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](#)

Observations on Thuc. Book I *Thukydides*, erklärt von J. Classen. Erstes Buch, bearbeitet von J. Steup. Berlin, 1897. M. 4.50.

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 05 / June 1898, pp 258 - 265

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032224, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032224

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 258-265 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032224

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

position of C. Lehmann that a considerable class of MSS. of the letters to Atticus can be proved to exist entirely independent of the Medicean. That being so, too much space and attention seems to be devoted to the certainly unconvincing and perhaps merely fanciful theories of O. E. Schmidt, who would attribute every existing MS. to the Medicean or its archetype, the Veronensian.

I proceed to notice a few out of many passages on which suggestions of interest are made.

In the famous letter of Sulpicius (Fam. IV. 5. 3) the Edd. read *cedo* for *credo*. This has the advantage of avoiding the difficulty of the combination of *an* with *credo*, and if it were unusually inserted parenthetically would no doubt be liable to corruption. On the other hand, an instance of *cedo* parenthetical seems much needed. I agree that Munro's proposal '*Cicero*,' is unconvincing; perhaps it would be better if substituted for the second *credo*, a little below. So elaborate a letter is certainly not likely to have had a rare usage twice in six lines.

p. 40. *Habet enim qualem vult* cannot possibly mean, as paraphrased, 'his son is an ideal youth.' The passage is so obscure that nothing better than a guess can be made; but it seems to imply that the son has been 'amenable to handling.'

p. 71. Few probably will accept the suggestion of the Edd., *coctius* = 'more mellowed,' for the corrupt *octius*, which they themselves half retract. Lehmann's *tectius* or *tector*, and Boot's *occultius*, are both far better. I think that the adverb, though remarkable, is defensible, and that *tectius* carries most probability.

p. 257. On the other hand, the suggestion of the Edd. that *seditio* has probably fallen out after *sed ita* is very much better than

Lehmann's proposed insertion of *concitatio*, which gives no explanation of the corruption. But are they right in saying that Wesenberg's *compressum est* 'is an awkward use of the impersonal construction'? Is not the preceding *malum urbanum* the subject?

In a few places the traditional reading is successfully maintained against proposed emendations. The most interesting of these is *Dolabellae aritia* (p. 261), for which *avaritia* (of course) and half a dozen Greek words have been substituted. But the Edd. cleverly suggest that Atticus through inadvertence actually wrote *aritia* for *avaritia*, and that Cicero rallies him on a slip of the pen, '*sic enim tu ad me scripseras*.' They rightly note that *avaritia* does not mean 'miserliness,' of which Dolabella was never accused, but 'rapacity,' and this was an endemic complaint of Romans.

The volume is like its predecessors, printed with scholarly care. The only misprints of importance that I have noted are '*Atticus*' for '*Attica*' on p. 328; and '*subject*' for '*subjunct.*' on p. 195. One is staggered, however, by the grammar of '*I expect young Quintus is romancing*' (p. 329); and Milton did not call fame 'that last infirmity of noble minds' (p. 122), though it is often so quoted, but 'of noble mind,' which is a different thing. Also one regrets to see still the 'battle of Pharsalia,' and the incorrect *ii* in tenses of *abicere*.

I am entirely unable to admit any force in the criticism of my method of translating Cicero's Greek words, which the editors have (courteously enough) introduced into the preface to this volume. This however raises a separate question, which I will, with the Editor's permission, discuss in some future number.

G. E. JEANS.

OBSERVATIONS ON THUC. BOOK I.

Thukydides, erklärt von J. CLASSEN. Erstes Buch, bearbeitet von J. STEUP. Berlin, 1897. M. 4.50.

THE great quantity of new material that Steup has included in his revision of Classen's *Thucydides* i., as well as the many difficulties of the original, render a somewhat lengthy notice necessary. A noticeable change in the Introduction is the argument,

as against Classen, in support of the Ullrichian hypothesis, of which Steup, of course, is an upholder. As the theory is rejected by Prof. Jebb (*Hellenica*, p. 272) and generally, I believe, by English and American writers, it may be worth while to mention the additional passages and arguments that Steup has adduced in its support. He holds that five of the passages cited by Ullrich as having been put into their present

shape before 404 B.C., namely 1. 10, 2; 1. 23, 3 (eclipses of the sun); 2. 1; 3. 87, 2; 4. 48, 5—have not been disposed of by Classen. The new passages he adds are five, being as follows. The statement about the earthquakes in i. 23, 3 can only apply to the ten years' war: the allusion to the inhabitants of Potidea in i. 56, 2 must have been written before the fall of that city: ii. 23, 3 was written before the capture of Oropus by the Boeotians in 411 (this is pointed out in my note *ad loc.*): ii. 94, 1 was written without knowledge of the revolt of Euboea (a very strong point): and the expression $\delta \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota \kappa\alpha\theta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ found in iii. 3, 1 and iii. 68, 4 can only apply to the Archidamian War. This last phrase means, according to Steup, 'the war being just then in the middle stage.'

Next, Ullrich rightly laid stress on the fact that only in v. 26 does Thuc. remark on the length of the war 'between the Pel. and Ath.' When he assumes the end and the length of the war as known in i. 13; 18; 23, he cannot, as he gives no explanation of his meaning, be including the 'half-peace.' Steup, however, does not agree with Ullrich that Thuc. broke off at about the middle of the Fourth Book; and indeed this detail in Ullrich's hypothesis may be regarded as finally abandoned.

