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](#)

Histories of Polybius *The Histories of Polybius*, translated from the text of F. Hultsch by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh. Macmillan & Co. 1889. 2 vols. 24s.

J. L. Strachan-Davidson

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 10 / December 1889, pp 445 - 449

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196167, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196167

How to cite this article:

J. L. Strachan-Davidson (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 445-449 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196167

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

1. Λυκιανὸς ὁ τυραννοκτόνος. f. 164.
2. Ἀποκηρυττόμενος. f. 174.
3. "Εἰκόνες." f. 189b.
4. "Πατρίδος ἐγκώμιον." 200b.
5. "Δημώνακτος βίος." f. 203b.

153.—BRIT. MUS. **Add. MS.** 5110 (ff. 203—210). Paper: ff. 8. $11\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. With Xenophon [No. 80], Polybius [No. 84], and Plutarch [No. 147]. XV cent. Belonged to Dr. Anthony Askew.

1. Λυκιανὸς βίων πρᾶσις. f. 203.
Imperfect: begins in cap. 7, "Ἐγωγε.
Εἶτα οὐ δέδιαις."
2. Ἀλιεύς ἢ ἀναβιούντες. f. 206.
Imperfect: ends at beg. of cap. 34, "καὶ γὰρ αὐ."

154.—BRIT. MUS. **Arundel MS.** 517 (ff. 91, 92). Paper: ff. 2. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ inches. Minuscules. With Plutarch [No. 148]. XV cent.

1. Λυκιανὸς Φάλαρις πρῶτος. f. 91.
The latter portion: beg.—"θῆναι κε
λεύσας ὡς μὴ μάνειε."
2. "Φάλαρις δεύτερος." f. 91b.

155.—BRIT. MUS. **Burney MS.** 276 (f. 1). Paper: f. 1. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in western Europe. Late XVI cent.

1. Λυκιανὸς προλαλιὰ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς.
The latter half: beg. "πολὺ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ
καὶ ἰσχυρότερος οὗτος."
2. "Περὶ τοῦ ἡλέκτρον ἢ τῶν κύκνων."

ATHENAEUS.

156.—BRIT. MUS. **Royal MS.** 16 C. xxiv. Paper: ff. 345. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. XV cent.

Ἀθηναίου Ναυκρατίτου δειπνοσοφιστῶν βιβλία γ-ιε'.

Begins with Bk. γ', § 74: "Στειλῆαν ῥαφὰ νῦδα."

The several Books are numbered η'-ιδ', ιδ' (*sic, bis*)-ιζ' ε', ι'.

157.—BRIT. MUS. **Royal MS.** 16 D. x. Paper: ff. 256. 12×8 inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy (?). XVI cent.

"E Bibliotheca Davidis Hoeschelii, Augustani."

Ἀθηναίου Ναυκρατίτου δειπνοσοφιστῶν ἐπιτομή.

Imperfect: "Athenaei locus, unde hic ἀκέφαλος codex orditur, extat libro tertio pag. 41, v. 46, edit. Basil."

AELIAN.

158.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 6295 (ff. 65—80). Paper: ff. 15. $8\frac{3}{8} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. With excerpts from Aristotle [No. 129]. XV cent.

Belonged to the Jesuit College of Agen in France.

"Ἐκ τοῦ Αἰλιανοῦ περὶ ζώων." : excerpts.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS.

159.—BRIT. MUS. **Arundel MS.** 531. Paper: ff. 178. $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. XV cent.

"Διατριβὴ Διογένηος βίων καὶ γνωμῶν τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ εὐδοκίμησάντων καὶ τῶν ἐκάστη αἰρέσει ἀρεσάντων."

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

HISTORIES OF POLYBIUS.

The Histories of Polybius, translated from the text of F. HULTSCH by EVELYN S. SHUCKBURGH. Macmillan & Co. 1889. 2 vols. 24s.

