

*Εὖθὺς οὖν με ἵδων δὲ Κέφαλος ἡσπάζετό τε καὶ εἰπεν· ὩΣ
Σώκρατες, οὐδὲ θαμίζεις ἥμῖν καταβαίνων εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ.*

οὐδέ, the mss. reading is surely wrong. Editors who seek to justify it have been forced into the most unlikely defences e.g. that here οὐδέ is elliptical (= 'you don't do other things which you should nor do you visit us very often') and that 'the idiom has a kind of colloquial effect' (Adam) or 'οὐδέ, if correct, must be regarded as one of those colloquial idioms which, logical enough in their origin, imperceptibly shift their application till they defy strict analysis' (Tucker). This is in fact tantamount to saying that οὐδέ can't be explained but may nevertheless be right!

Emendation seems the safer course. Among the suggestions of previous editors οὐ δέ with an implied *ἀσπάζομαι μέν* is too subtle to be worth considering at all; οὐ τι is at first sight intrinsically possible but there is no real reason to implicate Homer; and οὐ δὴ is palaeographically reasonable but otherwise unattractive.

I suggest that both sense and text can be satisfied if we assume that something has fallen out before οὐδέ, and if we also delete καταβαίνων. I would fill out the text with οὐ + verb probably in the second person singular and probably beginning with the letters δε-: thus something like <οὐ δειπνεῖς> οὐδὲ θαμίζεις may be considered as a possible restoration. The awkwardness which now remains, in that one would expect θαμίζεις to apply equally to the dining and the visiting, – which would necessitate a considerable recasting of the clause so that a participle δειπνῶν could be worked in – can be easily removed by deleting καταβαίνων as a typical explanatory gloss which has become incorporated in the text. Such an explanation could quite reasonably have been supplied by a scribe who sought to eluci-

date the construction of *θαμίζεις* by importing additional information from the first words of the dialogue. *θαμίζειν* without participle, however, is instanced elsewhere in Plato (*Hp.Ma.* 281b οὐθὲν *θαμίζω εἰς τούσδε τοὺς τόπους*. cf. Xen. *Cyr.7.3.2 πρόσθεν θαμίζων ἐφ ’ῆμᾶς*.)

There are three points to note on this reading; (i) δειπνεῖς is a present of ‘customary action’ (cf. e.g. *Dem.* 19. 46 οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ὕδωρ, ἔγώ δ' οἶνον πίνω), ‘you don't customarily take dinner’; (ii) ἥμιν is placed beside *θαμίζεις* in order to particularize the general location indicated by *εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ*, but is to be construed in *sense* with δειπνεῖς also: ‘you don't customarily take dinner with us nor ...’; (iii) οὐδέ is here in its climactic sense (‘nor even’, see Denniston *The Greek Particles* p. 193, and cf. *Rep.* 347d οὐκ ἔχοντες ἔαντάν βελτίονων ἔπιτρέψαι οὐδὲ δύμολοις.)

Reading then ⁷Ω Σώκρατες, οὐδὲ δειπνεῖς οὐδὲ θαμίζεις ἥμιν εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ, we translate: ‘Socrates, you don't dine with us nor even come down often to visit us at the Peiraeus.’

But it may still be objected: why should Cephalus assume that Socrates has come to dinner? It seems reasonable to infer that the time is at least afternoon when Socrates meets Polemarchus. Polemarchus urges Socrates to come home with him, and at 328a he tempts him with the prospect of watching a παννυχίς: ἐξαναστησόμεθα γὰρ μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον καὶ τὴν παννυχίδα θεασόμεθα. We need not boggle at the fact that this δεῖπνον is not again alluded to, for the lengthy discussion into which the *Republic* devolves is a natural sequel to the early arguments in Book i. However, if Polemarchus appears at home – his own or his father's is not in question here – with Socrates probably in the early evening, is it not likely that Cephalus would assume that Socrates has come for a meal? In the words οὐδὲ δειπνεῖς Cephalus is implicitly inviting and welcoming Socrates to a meal and explicitly chiding him for the infrequency with which he shares their hospitality.

University of New England, N.S.W.

A. S. Henry