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420a1 ἀλλ’ ἀτεχνῶς φαίη ἐν ὠσπερ ἐπίκουροι μισθωτοί ἐν τῇ πόλει φαίνονται καθήσθαι οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ φρουροῦντες.

ἄλλο ἢ AD: ἄλλ’ ἢ F

There are, in Plato, about ten instances of a form of οὐδεῖς followed immediately by ἄλλ’ ἢ, cf. K.-G. II 284 f. and Anm. 4; Denniston, 25; 27. About one half of these concern the phrase οὐδὲν ἄλλ’ ἢ, ‘simply, just’ (“doing nothing but”), qualifying a verb. Cf. *Men.* 84c10-11 σκέψαται δὴ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἀπορίας ὃτι καὶ ἁνευρήσεις ζητῶν μετ’ ἑμοῦ, οὐδὲν ἄλλ’ ἢ ἐρωτώντος ἑμοῦ καὶ οὐ διδάσκοντος; 76b7; *Phd.* 76a6; *Tht.* 167e2; *Lg.* 722c9. οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ is three times used in the same way: *Euthd.* 277e1 τούτω οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ χορεύετον περὶ σέ; *Tht.* 195e1; *Men.* 80a1. Ours is the only passage where the MSS are divided.

I don’t see why Plato cannot have used two versions of the same expression; the assumption would require changing the text in three passages. Therefore I follow AD: even though F’s reading might seem to be the lectio difficilior, it is unwise to adopt it, because F is notoriously unreliable in its transmission of particles.

Of course, ἄλλ’ ἢ itself probably originated as a misunderstanding of elided ἄλλο ἢ, so one might ask if ἄλλ’ ἢ in Plato shouldn’t be corrected to ἄλλ’ ἢ everywhere. But outside of this phrase elided ἄλλο is quite rare in the corpus: about ten instances in Burnet’s text—it could have been elided, but isn’t, in 220 cases including 39 ἄλλο ἢ. Therefore it is likely that the misunderstanding belongs to an older period of Greek. See Denniston, 26 f.; 581.

*) These notes continue those published *Mnemosyne*. 41 (1988), 276-298 (to which the reader is referred for their format and purpose); 42 (1989), 380-397; 43 (1990), 341-363. Once again it is my pleasure to thank the members of the Amsterdam Hellenist Club for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.
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420e6-7 ἐπιστάμεθα γὰρ καὶ τοὺς γεωργοὺς ξυστίδας ἀμφισβάντες καὶ χρυσὸν περιθέντες πρὸς ἡδονήν ἐργάζεσθαι κελεῦειν τὴν γῆν, καὶ τοὺς κεραμέας κατακλίναντες ἐπὶ δεξιὰ πρὸς τὸ πῦρ διαπίνοντάς τε καὶ εὐχωμένους, τὸν τροχὸν παραθεμένους, ὅσον ἂν ἐπιθυμῶσι κεραμεύειν, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας τοιούτων τρόπων μακαρίους ποιεῖν, ἵνα δὴ ὅλη ἡ πόλις ευδαιμονῆ.

The words I have italicized are in AD, not in F. It is not easy to account for their omission, as there is no homoioteleuton or similar cause, and while omission of one word is common in F (Boter, 106; above 419a7 theοίς), omission of two substantial words is rare. It is tempting to regard them as an interpolation, since rounding off a long sentence with a loose ‘and all others likewise’ is typical of Plato’s style (below, 421c2-3). But the word for ‘likewise’ in such phrases is normally ὡςαύτως, and phrases like τοιούτων τρόπων (Mx. 240b5; Phdo. 73c5 etc.) and (a correction which is palaeographically easy) τοίς αὐτῶι τρόπωι (below, 441d6), and related ones, always qualify a verb in the immediate vicinity, except once: Euthd. 290c9-d1 καὶ οἷς γε στρατηγοὶ ἔρησον οὕτω τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον. This, however, is no support for the F reading here, as τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον points forward as well as backwards (as does οὕτω) and is explained in the following sentence.

Therefore we have to accept the authenticity of μακαρίους ποιεῖν, even though the omission in F remains a bit of a problem. Dr. Boter suggests to me that one of F’s ancestors may have been a text written in columns of some 15 letters and that μακαρίους ποιεῖν filled exactly one line, which was omitted through telescoping. For Plato, such a text would have been unusual, cf. E.G. Turner - P.J. Parsons, Greek manuscripts of the ancient world (London 1987) 2, 106—the papyrus there has 15 letters to the line as a minimum, and μακαρίους ποιεῖν would be below average given its three iotas), but not unthinkable. The suggestion has nothing to do with another, no doubt later, ancestor, first reconstructed by A.C. Clark (414-417; cf. Boter, 99 f.), with about 35 letters to the line.

425a10 καὶ τὰ σμικρὰ ἄρα εἴπον δοκοῦντα εἶναι νόμιμα ἐξευρίσκουσιν οὕτοι, ἢ οἱ πρώτον ἀπόλλυσαν πάντα.—Ποία;

ποία ADF Stob. IV 1, 97 (IV 38, 12 Hense): τὰ ποία J.L.V. Hartman (108).

As Hartman points out, τὰ could easily have fallen out after πάντα.