In these volumes Mr. Shuckburgh presents us with a translation of the whole of the extant portions of Polybius. No attempt to put Polybius into English has been made for many years and the older translations deal very imperfectly with the fragments and extracts. The work is to be hailed as a useful and much needed contribution to the study of our author.

It is not easy to see why Mark Pattison should have spoken slightly of the task of translating, as 'the laziest of all occupation with the Classics.' It may well be argued that translation is precisely the work which most severely tests the scholar and

the critic. It is comparatively easy to talk about the meaning of a passage of Greek in a note. The annotator is not even compelled to make up his mind, but may leave the issue undecided between conflicting possibilities. The translator must choose his interpretation at his own peril, and must then seek for words which shall accurately render the meaning which he attributes to the Greek, and which shall at the same time be English in style and spirit. Again, the commentator can veil his perplexities in silence. He can fill his page with miscellaneous learning and leave his readers in the lurch just where they most need assistance. The translator may complain with Macbeth—

They have tied me to a stake; I cannot fly,
But, bear-like, I must fight the course'

Only two ways of escape are open to him. The first is the method admirably employed by Livy in the numerous passages in which he presents Polybius in a Latin dress. Livy writes like a gentleman, who is not bound to trouble himself excessively. If the reader of Polybius turns to Livy in order to see what he has made of a difficult passage, he will in three cases out of four be disappointed; he will find that Livy has experienced precisely the same difficulty as himself, and has gracefully but resolutely skipped it. A second and far more insulting method of evasion is the practice, so well known to examiners, of 'construing through a stone wall.' When unable to see what a passage means, the translator puts the Greek word for word into English, and produces a string of English syllables conveying no sense whatsoever.

Mr. Shuckburgh is quite above such expedients. He fairly attempts to put the sense of every sentence into English, and the passages are very few in which it can be said that he leaves us in doubt how he interprets his author. Fighting thus in the open, he mercilessly exposes his weak points, and reveals himself whenever he has misunderstood the Greek. Sometimes this is the case with single words, as when (in I. 37, 5) he translates *καταπληξάμενοι* 'intoxicated by' instead of 'striking terror into,' but more frequently in the bearing and construction of a sentence. In I. 57, 2 for instance, *ἐκ δὲ τῆς καθόλου τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐνεργείας καὶ τῆς ἐκατέρου φιλοτιμίας ἔστι καὶ τῆς ἐμπειρίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως πρὸς δε καὶ τῆς εὐψυχίας ἱκανὴν ἔννοian λαβεῖν*, he translates, 'Still one may conceive a sufficiently distinct idea of the affair by taking into account the general activity of the men, the ambition actuating each side and the amount of their experience strength and courage'; whereas Polybius evidently means that we are to gather an idea of these last, their experience, &c, by observing the activity and spirit which they display. In his Introduction to the story of the War of the Mercenaries Polybius remarks (I. 65, 6) *τόν τε γὰρ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λεγόμενον ἄσπονδον πόλεμον, τίνα φύσιν ἔχει καὶ διάθεσιν, μάλιστ' ἂν τις ἐκ τῶν τότε γεγονότων ἐπιγνοίῃ*, which can only mean that from the events of this struggle we may best get a notion of what people mean when they speak of a 'truceless war.' Mr. Shuckburgh, if we acquit him of the graver fault of having failed to express what he intends in English, must have taken 'the truceless war' to have been a title given to this particular contest, for he translates, 'The nature and peculiar

ferocity of the struggle which has been generally called the 'truceless war' may be best learned from its incidents.' These instances are taken from the First Book. A glance at Schweighäuser's Latin in each case would have kept the translator right. It is only fair to say that such errors become less frequent as the work proceeds.

