The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes on Herodotus, Books I–II

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 06 / July 1905, pp 290 - 296

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991844, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991844

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1905). Notes on Herodotus, Books I–II. The Classical Review, 19, pp 290-296 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991844

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

'fortune,' 'fate.' Messrs. Lang, Leaf and Myers translate *αἶσα* by 'lot' in l. 416, Monro translates *κακῇ αἵσῃ* 'with evil fortune' and Amejs 'zu einem schlimmen Lose.' At any rate I err in good company. But Mr. Earle tells us that *αἶσα* when used

of human life = 'doom.' Let us apply this to l. 416, 'seeing that thy *doom* is very brief and endureth no long while.' What an improvement!

R. C. SEATON.

NOTES ON HERODOTUS, BOOKS I-III.

BOOK I.

24. 81. *τελευτέοντος δὲ τοῦ νόμου ῥίψαί μιν ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν.*

Probably *τελευτέοντα* with the genitive, a well established construction. Herwerden *τελευτήσαντα*, but the present is both nearer to the MSS and better in itself, *just as he finished*.

ιβ. 11 *ιστορέεσθαι* (not elsewhere used in the passive by H.) should perhaps be changed to *ιστορέειν*, going on from the *ἔχειν* of the sentence before. So in 3. 99. 2 (for instance) R has *διαφθείρειν* against the *διαφθείρεσθαι* of other MSS. Valckenaer proposed *εἰρωτέεσθαι* here. Dr. Postgate suggests to me that *ιστορέεσθαι* may be middle. This is possible, but H.'s frequent and consistent use of the active is against it.

27. 4 *νησιώτας δὲ τί δοκέεις εὔχεσθαι ἄλλο ἢ . . . λαβεῖν ἀρᾶσθαι* *Λυδούς ἐν θαλάσῃ;* (MSS *ἀρᾶσθαι* or *ἀρώμενοι*)

Stein reads the ungrammatical and surely impossible nominative *ἀρώμενοι*. The infinitive is less anomalous, but still awkward. Should we not read *ἀρᾶσθαι*, but omit *εὔχεσθαι*, which may have been put in to fill up the ellipse of *τί δοκέεις ἄλλο ἢ ἀρᾶσθαι*? Cobet approves Toup's conjecture *αἰωρεομένων* as answering to *νησιώτας ἱππευομένους ἐν ἡπείρῳ* just before, and it is certainly plausible.

32. 6 *πάν ἄνθρωπος συμφορῇ.*

Quotations and A² (Stein) give *πάς*. The parallels in Stein's note point to *πάσα*, e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 909 *μικκός γε μάκος οὗτος*. Δ. *ἀλλ' ἅπαν κακόν*: Theocr. 15. 148 *χώνηρ ὅξος ἅπαν*.

48. 3 *διέπεμψε παρὰ τὰ χρηστήρια τοὺς θεο-πρόπους.*

παρά (which we should expect to take a

¹ In default of any way universally adopted of referring to specific parts of chapters, I have cited the sections as given in the old *Oxford Pocket Classics*.

personal accusative), probably because the oracle is more or less identified with the god or hero. Thus in 46. 2 *ἐς Δελφούς, ἐς Δωδώνην, παρὰ τε Ἀμφιάρεω καὶ παρὰ Τροφώνιον*. But *περὶ τὰ χ.* is possible.

59. 1 *τούτων δὲ ὧν τῶν ἐθνέων τὸ μὲν Ἀττικὸν κατεχόμενον τε καὶ διεσπασμένον ἐπυνθάνετο ὁ Κροῖσος ὑπὸ Πεισιστράτου.*

As *ὑπό* has nothing to do with *διεσπασμένον*, Herwerden reads *τέως* for *τε καί* and has also suggested *τέως διεσπασμένον κατεχόμενον*. We might very well adopt the transposition and read *διεσπασμένον τε καὶ κατεχόμενον*. The Athenians were divided and were under the control of P.

ιβ. 4 *οὐκ ὧν . . . πείθεσθαι ἐθέλειν . . . γενέσθαι <δὲ> οἱ κ.τ.λ.?*

65. 5 *ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον θεὸν ἔλπομαι, ὦ Λυκόοργε.*

The oracle is in doubt whether to call him god or man. It is hard to see the force of *ἔτι*. Perhaps *ἀλλά τι*. Both *καί* and *τι* are sometimes added to *μᾶλλον*.

67. 4 *Ἔστι τις Ἀρκαδῆς Τεγέῃ λευρῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ, ἔνθ' ἄνεμοι πνέουσι δύο κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης.*

It is surprising that exception has not been taken to the first of these lines. Not only does it make the *ἐνθ' ἄνεμοι πνέουσι* refer to Tegea as a whole, when it ought to be more specific, but the famous city is spoken of as *Τεγέῃ τις* in a slighting manner. Surely it stands to reason that we want 'there is a spot in Tegea where' etc. For the natural expression cf. Herodotus' own way of writing: 160. 4 *χώρος τῆς Μυσῆς*: 2. 75. 1 *ἔστι δὲ χώρος τῆς Ἀραβίης*.

