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](#)

Thucydides, viii. 107, 1

W. Wyse

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 1-2 / February 1893, pp 15 - 17

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196647, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196647

How to cite this article:

W. Wyse (1893). Thucydides, viii. 107, 1. The Classical Review, 7, pp 15-17 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196647

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

337 D. τι οὖν, ἔφη, ἂν ἐγὼ δείξω ἑτέραν ἀπόκρισιν παρὰ πάσας ταύτας περὶ δικαιοσύνης βελτίω τούτων ;

Perhaps παρὰ πάσας <οὔσαν> ταύτας.

347 D. ὥστε πᾶς ἂν ὁ γινώσκων τὸ ὠφελεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἔλοιτο ὑπ' ἄλλου ἢ ἄλλον ὠφελῶν πράγματα ἔχειν.

Τό is seldom or never added to the infinitive in this construction and is especially awkward when added to one infinitive and not to the other. Omit it here.

362 C. φασίν...τῷ ἀδίκῳ παρεσκευασθαι τὸν βίον ἀμείνον ἢ τῷ δίκαιῳ.

Read ἀμείνον' or ἀμείνονα.

364 B. ὥς ἄρα καὶ θεοὶ πολλοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς δυστυχίας τε καὶ βίον κακὸν ἐνειμαν, τοῖς δ' ἐναντίοις ἐναντίαν μοῖραν. This, as it stands, seems to say that bad men (οἱ ἐναντίοι) as a body, all bad men, are prosperous. Is not πολλοῖς a running together of πολλάκις τοῖς? πολλάκις then qualifies both clauses.

366 A. δίκαιοι μὲν γὰρ ὄντες ἀζήμιοι ὑπὸ θεῶν ἐσόμεθα,...ἀδικοὶ δὲ κερδανούμεν τε καὶ λισσόμενοι ὑπερβαίνοντες καὶ ἁμαρτάνοντες πείθοντες αὐτοὺς ἀζήμιοι ἀπαλλάξομεν.

Plato is fond of accumulating participles, but the accumulation here is very confused. Surely Plato wrote κερδανούμεν τε ὑπερβαίνοντες καὶ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ λισσόμενοι πείθοντες αὐτοὺς ἀζήμιοι ἀπαλλάξομεν.

366 E. οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἔψεξεν ἀδικίαν οὐδ' ἐπῆνεσε δικαιοσύνην ἄλλως ἢ δόξας τε καὶ τιμὰς καὶ δωρεὰς τὰς ἀπ' αὐτῆς γιγνομένης.

Insert διὰ before δόξας. Cf. διὰ δόξαν 358 A.

369 D. ἢ καὶ σκυτοτόμον αὐτόσε προσθήσομεν ; προστιθέναι here is not a verb of motion and cannot, I think, take αὐτόσε. Read αὐτοῖς, as in 370 D just below εἰ αὐτοῖς...προσθεῖμεν.

372 E. εἰ δ' αὖ βούλεσθε καὶ φλεγμαίνουσιν πόλιν θεωρήσωμεν, οὐδὲν ἀποκωλύει.

Though βούλει or βούλεσθε in a directly interrogative sense is often followed by a verb in the subjunctive (βούλει, βούλεσθε

ἴωμεν ; etc.) there would appear to be no other example of such a construction as we have here, where βούλεσθε depends on a conjunction. In βούλει ἴωμεν ; the ἴωμεν is really itself deliberative and interrogative ; the βούλει is only added to it by a sort of brevity of expression, and in no way governs it or causes it to be in the subjunctive. Εἰ βούλεσθε θεωρήσωμεν would be an entirely different construction, very strange in itself, probably unparalleled in Greek, and needing much more support than this passage can give it. It is quite as easy to read εἰ δ' αὖ βούλεσθε, καὶ φλεγμαίνουσιν πόλιν θεωρήσωμεν οὐδὲν ἀποκωλύει. No γάρ is needed after οὐδὲν, because οὐδὲν κωλύει or ἀποκωλύει is a stereotyped expression. Cf. esp. Ar. Eq. 972.