Mr. Shuckburgh warns us in his Preface that he has 'not undertaken to write a commentary on Polybius, nor to discuss at length the many questions of interest which arise from his text. Such an undertaking would require much more space than I was able to give.' This is a perfectly fair proviso: we have no right to demand discussions which do not fall within the plan of the work. At the same time it must be remembered that a translator is bound, not indeed to discuss, but to have thought over and made up his own mind about many questions which directly affect the interpretation of his text. He ought for instance to know enough of the Roman army to be aware that the *Principes* were armed with the *pilum*, and that he must not write (VI. 23 *ad fin.*) 'The *Principes* and *Triarii* are armed in the same way as the *Hastati*, except that instead of *pila* they carry long spears (*hastae*),' even supposing that it had not been sufficiently clear from the Greek (*ὁ δ' αὐτὸς τρόπος τῆς καθοπλίσεως ἔστι καὶ περὶ τοὺς πρίγκιπας καὶ τριαρίους, πλὴν ἀντὶ τῶν ὕσων οἱ τριαρίοι δόρατα φοροῦσιν*) that the third rank alone carried the pike. Nor should he, as Mr. Shuckburgh does in the next sentence, father on Polybius the erroneous statement that 'the *Principes*, *Hastati* and *Triarii* each elect ten centurions.' In the Astronomical passages Mr. Shuckburgh has gone hopelessly astray both about the Zodiac (ix. 15) and the weather-signs (I. 37). 'Of the two dangerous constellations,' he writes in the latter passage, 'one had not yet set, and the other was in the point of rising.' Now in the first place *καταλήγειν*, applied to a star, does not mean that 'it is setting' but that 'its influence has abated.' This is a small matter however: it is more to be regretted that, before committing himself to this translation, Mr. Shuckburgh evidently did not think it necessary to ascertain when the next visible setting of the star in question would actually take place. If he had done so, the impossibility of his rendering would have been at once revealed to him.

The same carelessness about consistency appears in the dates assigned to the events of the war between Rome and the Achaeans.

The problem is a very difficult one and turns mainly on the question: At what season of the year did the Achaeans elect their President? There are three distinct answers to this question, but Mr. Shuckburgh never makes up his mind between them. In the margin of his text (xxxix. 10) he adopts the view, which I believe to be correct, that the election was held in the summer, and that Diaeus (after having acted for some months previously in place of the deceased Critolaus) was elected President on his own account early in August 146 B.C., and in the course of the same month rejected the offers of Metellus, who had not yet been superseded by the arrival of the consul Mummius. In his Introduction however Mr. Shuckburgh first (p. xxxii) places the election of Critolaus in the autumn of 147 (apparently following Clinton, who adopts November for the date of the elections), and then on the next page he seems to go over without warning to Unger's view, that the elections were in February, for he places the arrival of Mummius and the supersession of Metellus *in the Spring* of 146 B.C. and, as we have seen, this event was preceded by the re-election of Diaeus.

On one occasion this blindness to difficulties in the sense has led Mr. Shuckburgh into a strange confusion. The passage is from the tenth book (ch. 17) and contains the well-known arithmetical puzzle regarding Scipio's fleet at Cartagena. Mr. Shuckburgh writes—'From the remaining captives he selected the strongest, those who were in the prime of youth and physical vigour, and assigned them to serve on board ship; and having thus increased the number of his naval allies by one half, he manned the ships taken from the enemy as well as his own; so that the number of men on board each vessel were now little short of double what it was before. For the captured ships numbered eighteen, his original fleet thirty-five.' Now 'naval allies' have nothing to do with Polybius's statement, προσέμιξε τοῖς αὐτοῦ πληρώμασι, καὶ ποίησας ἡμιολίους τοὺς πάντας ναύτας ἢ πρόσθεν κ.τ.λ. True, Schweighäuser's Latin gives 'socii navalis' as a rendering of πληρώμασι, but then 'socii navales' no more means 'naval allies' than a 'master's mate' means 'the captain's wife.' The fact seems to be that Mr. Shuckburgh has failed to notice the obvious difficulty which Schweighäuser is attempting (rightly or wrongly) to solve. Schweighäuser's solution is that it is the seamen (ναύτας) alone whose number is increased by only one half, while he supposes the number of the fighting men