The *excerpta* from Diodorus actually give *Τεγέης*, which we should like to make depend on *χώρῳ*, but this is impossible without some further change. We might think of *Τεγέῃ λευρὸς ἐνὶ χώρῳ*. The corruption however is not a likely one, and *χώρῳ* no doubt comes

from *Od.* 7. 123 τῆς ἑτερον μὲν θευλόπεδον λευρῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ. I suggest therefore that we should read ἔστι τοι Ἀρκαδῆς Τεγέης λευρῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ ἐνθ' ἀνέμοι κ.τ.λ., joining ἔστι with ἐνθα, as in *Xen. Cyrop.* 7. 4. 15 ἔστιν ἐνθα ἰσχυρῶς ὠφελούσι σφενδονῆται. The common Latin *Arcadius* seems to guarantee the use of Ἀρκάδιος as an adjective.

ib. 6 οἱ δὲ ἀγαθοεργοὶ εἰσι <οἱ> τῶν ἀστῶν ἐξιόντες ἐκ τῶν ἱππέων αἰεὶ οἱ πρεσβύτατοι?

The article cannot, I think, be dispensed with. The order of the words (instead of τῶν ἀστῶν οἱ ἐ. or οἱ ἐ. τ. ἀ.) has many parallels in H., e.g. 53. 3 τοὺς δὲ Ἑλλήνων δυνατωτάτους: 3. 26. 1 οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπ' Ἀμμωνίου ἀποσταλάντες.

77. 1 (or 76. 5) καὶ τὰ μὲν στρατόπεδα ἀμφότερα οὕτως ἡγωνίσασατο.

Write in accordance with H.'s practice ἡγώνιστο.

78. 2 ἐς τῶν ἐξηγητέων Τελμησσέων cannot be right, because with such a genitive we can only supply a word like *house* or *temple*, a building, not a country or tract of country. Perhaps τήν has been lost before τῶν. Qy. ἐς τήν τῶν T. τῶν ἐ.? Or ἐς τήν τῶν T., omitting ἐξηγητέων? Scheer proposed ἐς Τελμησσέων, omitting τῶν ἐ., and so too Herwerden.

84. 3 Τελμησσέων δικασάντων being ludicrously unsuitable, surely we should accept Reiske's διδασάντων, or possibly δεξάντων. The notion needed is that of instruction and information. In 6. 139. 3 again δικάσῃσι is wrong and has been corrected by Cobet to δικαιῶσι.

90. 2 Κροῖσε, ἀναρτημένου σεῦ ἀνδρὸς βασιλέος χρηστὰ ἔργα καὶ ἔπεα ποιέειν, αἰτεῶ δόσιν ἦντινα βούλει τοι γενέσθαι παραντίκα.

There are here at least three difficulties: (1) the genitive absolute referring to the subject of αἰτεῶ (this however! is trifling): (2) the pointless description of Croesus as ἀνὴρ βασιλεύς, which has no bearing on the case and has indeed also ceased to be true: (3) ἀναρτημένου ποιέειν when ποιήσαντος would be more suitable. Dobree partially restored the passage when he read σε for σεῦ, thus making ἀνδρὸς β. refer to Cyrus, which is obviously the meaning. Cyrus is ready (ἀναρτημένος) to reward Croesus. But, apart from the Zeugma ἔπεα ποιέειν (more awkward than 3. 135. 1 ἅμα ἔπος τε καὶ ἔργον ἐποίεε, because there ἐποίεε follows immediately on ἔργα), where is the suitability of χρηστὰ ἔπεα here at all? It is a practical

reward that Cyrus wishes to bestow, a δόσις. He does not ask, What would you like me to say of you? I take it then the χρηστὰ ἔργα καὶ ἔπεα must somehow be those of Croesus, the good counsel and services for which the king wishes to make a return. Did H. write something like ἀναρτημένου σε εὖ ἀνδρὸς βασιλέος <διὰ> χρηστὰ ἔργα καὶ ἔπεα ποιέειν? It might be a participle that has been lost. There is, I think, no objection to the long separation of εὖ and ποιέειν.

105. 5 ὥστε ἅμα λέγουσί τε οἱ Σκύθαι διὰ τοῦτο σφεας νοσέειν καὶ ὄραν παρ' ἑωντοῖσι τοὺς ἀπικνεομένους ἐς τὴν Σκυθικὴν χώραν ὡς διακέαται.

This may be right, but it seems odd that the last part should be stated as an assertion of the Scythians. One would expect something like καὶ ὄραν πάρα (or πάρεστιν or παρέχει) αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἀπικνεομένοισι κ.τ.λ. (Madvig has suggested πάρεστι τοῖσι without αὐτοῖσι.)

