NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

CONFIRMATION OF TWO "CONJECTURES" IN THE PRESOCRATICS: PARMENIDES B 12 AND ANAXAGORAS B 15

DAVID SIDER

IN EACH OF THE TWO PASSAGES discussed below, the indisputably correct reading is given by Diels as editorial conjecture, when in fact for each there is manuscript authority.

PARMENIDES B 12.4

In Diels's edition of Simplicius *in Ar. Phys.* (Berlin 1882) 31.10–17, we read:

καὶ ποιητικὸν δὲ αἴτιον οὐ σωμάτων μόνον τῶν ἐν τῇ γενέσει ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀσωμάτων τῶν τὴν γένεσιν συμπληροῦντων σαφῶς παραδέδωκεν ὁ Παρμενίδης λέγων

αἱ δ' ἐπὶ ταῖς νυκτός, μετὰ δὲ φλογὸς ἵεται αἶσα.   2[1]
ἐν δὲ μέσῳ τούτων δαίμων ἣ πάντα κυβερνᾷ·
†πάντα γὰρ στυγεροῖο τόκου καὶ μίξιος ἄρχει (ἀρχὴ F)
πέμπουσ' ἄρσενι θῆλυ μιγὲν τό τ' ἐναντίον αὖθις   5
ἄρσεν θηλυτέρῳ.

Editors generally read Bergk's μιγῆν in line 5 (Tarán mistakenly crediting it to Stein), but have failed to reach a consensus on the beginning of line 4:

πάντα γὰρ ⟨ἤ⟩ Diels (from 1897 on) plerique (e.g., Reinhardt, Untersteiner)
πάντα γ' ἄρα Karsten
πᾶσι Stein
παντός Brandis Preller Bergk[2]
πάντῃ Mullach Zeller Patin Tarán Hölscher[3]

Without naming their authors, Diels dismissed the last three conjectures, first in *Parmenides Lehrgedicht* (1897), "Die nächstliegenden Conjecturen πάντῃ, παντός, πᾶσιν haben keine Wahrscheinlichkeit;" and again in *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta* (1901), "πάντηι vel παντός vel πᾶσι

I wish to thank Miroslav Marcovich for his help on both parts of this note.

[1] Line 1 of B 12 is given by Simplicius elsewhere (39.14).

[2] Bergk also emended στυγεροῖο to σμυγ—(with as little cause as had Brunck at Soph. *Phil.* 166).

[3] Πάντῃ, when it has local force, means "in every direction," and is found with either a verb of motion or a local preposition or adverb (as in Parm. B 8.44 μεσσόθεν ἰσοπαλὲς πάντῃ). Tarán's "everywhere" is therefore incorrect. The extended meaning "in every way," i.e., "altogether," "überall," acceptable despite some hyperbaton, has to take second place to the reading given below.

corrigebant." In 1912, however, in *VS³*, we read that "die Konjekturen πάντων, πᾶσιν, πάντῃ werden überflüssig durch Einsetzung von ⟨ἤ⟩," a statement repeated in all subsequent editions of *VS*. The substitution of πάντων for Brandis' παντός seems a slip on Diels' part, as no text I have seen prints the former. Yet because Diels commands the authority he does, the trio πάντων, πᾶσιν, πάντῃ are reproduced elsewhere as "older conjectures;" e.g. H. Fränkel, "Parmenidesstudien," *NGG* 1930 181 n.3 (repeated in *Wege und Formen fruhgriechischen Denkens²* [Munich 1960] 185 n.4; Fränkel favored them over Diels's conjecture).

Were this all there was to the matter, it would hardly be worth spilling ink over, but in this erratic way Diels has printed the reading of a manuscript whose existence was unknown to him when editing Simplicius, and which proves to be an independent witness for the text: Moscow State Historical Museum 3649, s. xiii (here called W). The MS itself has been briefly described by B. L. Fonkich.[4] I plan elsewhere to discuss its affiliation in greater detail; for now it will suffice to show only that the text of W is remarkably close to that of Eᵃ, the fragment written at the end of E, covering only 20.1–30.16 and 35.30–44.19 of Simplicius. A. H. Coxon, "The MS Tradition of Simplicius' Commentary on Aristotle's *Physics i–iv*," *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968) 70–75, has noted a number of correct readings unique to Eᵃ. It can now be reported that the following are also correct in W.

