων καὶ μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν.

The correction πολλά (καὶ) κακά in Isaeus 5. 45 seems to me probable because of Isaeus' usage elsewhere. But the rule is not an absolute one,⁷ and the grammars (Kühner-Gerth 2: 252; Schwyzler 2: 181) and lexica are quite inadequate on this and other aspects of the treatment of πολὺς in Greek authors. It may be found useful by some if I take this opportunity to provide more detailed documentation for the word. For omission of a connective with the plural of πολὺς Passow's *Lexicon* s.v. πολὺς (p. 1012a) cites Aesch. *Choeph.* 277 πολλά δυστερπῆ κακά, 585 πολλά μὲν γὰρ τρέφει / δεινὰ δειμάτων ἄχῃ; Aristoph. *Eccl.* 435 τὰς μὲν γυναῖκας πόλλ' ἀγαθὰ λέγων, σὲ δὲ / πολλά κακά; Pl. *Leg.* 620B πολλά ἀγαθὰ κεκτημένος. LSJ, s.v. πολὺς II, 2 quotes the two passages from Aeschylus and adds *IG*, 1². 76. 45 (Eleusis, fifth cent. B.C.) . . . τοῖς δὲ ταῦτα ποιούσι / πολλά ἀγαθὰ εἶναι καὶ εὐκαρπίαν καὶ πολυκαρπίαν. That poetry provides some examples of the rarer phrasing is no surprise; variety is of the essence of poetic expression. See, for example, *Il.* 24. 518 and Antimachus Teius frag. 1 Kinkel πολλά κακά, and for elegiac poetry, Tyrtaeus frag. 9. 38 Diehl = 12. 38 West πολλά δὲ τερπνὰ παθῶν. Inspection of the two prose occurrences cited by the lexica reveals poetic coloration in both. In the Eleusis inscription the language is clearly that of traditional ritual prayers; note the assonance in the repeated -καρπίαν. Furthermore, ἀγαθὰ is here strongly substantival and coordinate with καὶ εὐκαρπίαν καὶ πολυκαρπίαν; πολλά καὶ ἀγαθὰ would have been most awkward. It seems obvious to me that πολλά ἀγαθὰ of the inscription is parallel to the traditional πάντα ἀγαθὰ ascribed to various deities. See Theopomp. frag. 38 K.; Ar. *Plut.* 182-83; Pl. *Resp.* 471 C. In Pl. *Leg.* 620B, the words πόλλ' ἀγαθὰ occur in a passage where Plato is paraphrasing a poem of Tyrtaeus. It is perhaps no accident that the phrase is the same as on the inscription; asyndetic πόλλ' ἀγαθὰ may well have been a sacrosanct religious phrase, which occasionally surfaced in certain "benefaction" contexts (e.g., Ar. *Ach.* 633, 641). There is further evidence for this suggestion, Isoc. 12. 62 . . . Λακεδαιμόνιοι πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν αἵτιοι τοῖς "Ἑλλῃσι κατέστησαν; 16. 16 πόλλ' ἀγαθὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐποίησεν; see also 3. 5, 12. 25. This despite the fact that Isocrates regularly and frequently uses a connective with πόλλ- (e.g., 7. 17 [bis], 71; 8. 4, 12, 79, 105, 145; 9. 51, 54; 10. 29, 69; 11. 28; 12. 44, 60, 90, 128, 149, 175, 207; 15. 40, 79, 98, 103, 127, 128, 138, 168; 18. 31, 45; 19. 50; *Epist.* 6.) Elsewhere in Isocrates I note asyndetic πολλά only at 12. 77: . . . τοὺς "Ἑλλῃνας ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ ταραχαῖς καὶ πολλοῖς κακοῖς ὄντας . . . Here, as in the Eleusis inscription (above), the coordination of κακοῖς with νοῦνις (πολέμῳ, ταραχαῖς) makes it emphatically substantival and explains the absence of καὶ.