377 A. οὐκοῦν οἶσθ' ὅτι ἀρχὴ παντὸς ἔργου μέγιστον, ἄλλως τε καὶ νέω καὶ ἀπαλῶ ὅπως ; μάλιστα γὰρ δὴ τότε πλάττεται καὶ ἐνδύεται τύπος, ὃν ἂν τις βούληται ἐνσημῆνασθαι ἐκάστω.

Read ἐνδύεται τύπον. The subject of πλάττεται and ἐνδύεται is evidently τὸ νέον. L. and S. give no instance of a real passive ἐνδύεσθαι 'to be put on,' while the middle ἐνδύεσθαι is common.

380 D. τότε μὲν αὐτὸν γινόμενον καὶ ἀλλάττοντα τὸ αὐτοῦ εἶδος εἰς πολλὰς μορφάς, τότε δ' ἡμᾶς ἀπατώντα καὶ ποιοῦντα περὶ αὐτοῦ τοιαῦτα δοκεῖν.

Ast and others ἄλλον for αὐτόν. But αὐτόν seems essential to the antithesis. Cf. 381 E 'Ἄλλ' ἄρα κ.τ.λ. : 382 E οὐτε αὐτὸς μεθίσταται οὐτε ἄλλους ἐξαπατᾷ : 383 A. Perhaps Plato wrote τότε μὲν <ἄλλον> αὐτὸν γινόμενον.

382 A. ἐαντοῦ would be more strictly grammatical than ἐαντῶν, but the latter may perhaps be what Plato wrote.

383 A. ὥς μήτε αὐτοὺς γόητας ὄντας...μήτε ἡμᾶς ψεύδεσι παράγειν.

Terminations (often abbreviated) were so easily corrupted that we ought surely to read παράγοντας.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

(To be continued.)

THUCYDIDES, VIII. 107, 1.

μετὰ δὲ τὴν ναυμαχίαν ἡμέρᾳ τετάρτῃ ὑπὸ σπουδῆς ἐπισκευάσαντες τὰς ναῦς οἱ ἐν τῇ Σηστῷ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔπλεον ἐπὶ Κιζίκον.

Professor Tucker, in his recent edition, finds a difficulty in the words ὑπὸ σπουδῆς, and has inserted in the text ἀπὸ σπουδῆς. His note is as follows : ' All MSS. give ὑπό,

upon which no commentator has remarked. Thucydides has κατὰ σπουδῆν, i. 93, ii. 90 ; μετὰ σπουδῆς and διὰ σπουδῆς are also natural expressions, but there is no parallel to this use of ὑπό. Such expressions as ὑπ' ὀργῆς, ὑφ' ἡδονῆς, ὑπὸ δέους, are only used when the ὀργή, ἡδονή, δέος is the cause or motive of

the action. In c. 35, 1, all MSS. wrongly give ἀπό for ὑπό. If the contrary emendation be made here, we get the well-authenticated ἀπό σπουδῆς = σπουδῇ or σπουδαίως = "they worked with a will." Cf. ἀπό τοῦ περιφανοῦς = περιφανῶς (1, 35), ἀπό ἀντιπάλου παρασκευῆς (1, 99). Hom. *Il.* 7, 359, εἰ δ' ἐτέον δὴ τοῦτον ἀπό σπουδῆς ἀγορεύεις.

The combination ὑπό σπουδῆς is rather rare. Apparently it is not found in Aristophanes, Xenophon, the Orators, Plato, Aristotle, Polybius. But the passage in the eighth book of Thucydides does not stand alone. I have collected the following examples, but do not imagine that the list is complete.

(1) Thuc. 3, 33. ὁ δὲ ὑπό σπουδῆς ἐποιεῖτο τὴν δίωξιν.

