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](#)

Dr. Rutherford's Thucydides, Book IV

R. Y. Tyrrell

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 03 / March 1890, pp 110 - 112

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189760, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189760

How to cite this article:

R. Y. Tyrrell (1890). Dr. Rutherford's Thucydides, Book IV. The Classical Review, 4, pp 110-112 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189760

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

DR. RUTHERFORD'S THUCYDIDES, BOOK IV.¹

DR. RUTHERFORD'S contributions to classical learning have been marked hitherto by striking vigour and originality. The book now under review is distinguished no less by conspicuous power of generalization, conciseness and force of style, and acuteness of logic. But the thesis which he now seeks to establish is far more important than any which he has yet handled, and has a far wider scope than any of his previous works have aimed at. Dr. Rutherford will have made an epoch in classical learning if he succeeds in making good his case. If he is right, Thucydides wrote, or may have written, in a style as simple and direct as that of Xenophon; all the characteristic Thucydideanisms are foreign accretions, and should be cut away. As we have Thucydides now 'there is hardly a page which does not supply an instance of a sentence violating every law of a sentence, but still regarded as justifiable in Thucydides, who for his great merits of another kind is to be forgiven occasional lapses into utopian syntax' (p. xiv). But we have not the work of Thucydides as it was written, or anything like it. According to the editor nearly all the violations of normal grammar may be explained on one principle. In the text of Thucydides have become embedded thousands of the glosses, comments, adscripts (to use the general term which he employs to include them all) of the scholiasts, copyists, ancient critics, and all and sundry who have had anything to do with his great work.

Dr. Rutherford does indeed point out (and very acutely) certain marked characteristics which distinguish the style of Thucydides from that of (say) Xenophon. These are, broadly: (1) the idiom by which almost any verb may in the active be paraphrased by *ποιεῖσθαι* and some substantive expressing the action of the verb — an idiom which, when its boundaries are somewhat enlarged, has a tendency to elude us, and disguise itself as grammatical license; (2) his management of participles; (3) the frequent use he makes of the indirect reflexive pronoun in the plural. Moreover he allows that there is such a thing as style, such a thing as genius modifying language, and giving it the

special impress of a great writer's mind. But nine-tenths of the so-called violations of the common law of grammar, which are supposed to be characteristic of Thucydides, arise, according to the editor, from the fact that into the very warp and woof of his language, as it has come down to us, has been wrought the adscript pattern of the copyists and scholiasts. Were it not for this his style would be as free from grammatical license as that of Plato or Demosthenes. Indeed Dr. Rutherford claims for Thucydides a singular preciseness in the use of grammatical forms, and illustrates his case by some very acute remarks on passages in the fourth book. For instance in c. 98 *σπένδουσιν* is defended as an instance of extreme logical exactitude, because 'one side can only bid the other *σπένδειν*, i.e. do their part in the common ceremony, not *σπένδεσθαι*, i.e. do the part of both.' So *ἀναπαύοντες* in c. 11 has a reason in strict logic, for it is the relieving party who make the attack. A like precision is claimed for the active *ξυνηγγόν*, c. 79, and for the reciprocal middle *διακινδυνεύεσθαι*, c. 19; and in c. 71 Dr. Rutherford finds in the word *ἐφεδρενόντων* an apt reference to the *ἐφεδρος* who sat by in the gymnastic contests, ready to step in and contend with the victor.

How, then, did it come to pass that this most precise of writers thus became the victim of a set of circumstances which have presented to us as his work something which certainly cannot be called precise? Every one admits that many adscripts have forced their way into the texts of the ancient Greek writers, and in Thucydides especially numbers have been pointed out by Dobree, Krueger, Badham, Herwerden, and above all by Cobet. The question which at once presents itself is, how did it happen that the text of Thucydides suffered so much more from this source of corruption than that of Xenophon, Demosthenes, or Plato? I cannot find any really satisfactory answer to this question in Dr. Rutherford's book. When he writes:

In Thucydides especially this kind of corruption has escaped notice more easily because of his undeserved reputation for obscurity and clumsiness of expression,

surely we have here something like that form of *petitio principii* which logicians call 'the vicious circle.' Whence came the undeserved reputation? Was it not from the adscripts? But what peculiar power of

¹ *The Fourth Book of Thucydides*, a Revision of the Text, illustrating the principal Causes of Corruption in the Manuscripts of this Author, by WM. GUNION RUTHERFORD, M.A., LL.D., Head-Master of Westminster; author of the *New Phrynichus* and editor of *Babrius*. London, Macmillan, 1889.

attracting adscripts had the text of Thucydides?