Certain other niceties in the use of the plural of πολὺς, for the most part unremarked in the grammars and lexica, remain to be considered. The type κακά πολλά, with πολλά following, is not especially rare, but chiefly poetic. The reason for the omission of καὶ in such phrases is clear. Adjectives of number and quantity (πολὺς) are by their nature emphatic and therefore tend to precede. Postponement of πολλά of necessity gives special prominence to the other adjective (κακά *vel*

7. Thus, for example, the MSS at Xen. *An.* 3. 4. 2 have πολλά δὲ κακά ἐνόμιζε ποιῆσαι (contrast *An.* 7. 1. 33) and at Arr. *Indica* 29. 7 πολλά κακά . . . παθόντες. Omission of καὶ before κακά is easy enough, but without a detailed study of a given author's usage caution is in order.

sim.) and marks it unmistakably as a substantive, with πολλά as its attribute. Compare the English "evils aplenty." Some instances of this type, *exempli gratia*: κακά πολλά (*Il.* 9. 540, 22. 380; *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 302, 355; *Batrach.* 110, 179; *Hom. Vit. Herod.* 1. 448 Allen (hexameter); *Theog.* 389, 1213; *Ar. Ran.* 786). δαίδαλα πολλά (*Il.* 14. 179; 18. 482; *Hes. Theog.* 581). In prose this type appears especially in the phrases ἄλλοι πολλοί, ἄλλα πολλά, for instance: *Pl. Cri.* 45B; *Meno* 76E, 81B, 92A (ἄλλοι πάμπολλοι); *Prt.* 316E, 340D; [*Pl.*] *Theages* 128A; *Isoc.* 12. 108, 183, 215. Here perhaps belongs *Pl. Resp.* 492B ἀθρόοι πολλοί ((οἱ) πολλοί Hermann: πολλοί del. Cobet). Note that ἄλλοι πολλοί can be combined with the commonest type: ἄλλα πολλά καὶ παντοδαπά (*Pl. Hp. Mi.* 363C); ἄλλα πολλά καὶ θαυμαστά (*Pl. Meno* 93D); ἄλλοι πολλοὶ καὶ σοφοί (*Pl. Prt.* 314C); ἄλλα δὴ πολλά τε καὶ ἀνόσια (*Pl. Resp.* 615D). Smyth (*Greek Grammar*², no. 2879a) makes an interesting distinction: "πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι means *many others also* (with καὶ adverbial). For *many others* we find ἄλλοι πολλοί (very common) or πολλοὶ ἄλλοι." He gives no examples. Contrast *Od.* 21. 251 εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ Ἀχαιῖδες with *Hes. Theog.* 363 πολλαὶ γὰρ μὲν εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλαι. See further *Pl. Prt.* 352E πολλά γὰρ οἶμαι, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες, καὶ ἄλλα οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι. *Od.* 3. 113 ἄλλα τε πόλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖς πάθομεν κακά. A similar set of phrases is found with τοιαῦτα. *Pl. Prt.* 353D ἄλλα τοιαῦτα πολλά; *Meno* 77A πολλά τοιαῦτα (*bis*). *Dem.* 38. 21 πολλά τοιαῦτα codd. SA: ἄλλα πολλά τοιαῦτα cett.; 37. 58 πόλλ' ἄλλα τοιαῦτα codd. SA: πολλά τοιαῦτ' ἄλλα cett.: ἄλλα del. Blass, coll. 38. 21.

Rarely, the type *adjective καὶ πολλά* (i.e., the reverse of the commonest sequence) occurs, *Theognis* 651 αἰσχρὰ δέ μ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα βίη καὶ πολλά διδάσκεις. The two word orders are by no means interchangeable. B. A. van Groningen's excellent note on *Theognis* 651 deserves to be quoted in full: "καὶ πολλά: Stobée lit κακά πολλά, ce qui oblige à considérer αἰσχρὰ comme épithète de κακά (ou inversement); en outre chez lui αἰσχρὰ et πολλά ne sont pas coordonnés par καὶ, ce qui est anormal. Ahrens s'est offusqué de l'ordre αἰσχρὰ καὶ πολλά au lieu de πολλά καὶ αἰσχρὰ et a proposé καὶ δειλά. Le texte est en règle, bien que ce soit le seul exemple dans Th.; cf. B 213 ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε εἰδώς, B 188 παλαιά τε πολλά τε εἰδώς. Bethe a noté avec raison que cet ordre des mots est plus énergique que l'ordre usuel; il traduit: *turpia ac multa quidem*." There is an example of this same use in *Plato Meno* 99C: καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι ἐνθουσιῶντες λέγουσιν μὲν ἀληθῆ καὶ πολλά κτλ. R. S. Bluck ad loc. comments: "ἀληθῆ καὶ πολλά. This is not the same as πολλά καὶ ἀληθῆ. The καὶ is intensive, so that καὶ πολλά means *sane multa*: cf. *Phaedo* 58d, *Resp.* 562C, and (with Stallbaum) *Elmsley* on *Eur. Med.* 871. (At *Arist. Nic. Eth.* 1100b25 τὰ δὲ μεγάλα καὶ πολλά γινόμενα represents ἀ δὲ μεγάλα καὶ πολλά γίγνεται, so that μεγάλα and πολλά are predicative adjectives, and the case is altogether different. In the same section we have πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἀτυχίας." Bluck's statement that καὶ πολλά means *sane multa* here is correct; his parallels from *Plato* are only partial ones, since in those passages the intensives καὶ πολλοί and καὶ πολὺ are not preceded by coordinate adjectives. His statement that the *Aristotle* passage is "altogether different" is wrong. The fact that the adjectives there are predicative is irrelevant; "cet ordre des mots est plus énergique que l'ordre usuel." There is a similar alternative in *Dem.* 37. 57: πολλά καὶ δεινὰ πέπονθας; . . . τὸν γὰρ δεινὰ σε καὶ πόλλ' εἰργασμένον. In *Isoc.* 8. 105 the variant οὕτω δεινὰ καὶ πολλά should perhaps be preferred to πολλά καὶ

