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](#)

Holden's Thucydides VII *Θουκυδδου Ἑβδομ. The Seventh Book of the History of Thucydides.* The Text newly revised and explained with Introduction, Summaries, Maps and Indexes, by the Rev. Hubert Ashton Holden, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of the University of London, Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Editor of the Cyropaedeia of Xenophon and of Select Lives of Plutarch &c. &c. Cambridge University Press 1891. [pp. lxiv. 384. 5s.]

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 06 / June 1892, pp 267 - 269

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185981, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185981

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 267-269 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185981

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

HOLDEN'S THUCYDIDES VII.

Θουκυδίδου Ἑβδομή. *The Seventh Book of the History of Thucydides*. The Text newly revised and explained with Introduction, Summaries, Maps and Indexes, by the Rev. HUBERT ASHTON HOLDEN, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of the University of London, Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Editor of the *Cyropaedia of Xenophon* and of *Select Lives of Plutarch* &c. &c. Cambridge University Press 1891. [pp. lxiv. 384. 5s.]

IN writing the Commentary on this masterpiece of the greatest historian, I have not found much room left for original work; my task has been more or less limited to selection and arrangement.' This task of selection and arrangement Dr. Holden has on the whole performed with great care and with sound judgment; so that he has produced a very useful set of variorum notes which will save the busy student the trouble of consulting several other books. In nearly two hundred pages of notes I have noticed only the following mis-statements: c. 21, 2 ἀπόπειραν λαμβάνειν, 'the substantive is not found elsewhere'—the whole phrase occurs in Polyb. 27, 4, 2: c. 58, 3 δύναται δὲ τὸ νεοδαμῶδες ἐλεύθερον ἦδη εἶναι, 'L. Dindorf . . . and H. van Herwerden were the first to doubt the genuineness of these words'—they were first suspected long long before by Portus. In the same note the editor continues 'Prof. Jowett . . . holds . . . that the idiomatic use of ἦδη is in favour of the genuineness of the clause.' But have Prof. Jowett and Dr. Holden never read the scholia on viii. 48, 5 and 89, 2, where ἦδη is equally 'idiomatic'? There is a strange note on c. 34, 7 ὅτι οὐ πολλὰ ἐνίκων. 'If the cause had rested on the authority of the writer, the optative νικῶεν would have been necessary.' But surely the opt. would then have been impossible, as the reference to Goodwin which is given by the editor would show. In ii. 21 ὅτι οὐκ ἐπεξάγοι does not give the cause assigned by the writer. c. 70, 8 Ἀθηναίους is said to be retained by Böhm; but both Böhm's text and the Böhm-Widmann edition give the word in brackets. On c. 75, 5 ἐπὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις Dr. Holden says 'this is the conj. emendation of Pluygers for the reading of B ὑπὸ τοῖς ὅπλοις.' In the first place B omits ὑπὸ (Hude, *Com. Crit.* p. 38). Besides the conjecture was first made by Bothe: but Bothe's edition is

not mentioned in Dr. Holden's bibliography, in which also Elmsley's text (1804), Sitzler's edition (1890), von Essen's Index, and Junghahn's *Studien* (1886) are absentees; while van Herwerden's edition is described—presumably from Engelmann (1880)—as in two vols. 1877–8! From this last error it is evident that Dr. Holden is unacquainted with van Herwerden's text, a conclusion which is borne out by the Critical Notes, in which the conjectures in van Herwerden's *Studia* (1869) are taken as representing their author's final opinion. This is especially hard on a critic whose judgment on textual difficulties in Thucydides has been marked by an almost feminine mutability. Lastly in c. 69, 4 Dr. Holden says 'Arnold and Classen read καταλειφθέντα after the Scholiast.' But the Schol., as is rightly stated in the *not. crit.*, reads παραλειφθέντα.

In the text, the bracketing of ἐπὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις (c. 75, 5) and αὐτοὺς for αὐτοῖς (c. 36, 3) are probably misprints. It is perhaps superfluous for me to say that in the interpretation and reading of many passages I am unable to agree with Dr. Holden: otherwise I should not still have an edition of the same book advertised. In all these cases others will judge between us. I will merely mention a few places where I think that the editor has deferred too much to the opinions of predecessors. The text given is that adopted by Dr. Holden. In c. 21, 3 ξυνανέπειθε δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἑρμοκράτης οὐχ ἦκιστ' αὐτοὺς ταῖς ναυσὶ μὴ ἀθυμεῖν ἐπιχειρῆσαι πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, λέγων οὐδὲ ἐκείνους πάτριον τὴν ἐμπειρίαν . . . ἔχειν. Here οὐχ ἦκιστ' αὐτοὺς is Stahl's conjecture for MSS. οὐκ ἦκιστα τοῦ; but, if a change is made in the punctuation, the MSS. reading requires no alteration: thus:—ξυνανέπειθε δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἑ. οὐχ ἦκιστα, τοῦ ταῖς ναυσὶ μὴ ἀθυμεῖν ἐπιχειρῆσαι, πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους λέγων οὐδὲ ἐκείνους κ.τ.λ., where τοῦ μὴ ἀθυμεῖν is inf. of purpose, and πρὸς τοὺς Ἀ. λέγων = 'saying with regard to the A.,' with hostility implied. No doubt πρὸς τοὺς Ἀ. λέγων would more naturally mean 'saying before the A.'; but who can deny that the words may mean what I suggest? This avoids the difficulty of constructing πρὸς τοὺς Ἀ. with ἐπιχειρῆσαι. An important passage, which has caused trouble ever since Valla mistranslated it is c. 75, 4 εἴ τῳ δὲ προλίποι ἡ ῥώμη καὶ τὸ σῶμα, οὐκ ἄνεν [ἀλέγων] ἐπιθειαςμῶν καὶ οἰμωγῆς ὑπολειπόμενοι. Dr. Holden gives in his note the array of con-

