

I suggest that Sophocles' νῆσαι is not from νέω (B) but from νέω (C),⁵ and that the items in question are to be placed in a pile. Although Homer does not speak of Nausicaa and her slave-girls piling up the clothes, he does refer twice to folding them (*Od.* 6.111, 252), obviously preparatory to stacking, and νηέω, the Homeric form of the Sophoclean verb, is used at *Iliad* 24.276 of loading goods (clothing prominent among them; *Il.* 24.248–51) onto a wagon. There is little point or profit in attempting to reconstruct the details of the plots of emphatically lost tragedies. But if one thing can be taken as certain about a play called *Nausicaa* or *Washing-women* and apparently based at least in part on *Odyssey* 6,⁶ it is that laundry—whether heaped in Nausicaa's room (*Od.* 6.26), or on the wagon that takes her and her slave-girls to and from the river mouth (*Od.* 6.74–5, 90–1, 252),⁷ or on the shore after it has been washed and dried in the sun (*Od.* 6.93–4), or on the wagon again to be transported home—played a significant part in the story, *inter alia* as a means of providing the naked, shipwrecked Odysseus with something to wear before he went to meet the princess' mother and father (*Od.* 6.178–9, 214). At some point—Sophocles, fr. 439 R. suggests—a character in the play at least imagined putting that laundry in a heap.⁸

University of Minnesota

S. DOUGLAS OLSON

sdouglasolson@gmail.com

doi:10.1017/S0009838815000038

A TEXTUAL NOTE TO PLATO, *GORGIAS* 465a4*

Gorgias 465a2-7

τέχνην δὲ αὐτὴν οὐ φημι εἶναι ἀλλ' ἐμπειρίαν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχει λόγον οὐδένα ᾧ προσφέρει ἃ προσφέρει ὅποι' ἄττα τὴν φύσιν ἐστίν, ὥστε τὴν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου μὴ ἔχειν εἰπεῖν. ἐγὼ δὲ

Development of Cloth in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages with Special Reference to the Aegean (Princeton, 1991), 39–78.

⁵ For νέω (C) in contemporary Athenian literature, see e.g. *Ar. Nub.* 1203; *Lys.* 269. The Dindorf brothers, in their *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* s.v. νέω, note in passing that the same suggestion was put forward by Gottfried Jungermann, the early seventeenth-century editor of Pollux, 'etsi νεοπλυνής'—a now-discredited reading at *Poll.* 7.45, the source of the fragment—'ostendit referri potius ad praecedens Νέω', i.e. νέω (B).

⁶ *Ath.* 1.20F tells us that Sophocles himself performed a ball-dance in the play, presumably referring to a version of the action at *Od.* 6.100, 115–16 that leads to the encounter between Odysseus and Nausicaa. Nothing is known of the content of the plays entitled *Washing-women* or *Nausicaa* and *Nausicaa* by the comic poets Philyllius and Eubulus respectively, except that someone was very hungry in the latter (fr. 68 K.-A.).

⁷ Fr. 441 R. λαμπάνη (glossed by Pollux 'a type of wagon on which they ride. Some [call it] an ἀπήνη') can reasonably be taken as evidence that Nausicaa's wagon—referred to specifically as an ἀπήνη at e.g. *Od.* 6.57, 69, 75—was mentioned in the play.

⁸ The laundry is visible in two roughly contemporary vase-paintings (Munich 2322, an amphora and the name-vase of the Nausicaa Painter, c. 440 B.C.E.; Boston MFA 04.18a–b, a pyxis by Aison, c. 420 B.C.E.), but in both cases is being actively processed by the women or hung to dry. Thanks are due to Benjamin Millis, David Sansone and the anonymous reader for *CQ*.

* My best thanks are due to Prof. Mark Schiefsky and to *CQ*'s reader for constructive criticism and invaluable comments.