(2) Thuc. 5, 66. διὰ βραχείας γὰρ μελλήσεως ἢ παρασκευῇ αὐτοῖς ἐγίνετο· καὶ εὐθὺς ὑπὸ σπουδῆς καθίσταντο ἐς κόσμον τὸν ἐαυτῶν.

(3) Eur. *Hel.* 1604. σπουδῆς δ' ὑπο ἔπιπτον οἱ δ' ὠρθοῦντο τοὺς δὲ κειμένους νεκροὺς ἂν εἶδες.

(4) Plut. *Vit. Romulū*, 8. ὅπερ οὖν οἱ ταραττόμενοι καὶ μετὰ δέους ἢ πρὸς ὀργὴν πράττοντες οἰοῦν ἐπιεικῶς πάσχουσι, συνέπεσε παθεῖν τὸν Ἀμουλίον. ἄνδρα γὰρ ἄλλῃ τε χρηστὸν καὶ τοῦ Νομήτορος φίλον ὑπὸ σπουδῆς ἐπεμψεν, διαπυθέσθαι τοῦ Νομήτορος κελεύσας, εἰ τις ἦκοι λόγος εἰς αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν παιδῶν ὡς περιγενομένων.

(5) Plut. *Comp. Thes. et Rom.* 5. πλάττει (τις Ἀττικὸς ἀνὴρ) τὸν Αἰγέα τῆς νεῶς προσφερομένης ὑπὸ σπουδῆς ἀνατρέχοντα πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν θεάς ἕνεκα καὶ σφαλλόμενον καταπεσεῖν.

(6) Plut. *Vit. Camilli*, 27. ἀρπάζαντες οὖν ὑπὸ σπουδῆς ᾧ τις ἕκαστος ὄψαφ προσετύγχανεν ἐκ τοῦ παρόντος ἐβοήθουν.

(7) Plut. *Vit. Nicias*, 3. τῶν χορῶν... ἄδειν κελεινομένων κατ' οὐδένα κόσμον ἀλλ' ὑπὸ σπουδῆς ἀσυντάκτως ἀποβαινόντων ἅμα καὶ στεφανομένων καὶ μεταμφιεννυμένων.

(8) Plut. *Vit. Ciceronis*, 44. τοὺς δὲ πολίτας ὑπὸ σπουδῆς θέοντας ἴστασθαι περὶ τὸν νεῶν καὶ τοὺς παῖδας ἐν ταῖς περιπορφύροις καθέζεσθαι σιωπὴν ἔχοντας.

(9) Lucian, *Vera Hist.* ii. 25. καὶ ἐπειδὴ νῦν ἐγένετο—ἐγὼ μὲν οὐ παρῆμην· ἐτύγχανον γὰρ ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ κοιμώμενος—οἱ δὲ λαθόντες τοὺς ἄλλους ἀναλαβόντες τὴν Ἑλένην ὑπὸ σπουδῆς ἀνήχθησαν.

(10) Aristides, *Ἱερῶν λόγος*, B. I. 485, Dind. (= p. 308, 10, Jebb, p. 544 Cant.). ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ χρυσάμενος περιέθειον παρέχων τῷ βορέᾳ ξαίνειν εὖ καὶ καλῶς, καὶ τελευτῶν προσελθὼν πρὸς τὸ φρέαρ ἀπελουσάμην· τῶν δὲ ὁ μὲν τις εὐθὺς ἀπεστράφη, ὁ δὲ σπασμῷ τε εἴχετο καὶ κομμοθεῖς ὑπὸ σπουδῆς εἰς βαλανεῖον μετὰ πολλῶν πραγμάτων ἐξεθερμαίνετο.