116. 3 ἐγὼ ταῦτα ποιήσω ὥστε σὲ καὶ τὸν παῖδα τὸν σὸν μηδὲν ἐπιμέμφεσθαι.

ταῦτα, one would think, ought to be τοιαῦτα, but the same question arises several times in Herodotus' text.

132. 4 μάγος ἀνὴρ παρεστὼς ἐπαίδει θεογονίην οἷν δὴ ἐκείνοι λέγουσι εἶναι τὴν ἐπαοιδήν.

If it was always a θεογονίη, why add οἷν δὴ κ.τ.λ.? Nor does the thing seem very appropriate in itself. Is θεογονίην an adscript? Certainly we should not miss it, if omitted. [I see now that Madvig has argued partly to the same effect in *Advers.* 3. 23.]

137. 1 μῆτε αὐτὸν τὸν βασιλέα μηδὲνα φονεύειν μῆτε τῶν ἄλλων Περσέων μηδὲνα τῶν ἑωυτοῦ οἰκετέων ἀνέκκεστον πάθος ἔρδειν.

It is impossible to accept Stein's view that μηδὲνα does double duty, both with Περσέων and with οἰκετέων. Herwerden seems on the right track when in his appendix he proposes to insert a τινά. But I hardly think τινά could stand after μῆτε, as he suggests. μῆτε τινά . . . μηδὲνα . . . πάθος ἔρδειν is to my mind doubtful Greek. Rather μῆτε τ. ἀ. Π. μηδὲνα τῶν <τινὰ> ἑαυτοῦ οἰκετέων. Or we might insert another μηδὲνα before τῶν ἑωυτοῦ.

141. 3 Fable of the piper and the fish. παύεσθέ μοι ὀρχόμενοι, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμέο αὐλέοντος ἠθέλετε ἐκβαίνειν ὀρχόμενοι.

Anybody's ear can tell him that the

occurrence of ὀρχόμενοι at the end of two successive clauses is wrong. Moreover the fish would not come out of the water dancing: they would come out and then dance on the shore. Hence Herwerden brackets the word and Cobet wished to read ὀρχησόμενοι. I would rather suggest ἐκβαίνοντες (or possibly ἐκβάντες, but the aorist is not necessary) ὀρχέσθαι. A good many instances can be got together of two words, as it were, exchanging terminations in this sort of way. Confining myself to verbs and participles, I find in this same book 192. 3 the MSS varying between ἡ δὲ ἀρτάβη μέτρον ἔδν Περσικὸν χωρεῖ κ.τ.λ. and μέτρον ἐστὶ Π. χωρεόν, while in 2. 64. 6 they vary between ἐπιλέγοντες ποιέεισι and ποιέυντες ἐπιλέγουσι. In Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 20 Dobree's ἀποθανεῖν εἰς τὸ βάραθρον ἐμβληθέντα seems right for the ἀποθανόντα... ἐμβληθῆναι of the MSS. In the following cases the confusion is easier. *Iliad* 8. 526 Aristarchus read εὐχομαι ἔλπομενος, Zenodotus ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος. *Od.* 17. 245 one MS has ὑβρίζεις φορέων for ὑβρίζων φορέεις. *Ar. Ach.* 91 R has ἦγοντες ἄγομεν in spite of metre for ἄγοντες ἦκομεν, and it is fairly certain that in *Wasps* 577 τάγαθὰ... ἄχως φάσκων should be ἄχων φάσκει, very probable that *Thesm.* 314 φανέντας ἐπιχαρῆναι should be χαρέντας ἐπιφανῆναι. Plato *Alcib.* 2 (beginning) προσευξόμενος πορεύει is a safe correction of πορευόμενος προσεῖξει. Cf. Rohde's suggestion in *Sympr.* 174 D, πορευόμενον ὑπολείπεσθαι for πορεύεσθαι ὑπολείπομενον. *Ajax* 1183 the MSS give μόλῳ... μεληθείς, but the *Etym.* M. has μολών... μεληθῶ. The change I would make has therefore plenty of parallels, though it is rather more considerable than most of them. Cf. below on 2. 51. 1.

152. 4 ἔπεμπον... ἀπερέοντα Κύρῳ Λακεδαιμονίων ῥῆσιν... μηδεμίαν πόλιν συναμωρέειν.

Cobet demurs to ῥῆσιν and would read ῥήμασι in the sense, I presume, of 'speaking on behalf of' or 'conveying their command.' But that seems an awkward expression. Does not ῥῆσιν stand for ἀπόρρησιν according to the Greek practice of using the simple word rather than repeat the compound (ἀπερέοντα)? ἀπερέοντα Δ. ρ. then is to prohibit him in a prohibition coming from the Lacedaemonians. H. might have said ἀπαγγελέοντα Δ. ἀπόρρησιν. Or ῥῆσιν may be actually a mistake for ἀπόρρησιν, as in 7. 10. 3 ἡγόρευον probably is for ἀπηγόρευον.