21.21 συναποδείκνυται EᵃW:—ύναι cett.
26.24 ἀπολλυόμενον Eᵃ:—ολυ— W:ἀπολελυμένο(ν) cett.
27.15 ἐνυπαρχόντων EᵃW:ὑπ—cett.
28.16 Ἀβδηρίτης EᵃW:αὐδ—cett.
30.6 ταυτόν τ' ἐν EᵃW:ταυτόν τε ὄν ἐν DF:ταυτόν τε ὄν καὶ ἐν E
30.9 τὸ ἐόν EᵃW:τ'ἐόν D:τε ἐόν E:τεόν F
37.13 τελείου EᵃW:καὶ τ. cett.
37.21 ἐλέγξει EᵃW:ἐλέγχει cett.[5]

Πάντων (*sc.* τῶν ὄντων; cf. Simplicius' opening words) gives excellent sense and is without question correct. For similar use of anadiplosis in Parmenides with γάρ, see B 1.4 τῇ φερόμηνʼ τῇ γάρ με κτλ, B 8.8 (οὐ) φάσθαι σʼ οὐδὲ νοεῖνʼ οὐ γὰρ φατὸν οὐδὲ νοητόν, and cf. B 6.1, 8.19 f. The error of all the MSS but W is easy to explain: a simple *lapsus calami* arising out of πάντα in line 3. For other examples of errors induced by the immediate context, cf. Lucr. 1.783 ff, where *ignem* in 783 causes *ignem* (for *imbrem*) in 784 and *igni* (for *imbri*) in 785; Eur. *Hel.* 1243 κενοῖσι θάπτειν ἐν πέπλοις (for πέπλων, Scaliger) ὑφάσμασιν; Cic. *Or.* 98 *acuto ... acute* (for *acuto ... argute*). The origin of Diels's error is less obvious. Let us credit it to a

[5]Generally, EᵃFW agree in error against DE.

lapsus memoriae in which an excellent conjecture (as it could only have been then regarded) displaced a weak one in the mind of the man who did more than any other scholar towards establishing the text of the Presocratics. (Incidentally, now that the truth is known, Stein deserves credit for having come closest in sense to the true reading, even though πᾶσιν is paleographically the weakest of all.)

ANAXAGORAS B 15

Simplicius *in Phys.* 179.3 Diels reads as follows: τὸ μὲν πυκνόν, φησί, καὶ διερὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν καὶ τὸ ζοφερὸν ἐνθάδε συνεχώρησεν ἔνθα νῦν ⟨ἡ γῆ⟩. In the apparatus Diels wrote "ἡ γῆ add. a(ldina) cf. Hippol. Philosoph. 8,2" (= A 42 τὸ μὲν οὖν πυκνὸν καὶ ὑγρὸν καὶ τὸ σκοτεινὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν . . . ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον, ἐξ ὧν παγέντων τὴν γῆν ὑποστῆναι).[6] Diels's printing of ⟨ἡ γῆ⟩ in his edition of Simplicius and in *VS* has produced unnecessary trouble for later students of Anaxagoras, both those who say that "earth" is indeed to be printed or understood (e.g., Guthrie, *History of Greek Philosophy* [Cambridge 1965] 2.295 n.6, "doubtless represents Anaxagoras' doctrine, but it is unnecessary to alter the text here") and those who deny that "earth" belongs here at all (e.g., C. Mugler, "Le problème d'Anaxagore," *REG* 69 [1956] 342 n.5, "en contradiction avec le frgt. 4, parce que la terre n' était pas toujours partout où elle se trouve maintenant"). Γῆ, however, appears in every MS I have examined (fifteen in number), and ἡ appears in P(arisinus graecus 1908), which Diels knew to be close to a, but which he did not collate; and in I[3] (Oxford, New College 244)—both in the F-family of MSS. The mistake may be Vitelli's, who did the actual collation of DEF, or, more likely, it may be Diels's, but clearly at one point ⟨ἡ⟩ γῆ was written as ⟨ἡ γῆ⟩ and never corrected. All that remains open to question now is how to regard the definite article, as elsewhere Anaxagoras writes γῆ both with (B 4a, 16) and without (B 4b, 16 *bis*) the article. It seems unlikely, however, that I[3]P have here alone preserved an authentic reading against the other MSS, so that we should follow the majority and omit the article.

Diels also wrote in his apparatus "videtur supplendum τὸ ante διερὸν et ψυχρόν," but both here and in *VS* he retained the text of the MSS he knew. W, however, and one other MS (Modena 184) have the article before ψυχρόν. Thus, although insertion and omission of articles are admittedly trivial errors, we may now print the text as follows: τὸ μὲν πυκνὸν καὶ ⟨τὸ⟩ διερὸν καὶ τὸ ψυχρὸν καὶ τὸ ζοφερὸν ἔνθαδε συνεχώρησεν ἔνθα νῦν γῆ.

URBANA, ILLINOIS

---

[6]Cf. D.L. 2.8 τῶν δὲ σωμάτων τὰ μὲν βαρέα τὸν κάτω τόπον ⟨ὡς τὴν γῆν⟩ . . . ἐπισχεῖν, where the words in brackets (received into the text by Long) are found only in the codd. dett. and seem to be a Byzantine addition, as Miroslav Marcovich, who is editing Diogenes Laertius for the Bibliotheca Teubneriana, kindly informs me.