If these sentences be examined it will be seen that the causal notion of ὑπό, which is felt in full force in a sentence like Theoph. *Char.* 25 τὴν σπάθην λαβεῖν ὑπὸ τῆς σπουδῆς ἐπελάθετο, is just perceptible in (4), (6), (7). In (3) Paley translates 'through eagerness in making the attack,' and therefore connects ὑπὸ σπουδῆς with ἔπιπτον only: I think that the phrase qualifies οἱ δ' ὠρθοῦντο also, and is meant to describe the heat and haste of the conflict as a whole; that, in short, the causal notion is effaced. In the remaining passages, (1), (2), (5), (8), (9), (10), the only sense permitted by the context is 'hastily,' 'cum festinatione,' not 'propter festinationem' nor 'prae festinatione.' To correct in these six passages ὑπὸ to ἀπό is impossible, since ἀπό σπουδῆς, so far as I can trace the phrase, which is not common, means 'seriously,' not 'quickly.' See in addition to *Il.* 7, 359 (12, 233), quoted by Prof. Tucker, Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* ix. 4 (740 B) μὴ παίζων ἀλλ' ἀπό σπουδῆς, *Amat.* 2 (749 F) σκώπτοντες ἐργωδέστεροι τῶν ἀπό σπουδῆς ἐνισταμένων ἦσαν ἀνταγωνισταί. But is there any valid reason for changing ὑπὸ σπουδῆς in all sentences where the action or state expressed by the verb cannot be regarded as the consequence of the σπουδῆς? To lay down that ὑπὸ σπουδῆς τρέχει can only mean 'he is in such a hurry that he runs' is to confine too straitly by logical bonds the easy movements of living speech. The meaning of the phrase shifts according to the nature of the verb and the cast of the sentence, and there are cases, e.g. (6), in which it is hardly possible to determine with certainty the intention of the writer. It must be borne in mind that the influence of a cross-current has to be reckoned with. The history of ὑπὸ with the genitive in Greek might be described as the subjugation or expulsion of rival usages by the tyranny of a popular construction, that of ὑπὸ denoting the agent. Nothing seems more natural than to apply the conception 'under' to express any sort of attendant circumstance. But in classical Greek this application is generally limited to certain external accompaniments of action (see Prof. Jebb on Soph. *Trach.* 419), and appears only in stereotyped formulae or in turns which evidently follow these familiar fixed phrases such as Plat. *Rep.* v. 461 A οὐχ ὑπὸ θυσίων οὐδ' ὑπὸ εἰχῶν φύς. Sometimes however this sense meets and mixes with the common use so that, e.g. in τοξεύειν ὑπὸ μαστίγων, πωλεῖν ὑπὸ κήρυκος, it is difficult to say which element predominates. This, I think, is a cause which has helped the growth of the idiomatic use of ὑπὸ σπουδῆς: the notions

'under the influence of haste' and 'with haste' are easily fused.

W. WYSE.

THUCYDIDES, VIII. 10.

καταδιώκουσιν ἐς Πειραιὸν τῆς Κορινθίας· ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν ἐρήμος καὶ ἔσχατος πρὸς τὰ μεθόρια τῆς Ἐπιδαυρίας.

Ptolemy (iii. 16, 12) enumerates the places on the coast between Epidaurus and Cenchreae in the following order; 'Ἐπίδαυρος, Σπείραιον ἄκρον, Ἀθηναίων λιμὴν, Βουκέφαλος λιμὴν, Κεγχρεαί. Plin. *H.N.* iv. 9 has: Epidauri oppidum Aesculapi delubro celebre, Spiraem promontorium, portus Anthedus et Bucephalus, et quas supra dixeramus, Cenchreae. Bloomfield wished to identify the place mentioned by Thucydides here and in cc. 11. 4, 5, 14. 2, 15. 2, 20 with Ptolemy's Ἀθηναίων λιμὴν, K. O. Müller on the other hand proposed ἐς Σπείραιον. This conjecture, so far as I can trace, has not been admitted into any text, but it has been confirmed by