With regard to the alterations made in the First Part (i.-v. 25), Steup's conclusion may be quoted, as it affects his notes in many places: 'Perhaps the history of the ten years' war was altered here and there after 404 [sc. in places other than those that have been cited by Ullrich and himself], but Thuc. certainly did not [as Classen holds] systematically revise this history then. Had he done so, he would not at the beginning have left us without an indication of the length of the war he was about to describe, nor should we find so many passages that will not apply to the twenty-seven years' war. Nor yet would there be so many places in which traces of incomplete revision are unmistakable.'

After all, the differences between Steup and Classen in this matter are not wide. Classen admits that portions of the work may have been put into substantially their present shape before the end of the twenty-seven years' war: Steup thinks that the whole of the history to v. 25 was written almost as we have it during the Peace of Nicias. Classen holds that Thuc. was engaged at his death in the last revision of what he had sketched from the outset of the war, and did not live to revise all parts

with equal thoroughness: Steup, that there was no revision worth the name, but only a few insertions (i. 89-118, 2; ii. 65 and 100, 2; and v. 21-24).

I may add two points in support of Steup's view. The description of the forces employed against Epidaurus in 430 (ii. 56) appears to be written without knowledge of the Sicilian expedition; otherwise Thuc. would surely have compared these forces with those described in vi. 30. In the latter place he refers back to ii. 56 for a comparison: yet at ii. 56 he says nothing to lead us to conclude that the forces employed against Epidaurus were relatively so great as he afterwards found them to have been. Again the curious digression about Teres and Tereus in ii. 29 has all the appearance of having been written at a time when the mythical connexion between the two families was a matter of interest at Athens. After the end of the war, Thrace was of no importance to Athens. We can see from Xenophon that the friendship of Odysæus was withdrawn—it was re-established subsequently by Thrasybulus the patriot—and the kingdom no longer possessed the greatness that Thuc. ascribes to it.

From the following remarks it must not be judged that the majority of Steup's new notes are likely to arouse feelings of opposition. But there is still something to be said on many passages in text and commentary; and of such passages only a few can be dealt with here. In c. 1, Steup repeats his former objections to the words $\kappa\alpha\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota \tau\iota\upsilon \tau\omega\upsilon \beta\alpha\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\upsilon \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$ It is indeed strange that nothing further is said of the effect of the war on the 'barbarians' in the historical sketch that follows. And it is probable that the statement $\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma \alpha\iota\tau\eta \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta \delta\eta \epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota \tau\iota\upsilon \tau\omega\upsilon \beta\alpha\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\upsilon$ is, taken strictly, untrue. To separate $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta \delta\eta$ from $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota$, as some critics do, is scarcely possible. But, as it is generally recognised that Thucydides exaggerates the importance of his subject, it seems both unsafe to attempt to fix the limits of his self-deception, and unprofitable to criticise with exactness the grandiloquence of his exordium. If we are to require exactness, it is not superfluous to ask what $\epsilon\pi\iota \pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omega\upsilon \omega\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\upsilon$ adds to τοῖς Ἕλλησι $\kappa\alpha\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota \tau. \tau. \beta\alpha\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\upsilon$. The explanation of Steup and those editors who do not adopt some artificial explanation of $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta$ produces a tautology, and strictly requires something like $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota \tau\omega\upsilon\varsigma \text{ Ἕλλησι } \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$ —or $\omega\varsigma \delta\epsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\upsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega$ — $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota \tau\omega\upsilon \beta\alpha\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\upsilon$, and there the sentence should end. Steup strains at the gnat and swallows the

camel. Far more serious are the objections to τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα, which Steup marks as corrupt. Herbst's Τρωικά for πρὸ αὐτῶν is very unlikely, and Steup's τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν τὰ παλαιότερα is a mere suggestion. Any one who will carefully examine this passage will see, I think, that Thucydides ought to have said: 'The history of the *barbarians* previous to this war and the early history of the Greeks *themselves* is obscure.' Steup rightly notes that, if τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν means, or includes, 'the events between the Persian and the Peloponnesian wars,' then σαφὲς εὐρεῖν διὰ χρόνου πλῆθος ἀδύνατα ἦν is inconsistent with the careful account of these years that follows. It appears to me that Thuc. *must* have dismissed the earlier affairs of the barbarians in this sentence. This would explain why, having once said οὐ μεγάλα νομίζω γενέσθαι, he does not revert to the subject. But it does not seem possible to make τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν refer only to the barbarians and to make τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα mean 'the remoter history of the Greeks.'

In c. 3, § 4 οἱ δ' οὖν ὡς ἕκαστοι Ἕλληνες κατὰ πόλεις τε ὅσοι ἀλλήλων ξυνίεσαν καὶ ξύμπαντες ὑστερον κληθέντες οὐδὲν... ἄθροοι ἔπραξαν is a very clumsy way of saying 'The gradual extension of the common name and common language which partly led and partly followed on the advance of commerce and intercourse had not gone far before the Trojan war: consequently no united action was possible.' Steup raises a series of objections to the sentence, and thinks that κατὰ πόλεις το κληθέντες may be spurious. I see no necessity for such a supposition. On cc. 5 to 8 Steup has an acute note, in which he points out that none of the editors have succeeded in making a consecutive narrative out of what Thucydides says. The passages that require to be reconciled may be exhibited in a table thus:—

1. οἱ Ἕλληνες καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων οἱ τε ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ παραθαλάσσιοι καὶ ὅσοι νήσους εἶχον ἐτράποντο πρὸς ληστείαν.