to have been increased in a much larger proportion (see his note) so as to make up the nearly doubled number of each entire ship's company (τοὺς ἀνδρας). I have expressed my opinion elsewhere that Schweighäuser's solution is hardly satisfactory, and have attempted one (possibly equally unsatisfactory) myself. Hultsch has (as I now find) anticipated me in it (Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* 1867), though he thinks it insufficient without some alterations in the text. Lastly, another writer, answering Hultsch in the same Magazine (1868), thinks the passage desperate unless we entirely change the sense by converting διπλασίους into παραπλησίους. This last method (with which I was not previously acquainted) seems somewhat violent; nevertheless I am now on the whole inclined to agree with it. The difficulty however of the passage is so great that every possible solution deserves respect. The only course which cannot by any chance commend itself is that taken by Mr. Shuckburgh. He translates as if there were no difficulty at all, and apparently sees no objection to making Polybius assert that when the number of men was increased by one half and the number of ships likewise increased by rather more than one half, there were *therefore* double as many men as before to each ship.

Even Mr. Shuckburgh's slips of the pen are sometimes unlucky in destroying the sense of a passage. In I. 20, 14 he writes 'quinneremes' for 'penteconters' as the class of ship which the Romans used to borrow from the Greek states of Italy. This is a trifle not worth noticing in itself; but the English readers 'who for various reasons do not care to use the Greek of Polybius' will be sufficiently puzzled to find this assertion in the same chapter with the statement that the use of quinneremes was unknown in Italy.

Enough has been done in the invidious task of pointing out obvious mistakes. It is more useful as well as more agreeable to turn to passages on which there may fairly be differences of opinion, and to note Mr. Shuckburgh's verdict on each.

In the third treaty between Rome and Carthage (III. 25, 3) we have the following—ἐὰν συμμαχίαν ποιῶνται πρὸς Πύρρον ἑγγραπτον, ποιείσθωσαν ἀμφοτέροι, ἵνα ἐξῇ βοηθεῖν ἀλλήλοις ἐν τῇ τῶν πολεμουμένων χώρᾳ. I have interpreted this to mean (*Selections* p. 64) that the Romans and Carthaginians, *in order* to secure their reciprocal rights to aid in defence, agree not to make any convention with Pyrrhus except in concert (ἀμφοτέροι).

After reading Mr. Shuckburgh's rendering—'If they make a treaty of alliance with Pyrrhus, the Romans or Carthaginians shall make it *on such terms as* not to preclude the one giving aid to the other, if that one's territory is attacked'—I am now inclined to prefer it to my own. I am further indebted to Mr. Shuckburgh for a correction of my historical note on the fragment respecting the treason of Heraclides against the Rhodians (xiii. 3 *seq.*) I was not aware that the rest of the story could be gathered from the *Stratagems* of Polyænus. I think that Mr. Shuckburgh is also probably right in translating ἀφίσταντο (I. 20, 6) 'held aloof,' rather than 'revolted' (as Schweighäuser). It does not seem likely that so early as the fourth year of the war the Romans can have had possession of any great number of Sicilian coast-towns. In another passage (XV. 11, 4) I ought possibly to surrender my interpretation of Hannibal's exhortation to his troops at Zama—παρήγγειλε δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους στρατιώτας ἕκαστον παρακαλεῖν, ἀναφέροντας τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς νίκης ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὰς μεθ' αὐτοῦ παραγεγενημένας δυνάμεις. I allow that it seems most natural to refer (as Mr. Shuckburgh does) ἑαυτὸν and μεθ' αὐτοῦ to Hannibal, but I still think that both words may indicate the individual officer (ἕκαστον) who is charged to address his own company. If it be possible to take it so, the sense becomes infinitely better: a general wishes that each man in his army should fight as if everything depended on his own exertions and those of his immediate companions, not that they should be trusting to have the victory won for them by another division of the army. On the whole then I abide by my former explanation of the passage—'each officer was to speak as though the whole issue of the day rested with him and his company.'