160. 4 ἐξέδοσαν δὲ οἱ Χίοι (Πακτύην) ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀταρνεί μισθῷ. τοῦ δὲ Ἀταρνέος τούτου ἐστὶ χώρος τῆς Μυσίης.

The last words are usually taken as a violent anacoluthon, but even so there is nothing to account for the genitive. What was he going to say? Should we not rather suppose something lost, e.g. a verb to the effect that they *wanted* Atarneus? Of course more words than one must be missing. It is hardly satisfactory just to substitute with Krüger ὁ δὲ Ἀταρνεύς.

186. 6 Nitocris built a stone bridge in Babylon, ἐπιτείνεσκε δὲ ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὅκως μὲν ἡμέρα γένοιτο, ξύλα τετράγωνα, ἐπ' ὧν τὴν διάβασιν ἐποιεύντο οἱ Βαβυλωνῖοι· τὰς δὲ νύκτας τὰ ξύλα ταῦτα ἀπαερέεσκον, so that they could not cross.

Inherent probability and the plural ἀπαερέεσκον make it pretty certain that H. wrote ἐπετείνεσκον. It was not by Nitocris or by orders from her twice a day that the planks were placed and removed.

190. 4 χρόνου τε ἐγγιγνομένου συχνοῦ ἄνω-τέρω τε οὐδὲν τῶν πρηγμάτων προκοπτομένων.

Comparing 3. 56. 1 ἐς τὸ πρόσω τε οὐδὲν προεκόπτετο, we shall be inclined to read προκοπτόμενον.

195. 1 περιβάλλεται for περιβαλλόμενος? If the latter, which is in itself awkward, were right, the following participle ought to have a τε or δέ or καί. Madvig's ἐπενδύνεται καί does not remove this objection, and ἐπενδύνομαι is a dubious form.

196. 5 καὶ ταύτην ἀνεκήρυσσε, ὅστις θέλοι ἐλάχιστον χρυσίον λαβὼν συνουκίειν αὐτῇ... τὸ δὲ ἂν χρυσίον ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τῶν εὐειδέων παρθένων.

ἂν is in a strange place and should, I have little doubt, be δῆ. χρυσίον... τὸ δὲ δῆ χρυσίον is the regular turn of phrase. Hermann suggested τὸ δὲ αἶ.

ib. 9 The words ἵνα μὴ ἀδικοῖεν (read ἀδικεῖεν)... ἄγωνται make no sense and are omitted by Stein, Cobet, and Herwerden. They would however do well enough if put four or five lines earlier after οὕτω ἀπαγαγέσθαι. The γενέσθαι preceding them is retained by Stein, omitted by Cobet and Herwerden. The latter seem right, but γενέσθαι may be the remains of ἀπαγαγέσθαι, if my suggestion is sound.

207. 9 Μασσαγέται εἰσὶ ἀγαθῶν τε Περσικῶν ἄπειροι καὶ καλὴν μεγάλων ἀπαθείς.

Herwerden's κακῶν for καλῶν should certainly be adopted. (1) The antithesis of ἀγαθὰ and κακά is much better than the rather unmeaning combination of ἀγαθὰ and

καλά: (2) ἀπαθὴς κακῶν occurs several times in H., whereas ἀ. καλῶν is a questionable phrase altogether: (3) the mistake is a very common one.

ib. 12 Perhaps λείψεται for λείπεται, agreeing in tense with τρέφονται. It is not strictly necessary, but the mistake is extremely common.

210. 2 In the reverse way I have sometimes thought we should read μὴ εἶη . . . ὅστις τοι ἐπιβουλεύει instead of ἐπιβουλεύσει, as the question is of there being someone plotting at that moment. But here again the tense may pass. Stein after Krüger ἐπιβουλεύσειεν, a change not worth making. [Dr. Postgate points out that there is very good authority for ἐπιβουλεύει. Stein's note in his critical edition is 'ἐπιβουλεύει B¹ R, ἐπιβουλεύει d 2.']

BOOK II.

2. 4 παῖδιά δύο . . . διδοὶ ποιμένι τρέφειν ἐς τὰ ποίμνια.

ἐς τὰ π. is wanting in construction. Perhaps ἀγοντι has been lost.

Just above in Ψαμμήτιχος δέ the δέ should perhaps be γάρ.

3. 4 τὰ μὲν νῦν θεία τῶν ἀπηγγελμάτων οἷα ἤκουον οὐκ εἰμὶ πρόθυμος ἐξηγέσθαι . . . ὅσα δὲ ἀνθρωπία πρήγματα κ.τ.λ.

οἷα should probably be ὅσα. Observe the ὅσα following. A common mistake.

5. 1 δῆλα γὰρ δὴ . . . ὅτι Αἴγυπτος ἐς τὴν Ἑλληνες ναυτίλλονται ἐστὶ Αἰγυπτίοισι ἐπικτητός τε γῆ καὶ δῶρον ποταμοῦ, καὶ τὰ κατύπερθε ἐτι τῆς λίμνης ταύτης . . . τῆς πέρι ἐκείνοι οὐδὲν ἐτι τοιόνδε ἔλεγον.