2. δηλοῦσι δὲ τῶν ἡπειρωτῶν τινες.

3. ἐλήζοντο δὲ καὶ κατ' ἡπειρον ἀλλήλους.

4. αἱ παλαιαὶ διὰ τὴν ληστείαν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης μάλλον φέκισθησαν, αἱ τε ἐν ταῖς νήσοις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡπείροις.

5. καὶ οὐχ ἦσσαν λησταὶ ἦσαν οἱ νησιῶται.

The current explanation is that Nos. 1 and 2 refer to piracy by sea: that No. 3 refers to piracy by land. But none of the editors say how the statement about the building of towns inland (No. 4) can be

reconciled with the assumption that Thuc. refers to piracy inland in No. 3. Steup, explaining that No. 3 must refer to piracy by sea, and observing that No. 5 fits on admirably to No. 3 when καὶ κατ' ἡπειρον καὶ οὐχ ἦσσαν is rendered 'not only...but no less,' pronounces all that intervenes in the text to be 'a provisional supplement' which the historian never revised and made to fit into the narrative. But I must point out in turn that Steup's rendering of ἐλήζοντο καὶ κατ' ἡπειρον is impossible. κατ' ἡπειρον = κατὰ γῆν: in 1, 142, the only other place in which Thuc. uses the expression, the two are synonymous: here it is the same as δι' ἡπείρου πορεύομενοι (e.g. schol. on Aristoph. *Vesp.* 398). λ. κατ' ἡπειρον then does not refer to piracy by sea. But neither can it mean piracy by land *at large*: that is clearly inconsistent with No. 4. It can only mean *piracy carried on by land between the towns on the coast*. Thuc. in effect adds a long parenthesis, which extends from these words to the end of c. 7, and he begins by saying 'The piracy (that affected the coast towns of the mainland—τῶν ἡπειρωτῶν τινες—was not confined to the sea—τῶν καταπλεόντων—but) was carried on also by land.' Steup says that ληστεία must mean all through these chapters 'piracy by sea'; but if you say ληστεία κατ' ἡπειρον, you obviously mean 'piracy by land': just as when you say πλεῦσαι alone you mean 'sail on the sea,' but when Isocrates says πλεῦσαι διὰ τῆς ἡπείρου, he means something different.

At c. 11, 2 Steup reads ραδιῶς ἂν [μάχη κρατοῦντες εἶλον]...πολιορκία [δ'], thus going further than Krüger. In c. 12, 3 Βοιωτοὶ τε γὰρ κ.τ.λ. Steup brackets γὰρ, and attaches the section to the previous sentence, on the ground that the migration of the Boeotians is not attributed to στάσις and cannot therefore be an illustration of it. But it seems to me that the details given in the text of the migration of the Boeotians and Dorians are wholly insufficient for any one to say that στάσις is precluded. In c. 13, 5 Steup introduces two alterations into the text; but to neither can I assent. He prints ἐπειδὴ τε οἱ Ἕλληνες μάλλον ἐπληζον, [τὰς ναῦς κτησάμενοι τὸ ληστικὸν καθήρουν] καὶ ἐμπόριον παρέχοντες ἀμφοτέρω δυνατωτάτην (for δυνατὴν) ἔσχον...τὴν πόλιν. He finds the words bracketed inconsistent with the work of Minos and with the statement καταστάντος τοῦ Μίνω ναυτικοῦ πλοῖμώτερα ἐγένετο in c. 8; and he says that the sentence ought to explain how it was that the Corinthians were the first to get a large fleet, as it will very well do when the obnoxious words are

removed. Each of these propositions appears to me to be false. I do not see why after *πλοϊμώτερα ἐγένετο* Thuc. may not denote a subsequent further development by the words *μᾶλλον ἐπλωζον*, and why the latter must refer to the same thing as the former. Nor do I see how *τὸ ληστικὸν καθήρουν* is inconsistent with *Μίνως καθήρει τὸ ληστικὸν ἐφ' ὅσον ἐδύνατο*. He says that *τὰς ναῦς* must 'refer to the great Corinthian fleet': but I believe we ought to refer *τὰς ναῦς* (i.e. *τριήρεις*) *κτησάμενοι* to *οἱ Ἕλληνες μᾶλλον ἐπλωζον*. The Greeks used the sea more when they got themselves triremes. Then the Corinthians suppressed piracy and added greatly to their wealth by commerce. Hence Corinth became a great sea power. As for *δυνατωτάτην*, after saying 'they made money by overland commerce,' Thuc. says 'they made money by commerce in both ways,' i.e. *ἀμφότερα δυνατὴν ἔσχον* is not a mere repetition of what has been said. Worthier of consideration is Steup's suggestion of a lacuna in the words *τῶν προσόδων μεζόνων γιγνομένων* in § 1 of the same chapter. It is not easy to see how these words can stand alone for 'as the wealth of individuals increased,' though of course to *πρόσδοδος* itself in this sense there can hardly be any objection. He proposes to insert *τισὶ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων*.