jectures which have been proposed for δλίγων, and follows Krüger and Stahl in bracketing it. But I believe that Thuc. after all wrote δλίγων here, and that the sense is (of course, not what Classen suggests, but) 'when any man's strength of mind and of body had failed him, he dropped behind only after a few appeals to heaven.' A man whose strength has utterly failed him may be, probably will be, capable of only a few appeals to heaven; which, as every singer knows, require vital energy if they are to touch the heart of God or man. The unexpected word δλίγων was intended to emphasize the awful condition of those miserable men when at last compelled to drop behind. It is by no means certain that 'the sense requires οὐ μετ' δλίγων,' which, by the way, is what Sitzler reads. In c. 68, 3 τοῦτο μὲν γάρ, καὶ ἔαν κρατήσωσιν, ὁμοίως δράσουσι—τὸ δὲ πραξάντων ἐκ τοῦ εἰκότος ἃ βουλόμεθα τοῖς τε κολασθῆναι καὶ τῇ πάσῃ Σικελίᾳ καρπουμένη καὶ πρὶν ἐλευθερίαν βεβαιωτέραν παραδοῦναι, καλὸς ὁ ἀγών, Dr. Holden wrongly explains 'πραξάντων . . ἃ βουλόμεθα, sc. αὐτοὺς πράξαι,' following Krüger, I fancy. πραξάντων and τοῖς τε do not apply to the same persons, and recent editors rightly supply ἡμῶν to πραξάντων. Then καλὸς ὁ ἀγών is, as usual, construed as if the sentence involved a slight anacoluthon; for, as Classen says, καλὸς ἀγών only would be expected. But is it certain that τὸ . . τε . . κολασθῆναι καὶ παραδοῦναι is the subject of the sentence? We might take τὸ δὲ alone, ('whereas'), and the infinitives as epexegetic of ἃ, and καλὸς ὁ ἀγών with πραξάντων (ἡμῶν), whether the latter be 'possessive' or 'absolute'; translating the whole: 'whereas, if we obtain our object, that is punish our enemies . . , the prize will be a glorious one.' It is a pity that the editor has been induced by 'Stahl and others' to bracket πολὺ πλεῖον in c. 63, 4 τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς ἡμετέρας οὐκ ἔλασσον κατὰ τὸ ὠφελεῖσθαι, ἔς τε τὸ φοβερόν τοῖς ὑπηκόοις καὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι [πολὺ πλεῖον] μετείχετε—thus ruining a fine instance of rhetorical δέυνσις, besides spoiling a chiasmus. Dr. Holden gives no reason; but presumably he considers the words are absurd; but they have been defended by Junghahn. At least the editor has not fallen into the error of stating that οὐκ ἔλασσον must = πολὺ πλεῖον in Thucydides.

Of the three maps two are printed almost entirely in various shades of blue—a pernicious system which is very exacting to the eyes by artificial light. The map of the Athenian retreat, which is apparently that of Fr. Müller's edition, still gives the

Aula Polyzeli north of the Kakuparis; neither Dr. Holden nor Freeman (*Hist. Sic.* iii. 708) accepts Holm's later opinion (*Top.* 235) that the Aula is S. of the river. The Athenians are, as usual, represented in this edition as marching due south on the fifth day of the retreat. To me this seems doubtful. They were closely followed on this day by the Syracusans, who worried them so much that, after muddling on for half a mile, they were forced to halt in the plain. They had been searching in vain for a gorge that should take them again on to the plateau towards the west from which they had been forced to retreat after the repulse at the Acraean Rock. But in the night (c. 80), Demosthenes proposed to change the direction, and go the opposite way to the route which the enemy were watching. As usual, Demosthenes was first to grasp the situation, and the result of his suggestion was that the army made for the Helorine road, which they reached on the morning of the sixth day. This seems to me to imply that the half mile which represents the progress of the fifth day had been in a generally south-westerly direction, though of course south of the road followed during the first three days. In the night, they turned sharp to the south-east. Prof. Freeman has remarked that the downward path taken by the retreating army to the Helorine road is only conjectural.

