STUART JONES'S *THUCYDIDES*.

Thucydidis Historiae. Edited, with short critical notes, by H. STUART JONES. Two Vols. (Scriptorium Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) 7s.

A FEW words of welcome must be given, χρόνῳ μὲν ἀλλ' ὅμως, to Mr. Stuart Jones's edition of Thucydides. Executed with admirable judgment, it has met the need, that before its appearance was severely felt, for a popular text based on the results of modern scholarship and equipped with a compendious critical apparatus.

In his preface, before reviewing the relations of the seven chief MSS., the editor acknowledges his obligations to Bekker and Hude, whose materials he has supplemented by himself collating most of M and a part of C. That the MSS. of Thucydides are excessively corrupt he refuses to believe, concluding from an examination of places where one of two variant readings is unquestionably wrong, (1) that the errors fall into certain definite classes, and (2) that we are rarely to depart very far from the traditional text. He rejects the theory of extensive interpolation, appealing to the Oxyrhynchus fragment, which, while showing that single words like *οἱ, εἰ, τις* have been readily lost or inserted, lends no support to suspicions of longer interpolations. At the same time, it is pointed out, the papyrus justifies our distrusting the MSS. on points that hardly, if at all, affect the sense, as when it gives *εἰ βούλονται* for *εἰ βούλουτο*.

Applying these principles the editor freely accepts such corrections—to take examples at random—as *καταθήσεσθε* for *κατάθησθε*, i. 33. 1, *ὑπὸ <τριῶν> τῶν μεγίστων νικηθέντες* *id.* 76. 2, *ἀποκτενεῖν* for *ἀποκτείναι*, *id.* 8. 5; and among them makes the following contributions of his own: *οἱ τῶν ἀργυρολόγων νεῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοί* for *Ἀθηναῖοι νεῶν E, Ἀθηναίων cett.* iv. 75. 1, *ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις* for *πολεμίοις id.* 80. 3, *ἀπροσδοκίτοις προσπεσῶν* for *ἀπροσδόκητος id.* 103. 5, *ἐνυμαχίδα* for *ἐνυμαχίαν* v. 33. 1, *προδιαλαβόντας* for *διαλαβόντας, προφθάσαντας* vii. 73. 1. Other suggestions are: *οἱ μὲν ἐφ' ὅπλοις ἵπποιμένοι*, 'fort. ἀναπανόμενοι' vii. 28. 2, *οὐκέτι . . . ἀλλ' ἄπορα νομίσαντες*, 'post οὐκέτι pauca excidisse censeo' viii. 56. 5, and *id.* 68. 2, *ἐπειδὴ † μετέστη ἡ δημοκρατία καὶ ἐς ἀγῶνας*

κατέστη † τὰ τῶν τετρακοσίων ἐν ὑστέρῳ μεταπεσόντα ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐκακοῦτο †, 'duas recensiones conflatas esse censeo.'

On the question of interpolation, Mr. Jones is perhaps not quite so conservative as his preface seems to imply. His words there are 'Quod autem quidam affirmant, codices Thucydeos maxima emblematum copia esse foedatos, id nullo modo factum arbitror, nec multa eorum, quae in contextu leguntur, uncis seclusi, nisi forte ex scholiastae interpretatione apparet eum ista non legisse.' In his text I have counted (though I cannot claim precise accuracy for these figures) 10 places where words (other than particles and the like) are bracketed on the evidence of a scholium¹ or of Valla's translation, as against 32 cases of words bracketed on the conjecture of previous editors, besides a probably larger number of similar conjectures thought worthy of mention in the notes. It must be admitted that a scrap of papyrus was sufficient to repulse the interpolation-theory from the times of the Byzantines and of Suidas (v. Rutherford's *Fourth Book of Thucydides*, pp. xxxii f., xl) to within five centuries of Thucydides' life-time; nor am I aware that its champions have yet rallied to defend the new position. Yet that the common tradition contains a considerable number of interpolated annotations, the present text concedes, and few will be found to deny. Where precisely to draw the line, it is almost impossible that any two critics should exactly agree. Mr. Jones retains τοῦ Πειραιῶς τοῦ λιμένος τῶν Ἀθηναίων ii. 93. 1, with expressed suspicion, and Ἀμόργην τὸν Πισσοῦθνον νῆδον νόθον viii. 5. 5, without. His moderation is justified by the object that he set before him, 'ut ea quae anti quitus tradita erant potius quam ea quae Thucydides scribere potuit assequeretur,'—which, though it need not content the Thucydean enthusiast, is no doubt the proper aim for the editor of a standard text. That position Mr. Jones's work is well qualified to occupy.

It is to be regretted that these volumes, like others of their series, lack the convenience of numbered pages.

H. RACKHAM.

¹ A good instance is a suggestion of Mr. Jones's own, i. 134. 4 *ἐς τὸν Καῖδαρ[. οὐπερ τοὺς κακοῦργους,] ἐσβάλλειν*, 'ut uidetur, non legit schol., seclusi.'