In c. 21, 1 Steup has bracketed *αὐτῶν* after *ὑπὸ χρόνου* with van Herw. In 22, 2 he reads *οἷς τε αὐτοὺς παρὴν καὶ <τὰ> παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων...ἐπεξελθών* after Ullrich. The emendation is approved by van Herw. in his review of Hude in these words: 'rectissime Hude cum Ullrichsio καὶ <τὰ>...edidit': but Hude does not admit *τὰ* into the text. In c. 23 Steup, unwilling to allow that Thuc. is quibbling, regards *δυοῖν ναυμαχίαν καὶ πεζομαχίαν* as an adscript. In § 6 of this c. *τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεστάτην πρόφασιν... τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἡγοῦμαι μεγάλους γιγνομένους...ἀναγκάσαι ἐς τὸ πολεμεῖν* 'the pres. partic. must be altered with Weidner into *γεγενημένων*,' because cc. 88 and 118, 2 show that A. greatness is referred to, as an object achieved. The passages are *φοβούμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους μὴ ἐπὶ μείζονι δυνήθωσι* and *οἱ Ἀ. ἐπὶ μέγα ἐχώρησαν δυνάμει*, of which the latter refers to the *Pentecontaetia*. Dionysius quotes all three together (*ind. Thuc.* p. 331). His text gives *γιγνομένους*; and I do not see why the *growing* greatness of Athens may not be alluded to. True, we afterwards find (c. 89 to 118) that they had *already* grown great; but were they not 'still growing'? We might look for *μεζίζους* *αἰ* in place of *μεγάλους*; but as the expres-

sion stands, it is merely a little inexact. And I believe that it is just this *increasing* greatness that Thuc. considered to be the *ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις τοῦ πολέμου*. It was the fear *μὴ ἐπὶ μείζονι δυνήθωσι* that drove Sparta into a corner more than *τὰ Κερκυραϊκὰ καὶ τὰ Ποτειδιατικὰ καὶ ὅσα πρόφασις κατέστη* (c. 118). Amongst the last, the growing greatness of Athens is more than once alluded to: see especially c. 69, 4 *μόνοι οὐκ ἀρχομένην τὴν αὐξήσιν τῶν ἐχθρῶν, διπλασιούμενην δὲ καταλύοντες*, which last agrees with *μεγάλους γιγνομένους*, and with *ἡ αὐξήσις τῆς πόλεως* which in Dionysius represents the *ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις* of Thuc.

We may now take c. 25, 4 *περιφρονούντες δὲ αὐτοὺς* (the Corinthians) *καὶ χρημάτων δυνάμει ὄντες κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ἴσοι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν πλουσιωτάτους καὶ τῇ ἐς πόλεμον παρασκευῇ δυνατώτεροι*—so Steup, proposing to read *ἴσοι* with Linwood and to bracket *τοῖς Ἕ. π.* It seems to me that Herbst is right in saying that the Corinthians themselves must be meant in *τοῖς Ἕ. πλουσιωτάτοις*. Stahl objects that it would be absurd to omit the Athenians. But the description may be a mere exaggeration, such as one finds when superlatives are used.¹ I suggest however *ἴσοι<οι> α<ἰ>τοῖς* *τοῖς κ.τ.λ.* In c. 26, 4 Steup does not throw much light on the much-discussed sentence: *οἱ δὲ Ἐπιδάμνιοι οὐδὲν αὐτῶν ὑπήκουσαν, ἀλλὰ στρατεύουσιν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς οἱ Κερκυραῖοι τεσσαράκοντα ναυσί.* Comparing the corresponding sentence of the previous section, *πλεύσαντες εὐθὺς πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι ναυσί, καὶ ὕστερον ἑτέρῳ στόλῳ*, I think all difficulties would be got over by reading *ἀλλ' <ἄλλαις> στρατεύουσιν κ.τ.λ.*, so that the forty ships would be the *ἕτερος στόλος*. It is not unusual for Thuc. to anticipate a statement. But in c. 29 the whole number of ships engaged at Epidamnus is set down as forty; so that it would be necessary to assume that the original twenty-five ships returned.

c. 30, § 3 is printed as follows: *τοῦ τε χρόνου τὸν πλείστον μετὰ τὴν ναυμαχίαν ἐκράτουν <τε> τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τοὺς τῶν Κορινθίων συμμάχους ἐπιπλέοντες ἔφθειρον, μέχρι οὗ Κορίνθιοι <πάλιν> περιμόντι τῷ θερί κ.τ.λ.* ('when summer again came round'): but Steup rightly says that 'in the remaining part of the summer' is an impossible rendering. *περιμόντι* of the MSS. must be an alternative spelling for *περιμόντι*, whatever the sense may then be. The addition of *τε* is an improvement, and I think with Steup that *τοῦ χρόνου* is explained by *μέχρι οὗ*:

¹ Cf. Andoc. 1, 130 *Ἰππώνικος δ' ἦν πλουσιωτάτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων*.

but Steup's *πάλιν περιμένει* makes it necessary to suppose—what is unlikely—that the Corcyrean ships held the seas and attacked Corinthian allies throughout the winter.

In c. 33, 3 *μηδὲ δυοῖν φθάσαι ἀμαρτῶσιν*, ἡ κακῶσαι ἡμᾶς ἢ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς βεβαίωςασθαι, Steup is inclined with Wex to bracket *φθάσαι*. But he does not seem to have noticed that the alternative is *preliminary* to the contemplated attempt on Athens.¹ If *φθάσαι* goes, then there is nothing to express the all-important words 'before attacking you.' The order of *φθάσαι* does however raise a difficulty, and perhaps we might correct to *φθάσαντες*, 'before we can combine against them.' In c. 35, 3 *ἡμᾶς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς προκειμένης τε ξυμμαχίας εἰρξουσιν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλοθεν ποθεν ὠφελίας*, Steup understands *ξυμμαχίας* to refer, not, as is usually thought, to the contemplated alliance with Athens, but to the body of *Corinthian* allies. In this case the next words themselves apply to alliance with Athens. Then for *εἴτα ἐν ἀδικήματι θήσονται, πεισθέντων ὑμῶν ἃ δεόμεθα*. πολλὸν δὲ ἐν πλείονι κ.τ.λ., he gives Krüger's *εἴ τε κ.τ.λ....πολὺν δὲ*, and, unless Thuc. wrote an illogical sentence,² some correction is absolutely necessary.