In his text Dr. Rutherford prints the supposed adscripts in uncials in the margin, and certainly in a great many instances their expulsion from the text is a great improvement to the style. A good example occurs in 126 (I inclose the adscripts in square brackets): γνώσεσθε τὸ λοιπὸν ὅτι οἱ τοιοῦτοι ὄχλοι τοῖς μὲν τὴν πρώτην ἐφοδὸν δεξαμένοις ἄπωθεν [ἀπειλαῖς] τὸ ἀνδρείον μελλήσει ἐπικυποῦσιν, where ἀπειλαῖς is evidently a gloss on μελλήσει used in its thoroughly Thucydidean sense of 'a demonstration' of feeling, as opposed to action. Again, in the speech of Hermocrates, c. 63, he detects a serious interpolation of nineteen words from κατ' ἀμφοτέρα to εἰρχθῆναι, and fairly asks commentators 'can they honestly render τὸ ἐλλίπες εἴργεται into English or any other tongue?' In some cases the interpolation is harder to detect because it has undergone some change—generally a change of case—to enable it to take its place as an integral part of the sentence. In c. 34 all the MSS. give αὐτοὶ τῇ τε ὄψει [τοῦ θαρσεῖν] τὸ πλεῖστον εἰληφότες πολλαπλάσιοι φαινόμενοι. Dobree emended πλεῖστον to πιστόν. Dr. Rutherford holds that τὸ θαρσεῖν was a gloss on πιστόν, which was changed to τοῦ θαρσεῖν to make it fit into the sentence. In the same chapter ἀποκεκλημένοι τῇ ὄψει [τοῦ προορᾶν] was originally ἀποκ. τῆς ὄψεως, but when the gloss got into the text τῆς ὄψεως was changed to τῇ ὄψει to procure a construction.

Most interesting are those *additamenta* which are betrayed by the presence in them of some idiom unexampled in classical usage but prevalent in late Greek. Of these the most remarkable are ὅτε ἐπεφεύγει, 133, where the pluperf. is used as a simple past, as in later Greek; διὰ τὸ περιέχειν αὐτήν, 102, where διὰ must bear its post-classical meaning of 'for the purpose of'; so in 40 δι' ἀχθηδόνα is a gloss because the meaning required is not the classical *in distress*, but the post-classical *to cause annoyance*; and in 67 διὰ τῆς τάφρου is foreign matter because the context requires for διὰ the late meaning of *by* or *along*. With like certainty we may reject the adscript in 120, περὶ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας [αἷς ἐπύρχοντο] because 'even if Thucydides may have used ἐπύρχοντο, so far as form goes, he undoubtedly no more used it in the late sense of *discuss* than he used διὰ in the late sense of *to cause* and *along*.'

Dr. Rutherford even gives us marks whereby we may detect the intruder into the text. A very common way of introducing a marginal or interlinear note is by

a relative pronoun, adverb, or conjunction, either simple or (far more commonly) compounded with περ. Suspect a clause beginning ὅπερ, ὥσπερ, οἷσπερ, ἵναπερ. Thus in 48 ἵναπερ τὸ πρῶτον ὠρμηντο should be expelled from the text, not corrected by a change of ἵναπερ to ἐνθαπερ or οἷπερ.

Sometimes the adscript gets into the wrong sentence, or the wrong part of a sentence, as in 66, οἱ δὲ φίλοι τῶν ἔξω τὸν θροῦν αἰσθόμενοι φανερώς [μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον] καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡξίουσαν κ.τ.λ., where the adscript really belongs to the following sentence, γόνυ οὐ δυνατόν τὸν δῆμον ἐσόμενον.

It is a pity that Dr. Rutherford almost completely confines himself to the limits of Bk. IV. in illustrating his theories. One would have been glad to know whether he regards as a gloss the οὐ in μᾶλλον ἢ οὐ, where it is apparently redundant, as in μᾶλλον ἢ οὐ τοὺς αἰτίους, III. 36. It is very interesting to read Thucydides afresh and watch for places where Dr. Rutherford would resort to excision. One feels at once a bloodthirsty desire to wield the weapon he has put into our hands; we cry φονᾶ φονᾶ νόος ἦδη, and we see everywhere τομῶντα πῆματα to which we will keene no incantations. To take Pericles's speech in the second book, I fancy Dr. Rutherford would certainly expel from the very beginning of it, c. 35, ἀγορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν and πιστευθῆναι, and probably αὐτῶν after ὑπερβάλλοντι. I would infer from the same speech, c. 39, that Dr. Rutherford goes too far when he says 'the text of Thucydides is dotted over with Λακεδαιμόνιοι and Ἀθηναῖοι in every case and every construction, none of which he ever wrote.' If the scholiasts and copyists were so prone to append these names by way of explanatory comment, why do they not always append them? In c. 39, if anywhere, we should have expected οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι to have crept into the sentence οἱ μὲν ἐπιπόνῳ ἀσκήσει εὐθὺς νέοι ὄντες τὸ ἀνδρείον μετέρχονται, for surely no one will believe that any person capable of writing any comment at all could fail to see that the reference here is to the Lacedaemonians, and yet the addition of the name would certainly add to the clearness and antithesis of the passage.