(1) The Egypt to which the Greeks sailed did not include τὰ κατύπερθε. I conclude therefore that these words are not an accusative, as Stein makes them, but a further subject of ἐστὶ. If this is so, we seem to want <καὶ> Αἴγυπτος or Αἰγυπτός τε. It would at any rate smooth the construction. (2) It is difficult to believe that τῆς can be used with reference to τὰ κ., as though he had written ἡ κ. χώρα. Has an original τῶν been corrupted to τῆς through the influence of λίμνης?

8. 1 τῇ μὲν γὰρ τῆς Ἀραβίης οὖρος παρατάται . . . 3. τὸ δὲ πρὸς Λιβύης τῆς Αἰγύπτου οὖρος ἄλλο κ.τ.λ.

Stein joins τῆς Ἀραβίης and τῆς Αἰγύπτου with οὖρος. But the expression is very

unlikely, and in 3 it is clear that the genitive depends on τὸ πρὸς Λ., as Krüger says. Perhaps πρὸς has dropped out before τῆς Ἀραβίης. This is more likely than that we should read πρὸς for τῇ, as we also might.

32. 6 ἐπεὶ has been corrected in various ways. I do not find any suggestion that it is itself right, but that an infinitive dependent on it (after they started) has been lost. This is a possibility not to be ignored.

39. 4 For μέλλοι read μέλλει with R. The optative is not really suitable.

43. 3 I should concur with Herwerden in omitting οὔτοι, if I saw why anyone should have interpolated it. Perhaps αὐτοί.

44. 1 ἡ δὲ (στῆλη) σμαράγδου λίθου λάμποντος τὰς νύκτας μέγας.

Dubitandum conieci εὐμεγάρους vel μεγάθει μέγαλου. Cf. 1. 51. *Ἀν μεγάλως?* says Herwerden, and Krüger in his very useful edition of 1866 'μέγας kann für μέγας nicht stehen. Die Stelle ist verfälscht: μέγα φῶς Reiske . . . Vielleicht war die Grösse angegeben.' κατὰ μέγας would give the right sense, nor would it be difficult for κατὰ to fall out after νύκτας. Cf. above on 8. 1. [Dr. Postgate suggests, like Krüger, that a word is lost which gave the actual size.]

51. 1 τοῦ δὲ Ἑρμέως τὰ ἀγάλματα ὀρθὰ ἔχοντα (so Herwerden for ἔχειν τὰ: perhaps ἔχοντα τὰ) αἰδοῖα ποιεῦντες οὐκ ἀπ' Αἰγυπτίων μεμαθήκασιν ἀλλ' ἀπὸ Πελασγῶν.

ποιεῦντες—μεμαθήκασιν is an odd inversion of the natural way of putting it. On the principle illustrated above at 1. 141. 3 I propose to read here ποιεῦσι . . . μεμαθηκότες. Cf. the double version of 2. 64. 6 there cited.

86. 4 οἱ μὲν δὲ ἐκποδῶν μισθῷ ὁμολογῶσαντες ἀπαλλάσσονται.

Krüger μισθοῦ or ἐπὶ μισθῷ. Probably rather μισθόν.

93. 7 καὶ ἀναπλώνοντες ὀπίσω τῆς αὐτῆς ἀντέχονται (οἱ ἰχθύες) ἐγχριμπτόμενοι . . . ἵνα δὴ μὴ ἀμάρτοιεν τῆς ὁδοῦ διὰ τὸν ῥόον.

Stein, whose scholarship cannot always be trusted, detects a subtle justification for the unusual use of the optative. His meaning is not to me altogether clear, but he seems to say that ἀμάρτοιεν ascribes the purpose wholly to the fish, while ἀμάρτωσι might imply that it approved itself also to

the writer. In such fantastic grammar few scholars nowadays will believe. The optative is however a real difficulty. As far as I can see at present, the only explanation possible is that which applies to several well known similar anomalies. The author is thinking, not of the present tense actually preceding, but of a past tense which in his mind it involves. He is thinking of *δαιμονίη τις ὄρμη*, which instigates the fish to act thus. Nature or heaven made the fish in the beginning with this impulse. Cf. in 3. 108. 2 ἡ τοῦ θείου προνοίη as to hares. The parallels referred to are such as *Ar. Frogs* 25: *Dem.* 22. 11. In 1. 110. 4 *κελεύει* . . . ὅπως ἂν τάχιστα διαφθαρείη the present *κελεύει* really refers to past time. *έκέλευσε* follows.

102. 4 *δεινῶς γλιχομένοισι περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας*.

To get over the difficulty of *περί*, may we not deem it probable that an infinitive (e.g. *ἀμύνεσθαι*) has been lost? Cf. on 32. 6 above. In 134. 4 again the easiest explanation would be that a verb governed by *ἐπείτε* is missing.