In several points in which one commentator or another appears to me to have gone astray I am glad to be able to claim the support of Mr. Shuckburgh's interpretation for the views which I believe to be correct, as for instance in the explanation of ὠφελιμώτατον (I. 4, 4) of τὸν τῆς ἀντιπλοίας λόγον (VI. 10, 7), of τῆς μάχης δ' αὐτοῖς κατ' ἀνδρά τὴν κίνησιν λαμβανούσης (XVIII. 30, 7), and of φιλοδοξήσας ἐν ἀριστοκρατικῷ πολιτεύματι (XXIII. 14, 1).

I wish that I could agree with Mr. Shuckburgh in his interpretation of II. 37, 11, καθόλου δὲ τούτῳ μόνῳ διαλλάττειν τοῦ μὴ μῖα πόλεως διάθεσιν ἔχειν σχεδὸν τὴν σύμπασαν Πελοπόννησον, τῇ μὴ κ.τ.λ. which he translates, 'Nor is their any difference between the

entire Peloponnesus and a single city except in the fact that &c.' . . . in other respects there is *nearly* absolute assimilation &c. Now if it be possible to take σχεδόν, with Mr. Shuckburgh, as a vague qualification of the whole sentence, which may be transferred at will to any part of it, we shall get rid of almost the only serious difficulty in supposing this passage to have been published (as I most certainly believe it was) before B.C. 146. I am afraid however that σχεδὸν τὴν σύμπασαν Πελοπόννησον must mean 'almost the whole of Peloponnesus' and that we are bound to justify it (as I have attempted to do elsewhere) by supposing some exceptions, otherwise unknown, to the union of *all* the Peloponnesian States at this period in the Achaean League. To take another passage of some historical interest, I have little doubt that Mr. Shuckburgh is mistaken in his explanation of the treacherous counsel given by Marcius Philippus to the Rhodians in B.C. 169 (XXVIII. 17, 4). The consul—θανμάζειν ἔφη πῶς οὐ πειρώνται διαλύειν οἱ Ῥόδιοι τὸν ἐνεστῶτα πόλεμον, μάλιστα τοῦ πράγματος ἐκείνοις καθήκοντος. Mr. Shuckburgh takes the ἐνεστῶτα πόλεμον to be that between Antiochus and Ptolemy. The Rhodians did indeed attempt to mediate in this war, but so did the Achaeans (XXIX. 25, 2) at the express and public request of Marcius himself. Such an action on the part of Rhodes would give Rome no sort of handle for a quarrel, and it was clearly a pretext for such a quarrel that Marcius sought to provide. I think then that the war in question must be that between Rome and Macedon, and that the intervention which Marcius instigated was that which the Rhodians actually undertook at Rome (XXIX. 19), and which, as Marcius intended, brought Rhodes to the depths of humiliation.

In XI. 8 I feel some doubt as to Mr. Shuckburgh's explanation of the μεθοδικὸς τρόπος as applied to the training of officers. Three kinds (τρόποι) of instruction are open to them, says Polybius, first ὁ διὰ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τῆς ἐκ τούτων κατασκευῆς, secondly ὁ μεθοδικὸς διὰ τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἐμπείρων ἀνδρῶν παραδόσεως, and thirdly actual practice in the field. How are we to distinguish between the first and the second? Mr. Shuckburgh takes both to refer to books, the first being histories, the second 'scientific treatises composed by specialists.' This may be right, but it seems simpler to regard all book-learning as compressed under the head of ὑπομνήματα and to refer the μεθοδικὸς τρόπος (like the ἐμπειρία μεθοδική of I. 84,

6) to the personal lessons of the drill-instructor. Greece must have been full of retired soldiers of fortune, qualified to impart their special knowledge for a consideration, much as Major Dugald Dalgetty was to instruct the Highlanders in the 'golden secret of military tactic,' 'teaching them to form battalia by extracting the square root' after the method of the divine Gustavus.