In c. 35, 5 an interesting grammatical difficulty occurs with regard to *ἦσαν*: πολλὰ δέ, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὑπέειπομεν, τὰ ξυμφέροντα ἀποδείκνυμεν, καὶ μέγιστον ὅτι οἱ τε αὐτοὶ πολέμοιοι ἡμῖν [ἦσαν]...καὶ οὗτοι οὐκ ἀσθενεῖς. First the 'didactic' imperf. occurs nowhere else in Thuc.; and secondly *καὶ οὗτοι οὐκ ἀσθενεῖς* does not correspond to anything that has been previously mentioned. Classen's explanation is much too forced to be possible.

c. 36, 3 *βραχυτάτῳ δ' ἂν κεφαλαίῳ τοῖς τε ξύμμασι καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶδ' ἂν μὴ πρόσθαι ἡμᾶς μάθουτε* τρία μὲν ὄντα λόγου ἄξια κ.τ.λ.: Steup (1) renders *βραχ. κεφ.* 'a cardinal point put shortly'; (2) explains *τοῖς τε ξ. κ.τ.λ.* as masc.; with the schol. a *dat. com.* to *κεφαλαίῳ*. His first reason is that *κεφάλαιον* here only applies to one point, the sea power of Corcyra. But then this is in fact the *only* positive point the speaker has made which is calculated to induce *the*

Athenians μὴ πρόσθαι: for though in c. 35 the *σαφεστάτη πίστις* is said to be that the Spartans are enemies of Athens as well as of Corcyra, the admission is at once made that a refusal would not matter to Athens were it not for the fleet of Corcyra. His other reason has more force, that *τοῖς ξύμμασι καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον* as adverbial (Cl.), or as apposition (Kr.) is very doubtful. On the other hand, it seems to me that if *the words* are masc., we should decidedly expect *οἱ τε ξύμμασιν*. If the text is right, I should prefer to take *τοῖς τε ξύμ. καὶ καθ' ἕ.* with *μάθουτε* and *βραχ. κεφ.* as appos.: 'by our arguments as a whole and considered singly, amounting as they do to the following brief summary,' etc.

c. 37, 1 *ἀλλ' ὥς καὶ ἡμεῖς τε ἀδικοῦμεν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰκότως πολεμοῦνται, μνησθέντας πρώτον καὶ ἡμᾶς. περὶ ἀμφοτέρων οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄλλον λόγον ἵεναι*. Steup supposes a lacuna after *ὥς* of something like *καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα ἀγαθοὶ διετέλεσαν*, for the following reasons: (1) *καὶ* after *ὥς* is out of place; (2) the expressions *ἡμεῖς τε ἀδικοῦμεν* and *αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰκότως π.* refer to the same thing, so that *ἀμφοτέρων* ought to be *τούτων*; (3) the speaker does not confine himself to the point specified in the text before proceeding in c. 40, 1 to *ὁ ἄλλος λόγος*. As to the first objection, the confusion of *ὥς* and *καὶ* is so well-known that we might transpose the words or think *καὶ* due to dittography. The second point is undoubtedly a good one (cf. c. 34, 7); and the Corinthian speaker perhaps shows at the opening of c. 40—*αὐτοὶ τε μετὰ προσηκόντων ἐγκλημάτων ἐρχόμεθα καὶ οὐδὲ βίαιοι καὶ πλεονέκται εἰσι*—that he has gone beyond the single hypothesis that he stated, according to the text, in c. 37, 1. It might however be that *βίαιοι καὶ πλεονέκται εἰσὶ* is intended to recapitulate the words *εἰκότως πολεμοῦνται*, for nothing has been advanced by the speaker that may not with a little latitude be included under the hypothesis as stated.

c. 37, § 2 *ξύμμαχόν τε οὐδένα βουλόμενοι πρὸς τὰδικήματα οὔτε* (with Dobree for *οὐδέ*) *μάρτυρα ἔχειν οὔτε παρακαλοῦντες αἰσχύνεσθαι*. In addition to the recognised grammatical difficulty raised by *οὐδέ*, Steup notices that the 'witness' referred to must be himself a *ξύμμαχος*.

In c. 37, 4 *οὐχ ἵνα μὴ ξυναδικήσωσιν* (leg. *ξυναδικῶσιν*) *ἐτέροις προβέβληνται, ἀλλ' ὅπως κατὰ μόνας ἀδικῶσι καὶ ὅπως ἐν ᾧ μὲν ἂν κρατῶσι βιάζωνται, ἀδικῶσι καὶ ὅπως* is probably spurious.

c. 40, 6 *εἰ γὰρ τοὺς κακὸν τι δρῶντας κ.τ.λ.*: (1) disturbs the argument; (2) the *γὰρ* is

¹ Hude reads *δμᾶς* for *ἡμᾶς*: but probably he is mistaken. He however rightly ignores Wex here.