τέχνην οὐ καλῶ ὁ ἄν ἥ ἄλογον πρᾶγμα· τούτων δὲ πέρι εἰ ἀμφοσθητεῖς, ἐθέλω ὑποσχεῖν λόγον.¹

a 3. οὐδένα] δοῦνα *Hissink* : οὐδένα <δοῦνα> *Theiler*. a 4. ᾧ προσφέρει ᾧ προσφέρει *codd.*, *Burnet*, *Croiset*, *Erler* : ᾧ προσφέρει *Aristidis LMN*, *schol. Dion. Thrac.* : ᾧ προσφέρει *Aristidis E*, *Ast*, *Stallbaum* : ὧν προσφέρει *Doxopatres*, *Cornarius*, *Heindorf*, *Bekker*, *Schanz*, *Hermann*, *Nestle*, *Serrano*: ὧν προσφέρει *Prol. in Hermog.* : ᾧ προσφέρει <ἧ> ᾧ προσφέρει *Dodds* : ᾧ προσφέρει <οὐδ'> ᾧ προσφέρει *scripserim*

This dense and elliptic passage is situated in a conceptually crucial section of the dialogue: Socrates refutes the claim of rhetoric to be an art (τέχνη), and defines its status as a spurious imitation (εἶδωλον) of justice (δικαιοσύνη). In this respect, the opposition between rhetoric and justice is mirrored by the contrast between cookery and medicine.² Hence the choice in 465a4 of the medical verb προσφέρω, used elsewhere by Plato with reference to medical treatment (for example, at *Symposium* 189a2). As is shown by *Charmides* 157c1-5, the verb can take both the accusative of the prescribed φάρμακον (or the like) and the dative of the object (or person) to which it applies (see also *Phaedrus* 268a9-b3 and 270b5-7).³

The text of *Gorgias* 465a4, as it is transmitted by the manuscripts, is in itself untenable, and a conjunction needs to be supplied between ᾧ προσφέρει and ᾧ προσφέρει.⁴ Above all, any attempt at emending the text must take into account that here both ᾧ προσφέρει and ᾧ προσφέρει are necessary for Plato's argument: Socrates states that medicine—unlike any pseudo-τέχνη—relies on inquiries concerning both the nature of the object that it heals and the cause of its treatments.⁵ The understanding of the nature (φύσις) of both the prescribed drugs and the patient's body requires λόγος, that is explanatory knowledge, not just ἐμπειρία.⁶ Unlike the latter, in fact, a truly rational τέχνη allows the person who masters it to individualize explanatory generalizations and to put them into practice. Like medicine, rhetoric must know both the object to which it refers and the grounds and causes (αἰτίαι) of its procedures in order to become a τέχνη,⁷ as Plato theorizes elsewhere (see, for instance, *Phaedrus* 270e3).

¹ Editions, commentaries and translations referred to in the apparatus criticus and elsewhere: F. Ast, *Platonis quae exstant opera*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1819); I. Bekker, *Platonis Scripta Graece Omnia*, vol. 3 (London, 1826); J. Burnet, *Platonis Opera*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1909²); I. Cornarius, *Platonis Opera Omnia* (Basel, 1561); A. Croiset, *Platon. Œuvres Complètes*, vol. 3.2 (Paris, 1935²); E.R. Dodds, *Plato Gorgias. A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1990²); M. Erler, *Platon: Gorgias*, Griechisch und Deutsch (Stuttgart, 2011); L.F. Heindorf, *Platonis dialogi selecti*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1805); C.F. Hermann, *Platonis Dialogi*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1851); D.H.H. Hissink, *Specimen literarium inaugurale continens animadversiones criticas in Platonis aliquot dialogos* (Deventer, 1845); W. Nestle, *Platons Ausgewählte Schriften*, vol. 2: *Gorgias*, erklärt von C. Cron und J. Deutschle, neubearbeitet von W.N. (Leipzig, 1909⁵); M. Schanz, *Platonis Opera quae feruntur omnia*, vol. 8 (Leipzig, 1881); R. Serrano Cantarín and M. Díaz de Cerio Díez, *Platón. Gorgias* (Madrid, 2000); G. Stallbaum, *Platonis opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Gotha, 1861³); W. Theiler, *Platonis Gorgias* (Bern, 1965²).

² For the distinction between τέχνη and ἐμπειρία, cf. Dodds (n. 1), 229. See further e. g. G. Cambiano, *Platone e le tecniche* (Rome and Bari, 1991), 78–9; M.J. Schiefsky (ed.), *Hippocrates. On Ancient Medicine* (Leiden and Boston, 2005), 346.