an inscription discovered at Epidaurus in 1886 and published in *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.* 1887, p. 11, Collitz, *Sammlung d. Dialektinschr.* n. 3025, *Recueil des Inscriptions Juridiques Grecques* p. 342: I quote from the last work. The inscription is placed between 242/1 and 234/3 B.C., and contains a judgment settling a dispute between Corinth and Epidaurus touching the possession of certain border lands. The opening words (after the date) are: κατὰ τὰδε ἔκριναν τοὶ Μεγαρεῖς τοῖς [Ἐπ]ιδανρίοις καὶ Κορινθίοις περὶ τῆς χώρας ὡς ἀμφελλέγον καὶ [περ]ὶ τοῦ Σελλανύου[υ] καὶ τοῦ Σπिरαίου: cp. l. 17 τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς ἀμαξιοῦ [τὰς κα]ταγούσας ἐπὶ τὸ Σπείραιον. This evidence disposes finally of the Πειραιὸς of Stephanus Byzantius, which Poppo accepts, and clears up an old confusion: there was indeed a Πείραιον in the Corinthian territory but it was on the Crissaeon gulf, in the neighbourhood of τὸ Ἑρραϊον and Οἰνὸγ (*Xen. Hell.* iv. 5, 1, 3, 5).

W. WYSE.

THE ELISION OF THE DATIVE IOTA IN ATTIC TRAGEDY.

It is the general practice of scholars, when a rule has been observed, to correct all exceptions to it. This method is however suspicious when applied to the by no means regular usage of the poets. Aeschylus has but a single example of the final optative with ἄν, yet this, as 'an archaism and therefore part of the literary style,' has appeared in every text from Vettori to Verrall without a single attempt being made to oust it. Yet when our MSS. offer us, in some half-dozen passages of the Tragedians, the elision of the dative ι of the third declension, an archaism which these poets might have used as well as many another, the critics at once endeavour to get rid of it by all means. But by what logic is the one admitted and the other denied? Which is the more reasonable assumption, that our copyists have preserved the true reading, or that on several occasions they have either by miraculous blunder or out of their extensive Homeric knowledge introduced an archaism into the 'regular' dialect of the Athenian poets? I believe it is an established fact that the copyists have more often changed what was rare into what was common than *vice versa*.

So much by way of prelude. Let us now examine the single passages as they are

NO. LVII. VOL. VII.

corrected. In Eur. *Alc.* 1118 the MS. reading is καὶ δὴ προτείνω, Γοργόν' ὡς καρατόμῳ, with which no fault has been found but that of the elided dative ι. Hence Lobeck wrote καρατομῶν, which is in reality ridiculous, for Perseus was a model of courage, and when the Choephoroe would urge Orestes to 'accomplish the baneful woe,' it is the spirit of Perseus they bid him to uplift in his heart. In Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1435 sq. σφῶν δ' εἰ διδοίη Ζεὺς, τὰδ' εἰ τελείτέ μοι θανόντ'· ἐπεὶ οὐ μοι ζῶντί γ' αὖθις ἔξετον, I think that the position of the word θανόντ' adds to its force and pathos, and that it is only on this word that the words ἐπεὶ οὐ κ.τ.λ. can follow, if they are to make any impression. Sophocles, I believe, knew his art and understood the power that lies in cunning arrangement of words better than to write τὰδ' εἰ θανόντι μοι τελείτ'· ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ., and if he did so write, then I fail to see how the passage was 'corrupted.' The error is as hard to trace in *Trach.* 675 if Sophocles there wrote ἀργῆς οἶδς εὐείρου πόκος, and not, as the MS. gives, ἀργῆτ' οἶδς εὐείρου πόκῳ. Euripides in a fragment of the *Aeolus* (*fr.* 21 Nauck) has ἄ μὴ γὰρ ἔστι τῷ πένηθ' ὁ πλούσιος δίδωσι: Erfurdt would write τῷ πένητι πλούσιος, yet the article seems re-

C