I fear that if we apply Dr. Rutherford's knife impartially in pruning away from the text what is ungrammatical according to normal usage, we shall find that many of the finest things in Thucydides will vanish. The following is a passage, II. 53, than which there are few more impressive in Thucydides: θεῶν δὲ φόβος ἢ ἀνθρώπων νόμος οὐδεὶς ἀπείργε,

τὸ μὲν κρίνοντες ἐν ὁμοίῳ καὶ σέβειν καὶ μὴ, ἐκ τοῦ πάντας ὄραν ἐν ἴσῳ ἀπολλυμένους, τῶν δὲ ἀμαρτημάτων οὐδεὶς ἐλπίζων μέχρι τοῦ δίκην γενέσθαι βίους ἂν τὴν τιμωρίαν ἀντιδοῦναι, πολὺ δὲ μείζω τὴν ἤδη κατεψηφισμένην σφῶν ἐπικρεμασθῆναι, ἣν πρὶν ἐμπσεῖν, εἰκὸς εἶναι τοῦ βίον τι ἀπολαῦσαι. It will be seen that we are at once confronted with a glaring violation of the strict laws of construction—a most characteristic Thucydideanism. At first sight the passage seems to illustrate most forcibly Dr. Rutherford's theory. The κρίνοντες clause and the οὐδεὶς ἐλπίζει clause are those which interrupt the construction and mar the grammar. The one would be a most apt explanatory note on θεῶν φόβος and the other on ἀνθρώπων νόμος. But where are we to stop? These supposed adscripts are inextricably bound up with what follows. We must refer to the commentator the whole sentence down to ἀπολαῦσαι, and the result is that by far the most memorable sentiment in the whole chapter belongs, not to Thucydides, but to the scholiast. I can think of only three ways in which Dr. Rutherford could meet the difficulty thus raised. He may maintain that the theory of the adscript is here inapplicable; but it seems to fit the passage to a nicety. Or he may show that the words of the comment may be disentangled from those of Thucydides without carrying away with them most of that to which the passage owes its glow and strength; but in the present case this seems to me to be impossible. Or finally, he may hold the theory that among the many scholiasts there may have been one or two capable of rising to the height of feeling and expression required by such a sentence as πολὺ δὲ μείζω τὴν ἤδη κατεψηφισμένην, κ.τ.λ. He may hold that there may have been a scholiast capable of doing for the text of Thucydides what Carlyle has done for the letters and speeches of Cromwell, capable of emphasizing and enhancing the beauties of the expression, and deepening and elevating the train of thought. Then I ask where are the writings of this Καρλύλιος? How did this genius content himself with the humble labours of a com-

mentator when he possessed original faculty of so high an order? I believe there never was a scholiast capable of conceiving or expressing this sentiment, though considerations of grammar only would point to it as an undoubted scholiastic comment.

Dr. Rutherford's work teems with evidences of his high and deep scholarship, and with instructive and suggestive comments on Greek usage. He has embodied in his text many acute conjectures of recent scholars,¹ and several of his own, which, though as a rule quite convincing, yet deal with such minute points that it would not be very interesting to record them here. He has undoubtedly detected many adscripts which have eluded the vigilance of even Cobet himself, and has thus proved that the text of Thucydides has suffered more than has been hitherto suspected from this particular source of corruption. When he writes (p. xxvii.) :—

His style is simple but powerful, a fitting weapon for a vigorous understanding dealing in an unaffected way with events and the lessons to be derived from them,

it seems to me that he has not yet succeeded in showing that we may fairly call the style of Thucydides simple. We shall be able to pronounce a more decided opinion when he deals with the question more at large—as I hope he will—and takes his illustrations from the whole work of Thucydides. One feels however that it would be unfair to claim the immediate performance of so large a task from one who is the Head Master of a great public school, and who has already begun to turn the sod of another new wide and fertile field of philological labour.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

¹ There are two conjectures by the Editor of this *Review* published in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. vii. p. 234, which might well have found a place among these. For προσέλαυντες in iv. 7 Professor Mayor would read προσεῖλσαντες, 'having penned up,' which he defends by comparing Hom. *Il.* x. 347, Eur. *Hel.* 445; and for σκαϊόττητα (al. νεόττητα), *ib.* 80, he conjectures σκληρόττητα, a word which expresses 'the unconquerable determination and stiff-neckedness of the Helots.'

COUAT'S ARISTOPHANES AND THE ANCIENT ATTIC COMEDY.

Aristophane et l'ancienne Comédie Attique, par A. COUAT, Recteur de l'Académie de Lille: Paris, 1889.

THOSE who have read M. Couat's *Étude sur Catulle* and his *Poésie alexandrine sous*

les trois premiers Ptolémées will expect much pleasure and instruction from a work by the same hand on the great Athenian wit. And they will not be disappointed. A French scholar has perhaps peculiar advantages in dealing with the genius who from one point