² The flaw is not removed by rendering *εἰρξουσιν*... 'shall attempt to exclude us from alliance with Athens, and then blame us if Athens accepts us for allies': for there is no inconsistency in the two actions. Moreover the addition of the *εἴτα* clause upsets the balance of the *μὲν...δὲ* that follow the *δεῖνόν*. Hude accepts *εἴ τε*, but retains *πολὺν δὲ* in the text.

out of place; (3) φανείται καὶ ἃ is a strange expression. All these three difficulties, says Steup, would disappear if the words were transferred to the end of c. 42. This looks very tempting, but if the section is regarded as a parenthetical comment on the previous section, and the γὰρ is elliptical ('You have good reason to follow us in accepting this principle; for,' etc.), the passage may very well stand where it is. Though φανείται καὶ ἃ is unusual, it is not on that account impossible.

c. 42, 4 ἡ τῷ αὐτίκα φανεῶν ἐπαρθένας διὰ κινδύνων τι (for τό, after Classen's conjecture) πλέον ἔχειν. S. objects both to τὸ πλέον and to ἔχειν. A similar difficulty occurs in ii. 81 οὐτ' ἐπεσχον τὸ στρατόπεδον καταλαβεῖν, where perhaps we should read τί.

c. 50, 1 τοὺς αὐτῶν φίλους οὐκ αἰσθόμενοι ὅτι ἦσσαν οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ δεξιῷ κέρα ἀγνοοῦντες ἔκτεινον. Steup thinks οἱ spurious and takes ἔκτεινον absolutely with ἄθεν, Naber, and Conradt; so that the Corinthians no longer kill their own allies.

c. 57, 5 Ἀρχεστράτου τοῦ Λυκομήδους μετ' ἄλλων δέκα στρατηγούντος. Steup heroically steps forward to defend δέκα. First he says that there could be more than ten strategi, and instances c. 116, where Pericles δέκατος αὐτὸς commands forty-four ships, while there are two other fleets at sea for whom strategi have to be provided. But, whatever be the precise meaning of δέκατος αὐτὸς, this much is at once clear that in c. 116, it is not necessary to assume that all ten strategi were employed on the forty-four ships: some of these ten may have commanded the other squadrons, especially if δέκατος αὐτὸς implies that Pericles held a superior position among the strategi. Steup further thinks that the form μετ' ἄλλων instead of ἐνδέκατος αὐτὸς may show that αὐτὸς was not used with ordinals above ten (!). It may be so; but as the formula is so frequently applied to the strategi, that would tend to show that it was at least very unusual to have over ten strategi; in which case we should expect Thuc. to have drawn special attention to the fact that eleven and subsequently sixteen strategi were employed in this year. A likely solution, it seems to me, is to suppose that ' has slipped into the text by a very easy error from the margin, and that Thuc. wrote μετ' ἄλλων only, because he had not ascertained the number.

At c. 58, 2 the editor is content with τῆς ἐαντοῦ γῆς τῆς Μυγδονίας περὶ τὴν Βόλβην λίμνην ἔδωκε νέμεσθαι. What we want, and what is not forthcoming, is a parallel to the definition περὶ τὴν Β. λίμνην added after this

'partitive' gen. I think Naber's <τὰ> περὶ is required.

c. 59, 2 ἐφ' ὅπερ τὸ πρότερον ἐξεπέμποντο, 'which was their original destination': I think that τὸ πρῶτον, the reading of C., is right. c. 63, 1 ὡς ἐς ἐλάχιστον χωρίον: 'ἐς nur von G. Einer jüngeren Hand des Cod. A und wahrscheinlich auch von M geboten wird.' M has the ἐς.

c. 68, 3 τί δὲ μακρογορεῖν, ὦν τοὺς μὲν δεδουλωμένους ὁράτε, τὰς δ' ἐπιβουλευόντας αὐτούς, καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα τοῖς ἡμετέροις ξυμμάχοις. Generally ὦν is referred to ἡμᾶς, the implied subject of μακρογορεῖν. As the ἡμᾶς must mean 'the allies of Sparta,' Steup objects that Athens had not 'enslaved' any of them. He therefore follows Conradt in referring ὦν to the preceding Ἑλλάδα, that is to the Greeks generally. Then ἡμετέροις ἔ. is generally supposed to mean Potidaea: but Potidaea was not a ξύμμαχος of Corinth, but of Athens (c. 56). Accordingly Steup accepts Conradt's ἡμετέροις, and the parallel passages show the change is necessary, though Hude ignores it.

In c. 69, 2 Steup retains Classen's text and notes, but thinks with him that some of the words are spurious. The sentence οἱ γὰρ δρῶντες, βεβουλευμένοι πρὸς οὐ διεγνωκότας ἤδη, καὶ οὐ μέλλοντες ἐπέρχονται as explained by Classen, seems most unsatisfactory, and it is better to follow the majority of the most recent editors—Forbes, Chambry, H. Stein, Lange—and to make the statement general.