111. 2 τοῦ ποταμοῦ κατελθόντος μέγιστα δὴ τότε.

Surely *μεγίστου*. The terminations are easily exchanged.

116. 1 Ἑλένης μὲν ταύτην ἄπιξιν κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps *τοιαύτην*. Cf. above on 1. 116. 3. This does not seem one of the cases in which the substantive can be taken as appositional and explanatory. In 135. 4 and the parallel 4. 166. 2 should the same change be made? See Stein on the former of the two.

125. 2. In the building of the great pyramid, when a stone had been raised on to the first step, ἐς ἐτέραν μηχανὴν ἐτίθετο ἐστεῶσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ πρώτου στοίχου, ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δεύτερον εἴλκετο στοῖχον ἐπ' ἄλλης μηχανῆς.

Anyone might think the ἄλλη μηχανή had not been mentioned before, but it is evidently identical with the ἐτέρα μηχανή of the preceding clause. Is not ἐπ' ἄλλης μηχανῆς an insertion?

133. 3 *συνταχύνειν αὐτῷ τὸν βίον*.

συνταχυνέειν? But the present and aorist are sometimes used of the future in oracular declarations, as though expressing fate rather than foresight.

135. 2 *μεγάλα ἐκτίσαστο χρήματα, ὥς ἂν εἶναι Ῥοδῶπιν*.

See this *Review* 6. 341 for my suggestion of ὥς δὴ εἶναι, ὥς δὴ being a common enough combination. But I do not now think the accusative can stand, though Cobet was satisfied with it. If *she* is the subject of εἶναι, we should need the nominative. Read Ῥοδῶπιος with Valckenaer and make the money the subject. 8. 4 of this book, οὐκέτι πολλὸν χωρίον, ὥς εἶναι Αἰγύπτου, will be just parallel.

146. 2 ἔφη ἂν τις καὶ τούτους ἄλλους γενομένους ἄνδρας ἔχειν τὰ ἐκείνων ὀνόματα τῶν προγεγονότων θεῶν.

ἄλλους has been found a difficulty. I conjecture αὐτούς, a word elsewhere confused with ἄλλος. 'These themselves too,' like Heracles.

156. 1 οὗτος μὲν νυν ὁ νῆος τῶν φανερῶν μοι τῶν περὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἱρὸν ἐστὶ θωμαστότατον· τῶν δὲ δευτέρων νῆος κ.τ.λ.

Read τοῦ δὲ δεύτερον. There would not be a number of things that came second. Gomperz has suggested τῶν δὲ δεύτερον, which I do not quite understand.

172. 2 μετὰ δὲ σοφίῃ αὐτοῦς ὁ Ἄμασις οὐκ ἀγνωμοσύνην προσηγάγετο.

οὐκ ἀγν. is little better than nonsense, and οὐκ εὐγνωμοσύνη, for which there is the authority of the Aldine, is but unsatisfactory. Why should H. carefully distinguish here σοφία and εὐγνωμοσύνη? Keeping εὐγνωμοσύνη, I cannot but think οὐκ a mistake for καί. Perhaps the εὐ had something to do with it.

178. 1 τοῖσι δὲ μὴ βουλομένοισι αὐτῶν οἰκέειν (ἐνοικίειν R) αὐτοῦ δὲ ναυτιλλομένοισι ἔδωκε χώρους κ.τ.λ.

Certainly αὐτοῦ cannot go with a verb of motion. Hence Herwerden conjectures and prints αὐτόσε, but that word is unemphatic and by no means strong enough for the position. αὐτοῦ must go with οἰκέειν and is quite naturally contrasted with the verb of motion: before δέ some other word, e.g. αἰεί or πολλάκις has been lost (οἰκέειν αὐτοῦ, πολλάκις δέ).

BOOK III.

10. 4 After saying that Thebes had never known rain before or since, he adds-ἀλλὰ καὶ τότε ὕσθησαν αἱ Θῆβαι ψακάδι. The editors do not tell us the meaning of καὶ τότε, words which can hardly be divided. Perhaps τότε is out of its place. We might for instance read τότε καὶ ὕσθησαν. At the end of 23 the καὶ before τὸ δεσμωτήριον should probably be omitted altogether.

23. 1 In ἔρεα μὲν . . . ἀπικνέσθαι, Krüger held that something like ἔφη should be inserted. Rather perhaps φάναι, corresponding to the infinitives which follow.

25. 2 ὡς ἤκουε τῶν Ἰχθυοφάγων.

Is this Homeric use of ἀκούω, *hear of*, with a genitive found elsewhere in H.? Perhaps περί is lost.

30. 6 ὁ δὲ . . . ἀπέκτεινε Σμέρδιν, οἱ μὲν λέγουσι ἐπ' ἄγρην ἐξαγαγόντα, οἱ δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἑρυθρὴν θάλασσαν προαγαγόντα καταποντώσαι.