The Introduction is a sketch of Sicilian History down to 414 B.C. One passage only appears to me to need further consideration. In describing the double wall which the Athenians built south of the κύκλος Dr. Holden says: 'They first fortified a point on the southern cliff, in the line of their blockading wall.' But Stahl, Holm and Lupus, with some reason, doubt this interpretation of vi. 101 (Lupus, *Stadt. Syr.* p. 134). It is however proper, to add that Freeman's view (*Hist. Sic.* iii. p. 670) accords with Dr. Holden's. Then no further mention is made of the double wall until we read: 'too much time was spent over that portion of them (i.e. the walls in general) extending across the low ground, which was built at first as a double wall.' Thus that part of the wall extending from the κύκλος itself to the point on the cliff which, according to the view accepted by Dr. Holden, was first fortified before the southern wall was begun, is left unaccounted for. It is indeed difficult to make out from the Introduction why the southern wall from the κύκλος to the κρημνός is marked as

a double wall in Dr. Holden's plan instead of single as in Stahl's and Freeman's. The editor follows Lupus and Fr. Müller; but in this matter he appears to have accepted the plan and to have rejected the arguments on which it is based.

There are one or two inconsistencies which it may be worth while to point out. In the notes to c. 62, 1 *ἐβλαπτόμεθα* is wrongly explained as meaning 'hampered': but in the index under *βλάπτειν*, the right meaning, *damno, afficere, nocere* is assigned to the word in this passage. In an enumeration of some of the readings peculiar to M, the MS. is wrongly credited with *προμῖξαι* at c. 22, 1; whereas in the critical notes the right word *προσμῖξαι* is given for M. I have already referred to a similar error which occurs in c. 69, 4.

'In the critical Appendix the variants of six different (*sic*) MSS. are given together with the readings of Krüger, Classen, Stahl and Hude, where they differ from my own.' Of course, amid such a mass of material, every editor must choose for himself what he will include in his critical notes. But as the value of a critical Appendix is either educational or nothing, most assuredly the readings of Bekker, after all the founder of the critical study of Thucydides' text, ought to be included. The six MSS. are BCAEFM. I have shown in another article that the editor's new collation of M is an advance on Eggeling's, but is not perfect. The editor is not responsible for much independent textual criticism: he has introduced an alteration of his own into the text of c. 53, 4, where, for *ἀντεμνηχρήσαντό τε σβεστήρια κωλύματα*, he

substitutes *ἀντ. σβεστήριά τε <καὶ> κωλύματα*, and notes 'videor lucem attulisse loco impedito.' But Sitzler had already inserted *καὶ* before him, while van Herwerden had still earlier thought of the same plan, but rejected it because Pollux i. 168 gives *σβεστήρια κωλύματα*, apparently from this passage.

The volume closes with another of those triple indexes for which Dr. Holden's editions are justly esteemed. In the Greek Index, 'the Numerals suffixed to words denote respectively:—1 words that occur only once in Thuc., 2 Ionic words, 3 poetical words.' This is excellent, though the numbers are wanting to a few words, such as *ἀδυνασία, αἰγιαλός* (omitted), *δικαιῶ = ἀξιῶ, ξυμφέρεισθαι = accidere, πρότερον ἢ* with subj., *προφέρειν = προέχειν, φονεύειν*. But, on the whole, Dr. Holden merits the thanks of teachers for his work. His, the latest edition in English, is also, I believe, the best. It is more complete than Prof. Forster Smith's excellent book, and of course follows Classen less exclusively; and it is printed on better paper. But a protest must be raised against one disfigurement in the printing. If the Cambridge University Press cannot place good head and tail pieces in school books, it would be far better to omit them altogether. From a press which is to help to educate the top forms of schools nothing should be issued which is either mean in design or bad in execution; and the head and tail pieces in this book have both faults in an acute form.

E. C. MARCHANT.

MACKAIL'S GREEK ANTHOLOGY.

Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology, edited with a revised text introduction and notes by J. W. MACKAIL, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Longmans Green & Co. 1890. 8vo. pp. ix. 403.

THE *Greek Anthology* has never failed to find lovers even among those who have no very deep or familiar knowledge of the language; but the bulk of it, with its large proportion of worthless writing, must have baffled many who would gladly have profited by the existence of a good selection. It is

for the benefit of such readers chiefly that this book seems to have been designed, and for their sake especially it should be welcomed.

Of over 5000 poems in this kind that we possess Mr. Mackail gives altogether 489, conveniently dividing them into twelve sections under such headings as *Love, Prayers and Dedications, Epitaphs, Beauty, the Human Comedy, Death and Life*. The selection is judicious, and is accompanied by a translation, notes, indices and an elaborate introductory essay. Doubtless it is to this last that Mr. Mackail himself attaches most