Passing over several minor points, I come to c. 73, 2 τὰ δὲ Μηδικὰ καὶ ὅσα αὐτοὶ ξύνιστε, εἰ καὶ δι' ὄχλου μᾶλλον ἔσται αἰεὶ προβαλλόμενα (with Classen for MSS. προβαλλομένοις) ἀνάγκη λέγειν. Steup says that only van Herwerden has followed Classen, but he thinks the change necessary. I have before pointed out in this review (ix. 361) that it would be better to place the comma after ἔσται; and I now think that αἰεὶ προβαλλομένοις (mid., sc. ἡμῖν) belongs to ξύνιστε, and would render the sentence: 'As for the Persian wars and what you yourselves know that we continually put forward in our defence even though it is certain that it will be an annoyance (to you), we are obliged to refer to the matter.'

c. 77, 1 καὶ ἐλασσοῦμενοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαίαις πρὸς τοὺς ξυμμάχους δίκαιαι καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐν ταῖς ὁμοίοις νόμοις ποιήσαντες τὰς κρίσεις φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν. Steup's explanation, which in the main follows Gilbert, depends on the supposition that δίκαιαι ἔ. means 'suits arising out of commercial contracts.' He renders: 'Though we for our part are at a disadvantage in cases against

our allies (viz. in their courts), and at Athens on the contrary have instituted proceedings in such cases so that both sides are on equal terms.' Thus the whole sentence (1) refers to *all* the allies; (2) refers to the *same* class of suits. 'We treat them fairly in our courts; but they do not (always) treat us fairly in theirs.'

c. 82, 1 Steup gives καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἄμα ἐμπορίζομεθα for the MSS. καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν. To the ordinary reading αὐτῶν he objects that Thuc. nowhere else uses the 3rd reflexive thus, and that τὰ ἡμέτερ' αὐτῶν occurs just before in a different sense. The latter may be just the reason why Thuc. should here have written αὐτῶν in place of ἡμέτερ' αὐτῶν.

c. 89, 2 οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου ξύμμαχοι, ἤδη ἀφεστηκότες ἀπὸ βασιλείως. Steup thinks ἤδη . . βασιλείως spurious. I think ξύμμαχοι <οἱ> ἤδη or else ξύμμαχοι ἤδη, <οἱ> represents what Thuc. wrote.

c. 90, 3 τειχίζειν δὲ πάντας πανδημεὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει, καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ παῖδας—S. proposes to add καὶ οἰκέτας (!). At c. 91, 6 S. reads, δοκεῖ οὖν σφίσι καὶ νῦν [ἄμεινον εἶναι] τὴν ἐαυτῶν πόλιν τείχος ἔχειν καὶ ἰδίᾳ τοῖς πολίταις καὶ ἐς τοὺς πάντας ξυμμάχους ὠφελιμώτερον ἔσεσθαι. His explanation makes it necessary to render ἐς τοὺς π. ξ. ὦ. ἔσεσθαι 'will be more advantageous *for* the allies' instead of '(for the Athenians) in their relations with the allies.' For the unusual ἐς he refers to ii. 89, 9 δ' ἐς τε τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολεμικῶν ξυμφέρει καὶ ναυμαχίᾳ οὐχ ἥκιστα, which, apart from the fact that the text there is not certain, does not support his view. His other passage is iii. 37, 2 ἐπικινδύνως ἐς ὑμᾶς helps, but not greatly. What S. does not notice is that by cutting out ἄμεινον εἶναι he destroys the very reference to the interest of the Greek alliance that he so much wants. ἄμεινον εἶναι in the preceding section must stand for ἄμεινον εἶναι σφίσιν τε αὐτοῖς καὶ τῷ κοινῷ, and consequently it does so here as well. The vulgate is perfectly right.

c. 93, 5 S. brackets δύο γὰρ ἄμαξαι ἐναντία ἀλλήλους τοὺς λίθους ἐπήγον, but I think Wachsmuth is right in supposing that the waggons moved, not along the top of the wall itself, as to which matter, as Herbst says, no hint is given in the text, but along the level. S. objects that the number is then ridiculous: but this difficulty disappears if we suppose that two waggons abreast were required to carry the μεγάλοι λίθοι. This view of the matter is strongly supported by the context, and I believe, has already been suggested by Bothe, who pro-

posed to read ἐνάρτιοι ἀλλήλους. Just after S. rightly gives ἐντομῇ ἐγγώνιοι.

c. 105, 6 S. proposes καὶ <πάνιν> παρασκευασάμενοι, ἡμέραις ὕστερον. In c. 115, 5 ἐκράτησαν τῶν πλείστων, he suggests τῶν αὐτομολούντων, to which Krüger's τῶν πολλῶν is surely preferable; but no change is really needed. When the details given are so scanty, it is risky to propose corrections that are merely based on the narrative. This remark applies also to c. 116, 2 where for ἐπολιόρουν τρισὶ τείχεσι E. Fabricius has suggested to S. ἐ. περιτειχίσει, and B has τάγμασι as an alternative.

c. 120, 1 χρή γὰρ τοὺς ἡγεμόνας τὰ ἴδια ἐξ ἴσου νέμοντας τὰ κοινὰ προσκοπεῖν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ἐκ πάντων προτιμῶνται. S. understands 'the leaders' duty is, while managing their own affairs in the same way (as the other members of the league manage theirs), to pay greater attention (than they) to the common interests, as they receive greater honour than the rest,' e.g. in the command of the army. A weak point in this explanation is that ἐν ἄλλοις remains unexplained. S. suggests ἐν πολλοῖς (neut.) in place of it. But ἐν ἄλλοις may very well mean 'in matters that do not concern the league'; i.e. even when there is no thought of war, Sparta is more respected than the members of her league.