I suspect H. wrote ἐξαγαγόν, οἱ μὲν λέγουσι being parenthetical as in 2. 181. 2. In the second clause λέγουσι steps into the government, but in the first this would be extremely awkward. ἐξαγαγόν was then accommodated to προαγαγόντα.

34. 4 Are not the words νῦν . . . νοήμονα a question?

52. 4 ἐν αὐτοῖσι. There is nothing for αὐτοῖσι to refer to. Read τούτοισι, the mistake being not very uncommon. So in 82. 9 αὐτῶν should probably be τούτων.

ib. 7 Surely Stein and Herwerden are wrong in preferring στείλας πλοῖον to στείλας πλοῖω. Cf. for instance 8. 75. 2 πέμπει . . . ἄνδρα πλοῖω and πλοῖω ἀπικόμενος: 6. 76. 3 πλοῖοισι σφέας ἤγαγε: 4. 42. 4 and 44. 1: this book 44. 4: etc.

60. 1 μᾶλλον <τι> ὅτι, as at the end of the chapter.

71. 7 ἢ ἴστε ὑμῖν ὅτι, ἦν ὑπερέσση ἢ νῦν ἡμέρη, ὡς οὐκ ἄλλος φθᾶς ἐμεῦ (Cobet ἐμέ) κατήγορος ἔσται, ἀλλὰ σφέα αὐτὸς ἐγὼ κατερῶ πρὸς τὸν Μάγον.

Is not ὑμῖν out of its place? It could only stand where it does, if very emphatic; and that is not the case. It might perhaps follow either ὅτι or ἦν, unless indeed it is a mere dittograph of the ὑμῖν in the line preceding: σφέα hardly harmonises with it.

110. 2 θηρία πτερωτὰ . . . ἐς ἀλκὴν ἄλκιμα.

Stein seems strangely content with the tautology of ἀλκὴν and ἄλκιμα. Herwerden remarks *quid lateat non exprobo*. May it not be δόκιμα? ἀ, δ, and λ are constantly confused. In 7. 129. 3 we hear of rivers, πέντε τῶν δοκίμων μάλιστα, and ib. 162. 3 ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἔστι τὸ ἔαρ δοκιμώτατον. (The question of the authenticity of these words is not material.)

116. 3 αἱ δὲ ὦν ἐσχαταὶ οἴκασι . . . τὰ

κάλλιστα δοκέοντα ἡμῖν εἶναι καὶ σπανιώτατα ἔχειν αὐται.

αὐται at the very end of the sentence presents no analogy to the use of οὗτος in the middle of a sentence, resuming after a description or semi-digression, to which Stein vainly compares it. Codex R has αὐτά, from which Herwerden after Dietsch reads τὰ αὐτά, with the strange result that winged snakes would have to be included among the κάλλιστα, as they certainly are among the σπανιώτατα. Perhaps αἱ αὐταὶ might do, that really equalling καὶ τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ τὰ σπανιώτατα.

119. 3 ἔλαβε αὐτόν τε κ.τ.λ.

συνέλαβε is the usual word, and συλλαβών is used three lines later.

128. 4 Bagaeus took some βιβλία with him καὶ Ὀροίτεω ἐς ὄψιν ἔλθων τῶν βιβλίων ἐν ἑκάστῳ περιαιρέμενος ἐδίδου τῷ γραμματιστῇ.

It is explained that περιαιρ., which ought to refer to the cover, is here applied to the thing covered, *taking off* for *uncovering*. Perhaps H. wrote προαιρέμενος *taking out*, just as in 78. 2 we have τὰ τόξα κατελόμενος, *taking down*. Cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 419 προαιρούσαις, the active participle, in this sense.

134. 7 λέγει Ἀτοσσα τάδε· ὄρα νυν, ἐπὶ Σκύθας μὲν τὴν πρώτην ἰέναι ἔασον . . . σὺ δὲ κ.τ.λ.

This use of ὄρα, merely introducing another imperative, without there being anything for anyone to 'see', is probably unique, and Stein regards it as doubtful. What if we turned it by a slight change into δρᾶ and joined τάδε with it, reading δρᾶ νυν τάδε or τάδε νυν δρᾶ, if it is thought that τάδε δρᾶ νυν could hardly be right? For the simple Ἀτοσσα λέγει cf. Chh. 71-73 of this book in several places (λέγει πρὸς ταῦτα Δαρείος, and so on).

136. 3 ἐνθαῦτα δὲ ἐκ ῥηστῶν τῆς Δημοκρίδους Ἀριστοφιλίδης . . . τὰ πηδάλια παρέλυσεν τῶν Μηδικῶν νέων.