δενά, which editors tend to print. This latter reading looks very much like a *lectio facilior*. Compare Isoc. 12. 179 τόπους . . . μικροὺς καὶ πολλοὺς.

VIII

ἡνάγκασμαι μὲν οὖν, ὦ ἄνδρες, διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι δίκην παρ' αὐτῶν λαβεῖν, τὴν μητέρα τὴν ἐμὴν ἐν τῇ ἀνακρίσει Ἀριστάρχου εἶναι ἀδελφὴν προσγράψασθαι. οὐ μὴν διὰ τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἡ διάγνωσις ἤττον περὶ αὐτῶν εὐκρινὴς γενήσεται, †ἀλλ'† ἐκ τῶν νόμων σκοποῦσιν εἰ κτλ.

ἐν τῇ ἄν. Dobree: πρὸς τῇ ἄν. ἡ διάγνωσις Scheibe: ἤδε ἡ γνωσις

[Isaeus 10. 2]

Of †ἀλλ'† Wyse comments: "The construction is intolerable. The writer of M boldly changed σκοποῦσιν to σκοπῶμεν. Dobree (*Adv.* 1., p. 307) and Schoemann ease the sentence by casting out ἀλλ'. But where did the intruder come from?" Thalheim accepts the deletion of ἀλλ'; the presence of this "intruder" has not been explained. Read

(ἀλλ') οὐ μὴν διὰ τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἡ διάγνωσις ἤττον περὶ αὐτῶν εὐκρινὴς γενήσεται, [ἀλλ'] ἐκ τῶν νόμων σκοποῦσιν εἰ κτλ.

ἀλλ' fell out, as small words so often do, and was later "restored" in the wrong position. Words and phrases sometimes wander in the MSS; for a fairly clear example of a small word (γάρ) so displaced see Galen, *De usu partium* 17. c. 1 (= 4. 360–61 Kühn = 2. 448 Helmreich); discussion of the passage in my "Lectioes Galenicae," *RhM* 108 (1965): 64–65.

For ἀλλ' οὐ μὴν see J. D. Denniston *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford, 1954), pp. 341, 344–45. It may be objected that ἀλλ' οὐ μὴν does not occur elsewhere in Isaeus; neither does οὐ μὴν. One or the other seems clearly necessary here, and ἀλλ' οὐ μὴν has the advantage of explaining the intrusive ἀλλ' below. The positive counterpart ἀλλά μὴν is common in Isaeus.⁸

IX

. . . ἀδικούμαι γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν, οὓς περιορᾶν μὲν ἀποστεροῦντας οὐ ῥάδιον, ἀπέχ-
θεσθαι δὲ ἀγδῆς [Sylburg: ἡδέως], μεθ' ὧν ἀνάγκη καὶ (θύειν καὶ) συνουσίας κοινὰς ποιείσθαι
κτλ.

[Isaeus frag. 4 Th.]

According to Thalheim there is a "litt. 2 vel 3 rasura" after ἀνάγκη καὶ in one of the MSS (F). The supplement (θύειν καὶ) is due to H. Sauppe; L. Radermacher conjectured (συνθύειν καὶ). For this latter, compare Isaeus 8. 15 . . . εἴτε μικρὰ εἴτε μεγάλα θύου, πανταχοῦ παρήμεν ἡμεῖς καὶ συνεθύομεν. There can be no certainty here. Perhaps καὶ is simply to be deleted as a dittography after -κη: . . . μεθ' ὧν ἀνάγκη

8. In general, given the great variety of Greek particles and the slender bulk of most of the Attic orators (including Isaeus), some caution should be used before appealing to the *argumentum e silentio*. Consider. Denniston in *GP*², p. 29 states: "The authorities note that οὐ μὴν ἀλλά is confined to Attic Greek. . . . They do not go on to observe that its distribution over Attic Greek is extremely uneven. It is never found (except for the solitary instance of οὐ μὴν . . . ἀλλά) in verse. I know of but one example in Xenophon; of but one in any orator other than Isocrates and Demosthenes (*Lyc.* 124): and of none in Thucydides. . . ." Wyse on Isaeus 11. 34 also denies the occurrence of οὐ μὴν ἀλλά in Isaeus. In fact οὐ μὴν ἀλλά occurs in Isaeus twice: *Or.* 8. 5; frag. 19. The text is questioned in neither place.