c. 122, 2 νῦν δὲ πρὸς ξύμπαντάς τε ἡμᾶς Ἀθηναῖοι ἱκανοὶ καὶ κατὰ πόλιν ἔτι δυνατώτεροι. The context, says S., shows that ἐτι δ. is not strong enough, and the wording of it suggests that after ἱκανοὶ something like καὶ κατὰ ἔθνη πολὺν κρείσσοις is lost. But in the context the speaker is blaming the members of the league for want of spirit: he says just after εἰ μὴ καὶ ἄνθρωποι καὶ κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ ἕκαστον ἄστρ' μιᾷ γνώμῃ ἀμνυνόμεθα, and this shows that by ἔτι δυνατώτεροι he is to mean 'still more powerful against us singly (than they would be if we were acting μιᾷ γνώμῃ)'. At present, he means, δίχα ἐσμέν, which is an exaggeration of the facts, but is an effective exaggeration.

c. 132, 5 ἵνα, ἣν ψευστοῇ (sc. ὁ Ἀργίλιος) τῆς δόξης ἣ καὶ ἐκεῖνός τι μεταγράψαι αἰτήσῃ, μὴ ἐπιγνῶ (sc. ὁ Πανσανίας) S. proposes to insert ἣ ὁ Ἀρτάβαζος before ἣ καὶ, and to read αἰτήσας. I really cannot see the need of this. The Argilian forged the seal before he started. 'If,' he reflected, 'the letter does not contain directions to kill me, I will take it to Artabazus, who will never discover that the seal has been tampered with, and therefore Pausanias will not hear of it from him. If my suspicion is true, I will give information to the Ephors. But what

if P. asks for the letter before I start? Oh well, *he* won't detect the forgery either.' No doubt he might have reasoned: 'Oh well, I can then go to the Ephors at once, whether my suspicion prove true or false,' but, as he was not so logical as Steup, that view of the matter didn't occur to him.

c. 144, 2 πολέμου δὲ ὅτι οὐκ ἄρξομεν, αἰρομένου (for ἀρχομένου) δὲ ἀμυνόμεθα is a good emendation.

These remarks give a wholly inadequate

account of Steup's commentary, of which every page shows the results of his laborious revision of Classen's work. The book, so far as the notes are concerned, ought to be named 'a commentary on Classen's edition of Thucydides.' The number of small improvements made in the text too is considerable, though Steup has admitted very few conjectures of his own or of other critics that were not in Classen.

E. C. MARCHANT.

WESTERN MSS. IN THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY.

MADAN'S *Summary Catalogue of Western MSS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, Nos. 16670—24330. Vol. iv. Oxford. 1897. 25s.

Vol. iii. of Mr. Madan's great undertaking containing twenty collections or 7,959 MSS. acquired by the Bodleian in 1698–1700 was noticed by the present writer in this Review ix. p. 367. Vol. iv., Mr. Madan's second instalment (vols. i. ii. will be completed later), deals with twenty-three collections, containing 7,661 MSS. Some of these are the most valuable which the library contains, e.g. the D'Orville, Clarke, Canonici, Malone, Meerman, and Douse collections. It is impossible in so large a number to do more than select *some* of the most important MSS., but, speaking generally, the new volume will be found even more interesting than its predecessor.

First among its treasures must be mentioned the Clarke Plato, No. 18400, the description of which occupies half p. 309 in Mr. Madan's octavo volume. It was written in Nov. 895 A.D. for Arethas of Patrae, subsequently bishop of Caesarea, the same Arethas who bought the Euclid written in 888 A.D., also in the Bodleian, MS. D'Orville 301, No. 17179 in the present volume. It contains the *Euthyphron*, *Apologia*, *Criton*, *Phaedon*, *Cratylus*, *Theaetetus*, *Sophistes*, *Politicus*, *Parmenides*, *Philebus*, *Symposium*, *Phaedrus*, *Alcibiades* i. and ii., *Hipparchus*, *Erastae*, *Theages*, *Charmides*, *Laches*, *Lysis*, *Euthydemus*, *Protagoras*, *Gorgias*, *Menon*. It was bought in 1801 by Dr. E. D. Clarke from the monks of S. John the Evangelist at Patmos. The Euclid is described by Mr. Madan on p. 104 of the present volume. He there mentions some other MSS. which are known to have belonged to Arethas; the

Florence *Aristides*, the Venice *Athenaeus*, the Vatican Aristotle's *Organon* (Urb. 35), the Paris *Clemens Alexandrinus* (MS. Grec. 451), the Harley *Lucian* in the British Museum.

Clarke's collection includes some Latin MSS.; these are mostly of the fifteenth century. Among them is a MS. of Cicero's *Letters ad Familiares* written in 1449 (Madan 18386).

Interesting to every scholar will be the account of D'Orville's collection, and the short biography of D'Orville which precedes it (p. 37). Might it not be well to republish some of this learned Dutchman's *Miscellanea*? His period (1696–1751) was one of great philological activity in Holland, and his ingenuity was supplemented by an ample fortune. Well known to students of Latin fables is his discovery in 1727 of the Perottine collection, now generally appended to Phaedrus: I have given a short account of it in my lecture, *The Fables of Phaedrus*, recently reprinted.

D'Orville projected editions of Theocritus and the Greek anthology. His collections are largely taken up with these authors, and seem to have been little used. 17115 is a transcript of part of the Palatine MS. of the Greek Anthology: so also is 17116: both contain the Μούσα παιδική. All the numbers from 17112 to 17143 bear on the Greek Anthology, as well as 17150–17168. Those on Theocritus form Nos. 17144–49, and 17169–17176: a proof of D'Orville's incessant activity.

There is among the Latin MSS. in this collection, Madan 17036, a Horace of the eleventh century, examined for C. Kirchner's *Nouae Quaestiones Horatianae* (1847). The order of the poems is as follows: Odes, Epodes, C. Saeculare, Ars. P., Sermones,