The uncertainty of the text is well known. ῥηστῶν Wesseling e cod. Cantabr.: κρότωνος R, κρηστῶν ceteri' says Stein in his critical edition, and ῥηστῶν is explained to mean good will, kindness to Democedes. Unfortunately there is no evidence that ῥ. ever has any such meaning. The three other passages quoted for it by Liddell and Scott exhibit in

reality nothing but the ordinary sense. *χρησμοσύνης* has been conjectured and read, but is of course not very likely. I am disposed to suggest *ἐς ῥηστώνην τὴν Δημοκίδεος*, to relieve *D.* *ἐκ* and *ἐς* or *εἰς* are very easily mistaken for one another.

137. 6 ἵνα φανῇ πρὸς Δαρείου ἔων καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ δόκιμος.

I do not know how the editors can have persuaded themselves that this means *appear to Darius, be seen by Darius*. That would require either *Δαρείῳ* with *φανῇ* or with *πρὸς Δαρείου* some other verb. The only sense the text can well bear is *appear, be made out, on D.'s part*, that is, *by D.*, and this is of course quite unsuit-

able. A suggestion which seems obvious, but which does not appear to have been made, is *πρὸς Δαρείον*, with which *φανῇ* might mean *be made out, represented to D.*, much as Clytemnestra says *Agam.* 593 *λόγοις τοιούτοις πλαγκτὸς οὗς' ἐφαινόμην*, only with no suggestion of falsity. *φανῇ* would roughly = *ἀπαγγελθῇ*.

139. 5 ταύτην πωλέω μὲν οὐδενὸς χρήματος, δίδωμι δὲ ἄλλως.

ἄλλως not *gratis*, a sense for which there is no evidence, but *only, just*, a slight extension of its common idiomatic meaning, *only* i.e. *no more than*. In English *just* has the same capability of meaning.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

PLATONICA III.

THE chief aim of these papers has been to eliminate the Renaissance MSS. particularly *Eqv*, from the *recensio* of the *Republic*. As the nature of the problem changes completely, so far as Ξ is concerned, shortly after the beginning of Book III, it will be well to summarise the results of our inquiry so far.

I.

It is a remarkable fact that Mr. Adam does not quote Ξ once for a reading which he adopts in Book II. In Book I he quotes it in support of his own text twelve times; but in one of these cases the reading is also that of A (330e *ἡδίκηκεν*), while in three of them it is that of the contemporary diorthotes (duly cited by Mr. Adam as A²), and the citation of Ξ is quite superfluous.¹ We are left, then, with eight Ξ readings, of which, however, four are in Vind. F.² Of the remaining four, I believe three to be wrong,

¹ There can be no doubt that A² was contemporary; for he added the accents and breathings in the same ink as he made his interlinear corrections, and the accents are as a rule adapted to the corrections rather than to the original text. Indeed it seems most probable that A and A² are one and the same person. I have examined A and the Paris MS. of Maximus Tyrius, written by the same scribe, side by side, and they both present the same phenomenon. See T. W. Allen in *Journal of Philology* xxi. pp. 48 ff. The three readings referred to are 327c *ἐν λείπεται*, 333e *οὐκ ἂν οὖν*, 352b *δὴ καὶ οὖς*. The last is also in F.

² These are 339d *δὲ* (for *δὴ*), 346d *αὐτῇ* (for *αὐτῆς*), 347a *ᾧ* (for *ῥ*), 352d *δ' ἔτι* (for *δέ τι*).

namely 332b *δὲ* (for *δέ γε*),³ 346b *ἐνυφέρειν*,⁴ and 353d *ἐκείνου*.⁵ It is just to keep out such facile corrections that it is necessary to purge the *apparatus*. We are left with 342b, *αὐτῇ* for *αὐτῆς*, which can hardly be said to count. Even if the three readings which I object to are right, this is a small contribution for Ξ to make to the text of two whole books.

Now the reason why Ξ is so unfruitful up to this point is that it generally agrees with A; it is only after III 389d that it begins to show a tendency to keep company with F rather than A and so becomes more useful in correcting A.⁶ That is because it is copied from Ven. T so far as the old part of that MS. goes, viz. to III 389d *σωφροσύνης ἄρα οὐ δεήσει*. After that, it is based upon another MS., which can also be identified.

The external evidence that Rhosus, the scribe of Ξ , had T in his possession is complete. As Bekker saw, the Timaeus Locrus, the epitome of Plutarch *περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ*

³ I miss the *γε* here very much. Polemarchos is eager and insistent, 'and what is owing from an enemy to an enemy,' etc. On *δέ γε* see the excellent note of Forman, *Selections from Plato*, p. 428.

⁴ C.R. xviii. 204. Note that the reading *ἐνυφέρειν* is ascribed to Ξ^2 , that is, in all probability, Cardinal Bessarion himself. It is also in F.

⁵ No doubt it is illogical for *ἐκείνης* to take the gender of *ψυχῇ* instead of *ἐσθ' ὄντος*, but see Campbell, *Essay on Syntax*, § 56. These 'assimilations' always fall an easy prey to the corrector.

⁶ The change begins to show itself at once. In 389e Ξ has the F reading *παρ' Ὀμήρῳ* instead of 'Ὀμήρῳ with ADM.