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](#)

The Text of Thucydides VII

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 04 / April 1893, pp 152 - 153

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197276, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197276

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1893). The Text of Thucydides VII. The Classical Review, 7, pp 152-153
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197276

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

that renders them readily nominal equivalents of verbal expressions. One is surprised to observe that this mode of indicating finality finds no mention among the many varieties cited in the first section of Widmann's excellent and careful dissertation *De Finalium Enuntiatorum Usu Thucydideo* (Gött. 1875).

Suppl. 899 *sqq.*

πολλοὺς δ' ἐραστὰς κατὰ θηλειῶν † ὅσας
ἔχων κτέ.

Canter emended ἴσας, which would naturally suggest itself to any one. Perhaps

the MSS. reading is a contamination arising

from a variant ICAC (i.e. ὁμῶς).
OMWC

Suppl. 1232.

στέιχόμεν, *Ἀδρασθ', ὄρκια δῶμεν.

Equivalent to στέιχόμεν, ἴν' ὄρκια δῶμεν. An excellent survival of the paratactic construction out of which the final clause (in stricter sense) with subj. grew. This indicates the original hortatory character of this subj.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

THE TEXT OF THUCYDIDES VII.

III.

It is well known that from vi. 92, 5 onwards the *Vatican* and its Paris copy H (as far as it goes) contain a version of the text which varies very considerably from that given by all the other MSS. It is equally certain, after all that has been written on the subject, that it is useless to say that either version—the *Vatican* or the *Laurentian*—is the better. We must test each passage wherever there is a difference on its own merits.

Any one who observes the two versions closely soon notices that the *Vatican* constantly contains a little word—generally it is τε—which is wanting in other MSS. Probably the scribe used a better MS. from vi. 92, 5 onwards. Sometimes he may be emending the text on his own account. Some one has called him 'a great grammarian,' perhaps only half in earnest. But, in any case, the minute addition does, in nine cases out of ten, carry conviction with it. To give instances of what is perfectly well known to all who are concerned with the text of Thuc. would be merely tedious.

What I wish to suggest is that it is highly probable that there is a large number of omissions in the received text of Books i.—v. 92; for, if we had the second version of these books, we should certainly find small words often in that text where they do not appear in our MSS. Further, it appears that the addition of a small word where it seems to be required and where the omission can be properly accounted for, is a scientific method of emendation in Thuc. We can-

not always be certain; but at least we should not be ridiculed for trying this method.

That there are occasional lacunae in the text, all are agreed; but I suggest that omissions of small words are far commoner than is supposed.

I believe that some of the greatest difficulties which we encounter in the generally simple Seventh Book would disappear if we could recover here and there a word or two still wanting even in the *Vatican*. In c. 2, 4 for τῷ δὲ ἄλλῳ τοῦ κύκλου, I believe we should read τῷ δὲ ἄλλῳ <ἄνω> τοῦ κύκλου; and hope to be able to show in my notice of Professor Freeman's *Shorter History of Sicily* that not one of the suggested explanations of the vulgate is possible. In c. 7, 1 for μέχρι τοῦ ἐγκαρσίου τείχους, it would be better to read μέχρι <τοῦ Εὐρυήλου> or <τοῦ τέλους> τοῦ ἐγκαρσίου τείχους than either to bracket μέχρι with some, or to explain the text as Freeman does. I shall have more to say on this passage also.

In c. 7, 4 for τρόπῳ ᾧ ἂν ἐν ὀλκάσιν ἡ πλοίοις ἢ ἄλλως ὅπως ἂν προχωρήῃ, I feel fairly confident that we ought to read τρόπῳ ᾧ ἂν ἐνῇ, ὀλκάσιν ἡ πλοίοις ἢ ἄλλως ὅπως ἂν προχωρήῃ. The dative without ἐν occurs in the same way a little further on; or even if it were impossible, we could fairly read <ἐνῇ>, ἐν.

In c. 56, 4 we at present read ἔθνη γὰρ πλείστα δὴ ἐπὶ μίαν πόλιν ταύτην ξυνηλθε, πλὴν γε δὴ τοῦ ξύμπαντος ὄχλου τοῦ ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ πρὸς τὴν Ἀθηναίων τε πόλιν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων. But Stahl rightly objects

(1) that we cannot legitimately supply *ξυνελθεῖν* after *πολέμῳ*; for that in all other cases the infin. or partic. is only supplied to complete some verb that is expressed in the second clause, as in *οὐ μέντοι εὐθύς γε ἀπέστη ἀλλὰ διανοεῖτο*: and (2) that, even if we could, the sense given is absurd. So I suggest *ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ <πολεμοῦντος> πρὸς τὴν...*, and all becomes satisfactory.