[καί] συνουσίας κοινὰς ποιείσθαι. But if the supplements proposed above are along the right lines, as well they may be, there is a simpler solution: μεθ' ὧν ἀνάγκη <καὶ θυσίας> καὶ συνουσίας κοινὰς ποιείσθαι (or with the nouns in the reverse order). Compare Isoc. 4. 43 . . . εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας κοινὰς ποιησαμένους . . . ; 19. 10 . . . οὐτε θυσίαν οὐτε θεωρίαν οὐτ' ἄλλην ἐορτὴν οὐδεμίαν χωρὶς ἀλλήλων ἤγομεν; Isaeus 8. 16 . . . ταύτης [sc. τῆς θυσίας] ἡμεῖς ἐκονωνοῦμεν. In uncials, because of the shapes of omicron and theta (O, Θ), θυσίας and -ουσίας can be readily confused.

ADDENDUM

In Isoc. 20. 21 (above p. 243) I now think that the anonymous referee, who preferred ὡς to ὥσπερ, is correct. Against the passages adduced in support of ὥσπερ see Aesch. 3. 247: ὡς οὖν μὴ μόνον κρίνοντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεωροῦμενοι, οὕτω τὴν ψῆφον φέρετε. The variant ὥσπερ is due to the influence of the following ὑπέρ.

ROBERT RENEHAN
University of California,
Santa Barbara

ON ETYMOLOGICUM GENUINUM β 120 (65. 7 BERGER)

Βίνη· πόλις. μέμνηται δὲ ταύτης Ἡρόθεος καὶ φησιν ὠνομάσθαι ὑπὸ Φιλίππου οἰκισθεῖσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ συνοικισθέντων μοιχῶν. οὕτως Ὕλρος.

Ἡρόθεος A Ἡρ^Δ (= Ἡρωδιανός) B

The name of Orus' source for the etymology of Βίνη as transmitted in A and printed in the text by G. Berger¹ is highly suspect. Ἡρόθεος is a very rare name,² no author is known to have borne it. It is much more likely that the alternative reading Ἡρωδιανός is correct.

The city Βίνη is also mentioned in Theognostus' *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας*: τὰ διὰ τοῦ ιη διὰ τοῦ ι γραφόμενα τὴν παραλήγουσαν ὀλιγιστὰ εἰσιν' . . . Βίνη ἢ πόλις' . . .³ Theognostus' source here is probably Herodian. In his dedicatory epistle he names Herodian's *Καθολικὴ προσφῶδια* as a source for his work;⁴ he cites Herodian particularly often in the second part of the treatise (canons 143 to the end, the part dealing with terminations from which the passage just quoted is taken).⁵ Lentz was surely correct in including the word Βίνη in his reconstruction of the *Καθολικὴ προσφῶδια* on the basis of the Theognostean passage.⁶ It would by no means have been

1. *Etymologicum Genuinum et Etymologicum Symeonis* (β), Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 45 (Meisenheim am Glan, 1972), p. 65. 7; this reading is likewise adopted by R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 320. 24, where our gloss is rightly included among fragments to be attributed to Orus' *Περὶ ἔθνικων*.

2. Attested IG, 12.9. 1189, line 10 (Histiaea-Oreus; 2nd cent. B.C.): Ἡρόθεος Ἡροθέου Χρεμείδης.

3. J. A. Cramer (ed.), *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1835), p. 113. 25–27.

4. Cf. K. Alpers (ed.), *Theognostos, ΠΕΡΙ ΟΡΘΟΓΡΑΦΙΑΣ. Überlieferung, Quellen und Text der Kanones 1–84* (Ph.D. diss., Hamburg, 1964), p. 69. 4 (Alpers here posits a lacuna in which the names of other sources would have stood).

5. Ibid., p. 27.

6. A. Lentz (ed.), *Herodiani Technici reliquiae*, Grammatici Graeci 3.1 (Leipzig, 1868), p. 333. 8.