³ Cf. H. Yunis (ed.), *Plato Phaedrus* (Cambridge, 2011), 210.

⁴ Dodds (n. 1), 229–30.

⁵ *Grg.* 500e4–501a3. See further Cambiano (n. 2), 69.

⁶ For the medical concept of explanatory knowledge as presented by Hippocrates see e.g. *VM* 20.1–3 (with Schiefsky [n. 2], ad loc.).

⁷ See e.g. Cambiano (n. 2), 185.

Thus, despite the palaeographic likelihood of a confluence of *lectio falsa* and *lectio emendata*, there is strong philosophical evidence in favour of the reiterated προσφέρει at *Gorgias* 465a4.⁸ Accordingly, Dodds suggests the simple ‘diagnostic’ integration of a conjunction like <ἢ>, which could have easily dropped out: ‘it has no rational understanding of the patient or the prescription’.⁹ Nevertheless, Dodds himself does not present his solution as definitive and irreplaceable.

In fact, his integration may not be the only possibility. Given that 501a1-2 states the necessity of both the patient and the causes (καὶ [...] καὶ), the corresponding denial of the relevant competences in 465a4 can become more emphatic if we insert <οὐδέ> or <οὐδ’> between ᾧ προσφέρει and ἃ προσφέρει: together with the preceding οὐκ [...] οὐδένα,¹⁰ the passage would thus show an instance of redundant accumulation of negative particles,¹¹ which is a frequent stylistic device in the whole Platonic corpus.¹² In particular, a correlation of negative clauses is provided by the mentioned recapitulation at *Gorgias* 501a4-7.¹³ In order to account for the loss of οὐδ’ in the manuscript tradition, we may attempt a detailed palaeographic explanation, involving both the double προσφέρει and the likely misreading of οὐδένα and οὐδ’ ἃ (especially in *scriptio continua*). For instance, a scribe could have accidentally omitted οὐδ’ ἃ προσφέρει, reinserting it in the margin; a later scribe could then have mistaken οὐδ(ὲ) for a signal word introducing a variant reading—or a correction—after οὐδένα, and thus could have written ἃ προσφέρει *supra lineam*,¹⁴ the latter would have subsequently penetrated into the text, directly following ᾧ προσφέρει. In conclusion, the conjecture here proposed has the double convenience of making the syntax match closely the philosophical argument and of offering a possible palaeographic explanation for the loss of the conjunction. A translation of the emended passage would read: ‘it has no rational understanding whatsoever of the person to whom it applies *nor* of the nature of what it applies’.

Harvard University

MARCO ROMANI MISTRETTA

romanimistretta@fas.harvard.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838815000269

⁸ For a similar Platonic instance cf. *Symp.* 187e1-2. A significant Hippocratic parallel for the polyptoton of the verb is found at *Epid.* 1.3.10.1 (Littré 2.668-70), where the juxtaposition of the passive voice and the active voice differentiates between medical prescriptions and the physician who prescribes them.

⁹ Dodds (n. 1), 230.

¹⁰ For the use of οὐδέ as a negative addition to a negative sentence, see A.C. Moorhouse, *Studies in the Greek Negatives* (Cardiff, 1959), 15.

¹¹ For the phenomenon see e.g. Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hanover, 1892-1904³), 2.2.203; O. Jespersen, *Negation in English and other Languages* (Copenhagen, 1917), 64; J. Wackernagel, *Lectures on Syntax, with Special Reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic*, edited with notes and bibliography by D. Langslow (Oxford, 2009), 787; J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1975²), 196-7; Moorhouse (n. 10), 132-3.

¹² Cf. e.g. *Ap.* 19d8-e1; *Grg.* 508c5-7; *Phd.* 78d6-7; *Prm.* 166a1-3; *Symp.* 204a1-4, 211a5-8; *Resp.* 614a5-6; *Leg.* 808b5-6.

¹³ See further Schiefsky (n. 2), 347-8.

¹⁴ For scribal corrections with signal word, and their frequent misunderstandings, see e.g. G. Magnaldi, *La forza dei segni. Parole-spie nella tradizione manoscritta dei prosatori latini* (Amsterdam, 2000), 113-19.