Lastly, in c. 75, 6 there has been much dispute over *καὶ μὴν ἡ ἄλλη αἰκία, καὶ ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν, ἔχουσά τινα ὅμως τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν κούφισιν, οὐδ' ὥς ῥαδίᾳ ἐν τῷ παρόντι ἐδοξάζετο*. The remarks of Classen and Stahl have been severely handled by Junghahn in his *Studien zu Thuk.* It seems plain that *ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν* is *part* of the *αἰκία*: was it not a terrible thing that highest and

lowest, that Nicias and the humblest camp-follower, should be in the same plight? Yet, as Machiavelli remarks, 'general evils are endured more easily than private ones.' Hence both *ἡ ἄλλη αἰκία* and the special *αἰκία* brought in them *κούφισιν τινα*, namely *τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν*.

But, in order that we may get this sense from the Greek, must we not follow the regular Thucydidean form of expression by reading *ἡ <τ> ἄλλη αἰκία καὶ ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν*, that the one part may be the complement of the other?

I have still to deal with a few passages in which either the punctuation is wrong or the letters have been confused.

E. C. MARCHANT.

PROPERTIUS III. (IV.) 22, 3.

Dindymus et sacra fabricata inventa Cybebe
(or Cibeles).

This MS. line has been variously corrected, the change which has found most favour being Haupt's *e vite*, for the unmeaning *inventata*.

But a passage in Pausanias, viii. 46, makes it probable that the word which Propertius put before *Cybebe* was *dente*; for Pausanias there says that the face of the Mater Dindymene at Cyzicus (to which Propertius is referring) was made of 'wrought teeth of the hippopotamus.' *Κυζικηνοὶ τε ἀναγκάσαντες πολέμῳ Προκοινησίους γενέσθαι σφίσι συνοῖκους Μητρὸς Δινδυμήνης ἀγαλμα ἔλαβον ἐκ Προκοινησίου· τὸ δὲ ἀγαλμὰ ἐστὶ χρυσοῦ, καὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀντὶ ἐλέφαντος ἵππων τῶν ποταμίων ὁδόντες εἰσὶν εἰργασμένοι.*

I pointed out this passage to Mr. Robinson Ellis, and proposed to read *fabricata e dente*; but he thinks that would not account for the corruption *inventata*, and that the true reading must be *in dente*. He happily cites 'casus effingere in auro' (the sense being 'in the material of gold'), Virg. *Aen.* vi. 32. So 'caelataque in auro,' *Aen.* i. 640.

What word should precede *fabricata*, is more doubtful. It might be *sacro*, if the point thereof could be discerned. Mr. Ellis cites a curious remark of Aelian's, *Hist. Anim.* vii. 19, on the hippopotamus, *ἀσεβέστατον δὲ καὶ ὁ ποτάμιος ἵππος, γέγεται γὰρ καὶ τοῦ πατρός.*

He suggests that *sacro* might be meant to refer to this habit of the animal, as if his tusks were set apart for use in the goddess' image 'in some connexion with the ideas of piety to parents, which Lucretius associates with her cultus, ii. 614-617.' Otherwise *sacro* seems pointless. But I venture to think the lost word is *secto*, if it be not too wide of the MS. *sacra*. Virgil has 'secto elephanto,' *Aen.* iii. 464. The idea would be 'sections of teeth,' so that *secto* would roughly correspond to Pausanias' word *εἰργασμένοι*. The teeth, if used at all, must have been in sections, or they could not have fitted; so that, if *dente* be right, the idea of *secto* is naturally implied, whether it be expressed or not.

On the other hand, if Propertius wrote *secto*, it could hardly have kept its place when *dente* was once lost, having become thereby unmeaning.

Mr. Ellis says, 'I do not deny that *secto* would be far better in every way; nor is the change very violent. The passage too is obviously one which descended from an early period in a completely vitiated state; *secto* may therefore be considered very likely.'

If we accept these views, the line runs

*Dindymus, et secto fabricata in dente
Cybebe.*

A. T. BARTON.