In passages more immediately affecting the Greek, I cannot agree with Mr. Shuckburgh that the *συνγότης* of the senate (III. 20, 3) implies that they 'put on mourning,' nor that *γενναϊότατα κεκοινηκότες ἑαυτοῖς πραγμάτων* (IX. 25, 5) should be explained as if Hannibal and Mago 'had arranged a most generous subdivision of operations,' nor again that *προπορεύεσθαι πρὸς τὴν στρατηγίαν* (XXVIII. 6, 9) means 'should go without delay to his duties as Strategus.' As far as I am aware, all commentators take *προπορεύεσθαι* to mean 'become a candidate for the office' (as *προσπορεύεσθαι* and *μεταπορεύεσθαι* in X. 4), and this must surely be the true rendering. Another word, as to which a controversy arises, is *ιστορεῖν*. It is an open question whether it can bear the sense of 'narratum legere' in I. 63,7 and II. 17,2. I do not regret my acceptance of Schweighäuser's interpretation. In any case it is difficult to see why Mr. Shuckburgh should emphasise his rejection of this rendering in a note on the first of these two passages and yet should silently accept it on another very similar occasion (XXX. 4, 17).

In the description of Hannibal's array at Cannae Mr. Shuckburgh follows Sir Walter Raleigh in taking the words *μηνονειδὲς ποιῶν τὸ κύρτωμα καὶ λεπτύνων τὸ τούτων αὐτῶν σχῆμα* (III. 113, 8.) very literally, 'the whole line became crescent-shaped diminishing in depths

towards its extremities.' I still believe that *μηνονειδὲς* is not to be taken strictly for the actual shape of a crescent moon, but that it indicates simply a convex projection, and that *λεπτύνων* has nothing to do with the tapering horns of the moon but merely expresses that the ranks of the Gauls and Spaniards (*τούτων αὐτῶν*) were somewhat attenuated by being extended so as to occupy an arc in front instead of a straight line as before the advance.

I will conclude this discussion of doubtful passages with a case in which Mr. Shuckburgh criticises *nominatim*, a rendering of my own, regarding which I am impenitent. At the scene of the burning of Carthage (XXXIX. 4) Hasdrubal's wife is described as *τοὺς παῖδας ἐν χιτωνίσκοις ἐξ ἑκατέρου τοῦ μεροῦς προσειληφύια ταῖς χερσὶ μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων ἐνδυμάτων*. I do not understand on what grounds a German translator has (as Mr. Shuckburgh tells us) 'given up these words in despair.' *προσλαμβάνειν* (with accusative or genitive) may be used, as is clear from the references (Soph. *Tr.* 1024 and Ar. *Ach.* 1215 sq.) given in Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*, in the sense of 'to take hold of.' Quite literally then the Greek says that the lady 'grasped the boys, dressed in tunics, with her hands on either side along with her own clothes'; which means, I take it, that each hand encircled a boy along with a portion of her own skirt; this is physically possible only if we picture the garment as held wrapped by the hand round the boy. I have tried to express it by saying that she 'folded them in her own robe with her hands,' and I cannot see that this is 'straining the meaning of *προσειληφύια*.'

J. L. STRACHAN-DAVIDSON.

CAESAR'S SEVENTH CAMPAIGN IN GAUL.

Caesar's Seventh Campaign in Gaul, by W. C. COMPTON. Bell. 1889. 8vo. pp. x., 138. Price 4s.

THIS is in several ways a noteworthy school-book. Firstly, it is profusely illustrated. Mr. Compton has, it seems, studied the campaign in the country where it was fought—would that more schoolmasters were so energetic—and has brought back a quantity of sketches. He has adopted plans from van Kampen and has added representations of siege-engines, entrenchments and the

like. The idea of the whole is excellent and the success in execution is considerable. The vignette sketches inserted in the text are very attractive, the maps are well-chosen, and the 'Representation of a Siege' on the frontispiece is ideal in two senses of that word. It is to be hoped, and it is to be expected, that other editors will follow the example of Mr. Compton. It is impossible to have too much 'realism' in our teaching, whether the teaching be done in a school or a university.

Perhaps, as the subject is one I have