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](#)

Note on Curtius X. 1, 19

P. H. Damsté

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 10 / December 1894, pp 445 - 446

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189115, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189115

How to cite this article:

P. H. Damsté (1894). Note on Curtius X. 1, 19. The Classical Review, 8, pp 445-446
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189115

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the payment of bronze; where with *ζημιούν* (Hdt. vi. 136) it means that the punishment consisted in the payment of money; but where it is used with *κερδαίνειν* (Hdt. viii. 60) the gain consists of something *received*. The grammarians in fact neither knew nor cared for anything more than that *ἐκτεμóροι* had something to do with a sixth part.

Then, last of all, comes Eustathius, who observes on *Od.* τ 28 (but not much *à propos* of anything) *ἐθνικὴ δὲ λέξις καὶ ἡ μόρτη, τὸ ἔκτον, φασί, μέρος τῶν καρπῶν, ἣ ἐδίδοτο τοῖς ἐκτεμóροις ὡς ἐν ἀωνύμῳ κεῖται λεξικῷ ῥητορικῷ*. Here at last, amid the dregs of a Byzantine tradition, we have a definite statement, as I hold, on the wrong side. The bishop has got hold of one of the ambiguous glosses and read it the wrong way. So much then for the ancient evidence. If I were to attempt to mark the scores made so far, I think I should describe it as three goals against a try.

II If we turn to *à priori* considerations the case is still clearer. It is absurd to say that the payment of one-sixth of the produce would not be felt as a hardship. If the economic rent of a holding be nil, the payment of a sixth of the produce *will* be felt as a hardship. But there are holdings of which the economic rent is nil. Probably no Irish landlord, perhaps even no English College Bursar, would have fallen into the mistake made by these great German scholars. Mrs. Poyser went so far as to compare English farming to cooking a feast all the year and getting nothing but the smell for your pains; but what would she have said to surrendering five-sixths of the produce of her dairy? To the names of Oncken and Gomperz, quoted by Dr. Sandys as supporting his view, must be added that of Naber. He in his *Prolegomena* to Photius, p. 57, after quoting Schömann's view, most sensibly says: 'Plane contra est; nusquam terrarum adeo sunt fertiles agri ut hanc conditionem agricolae ferant. In insula Java verbi causa, hoc est sub caelo haud parum felice, agrorum possessores olim solvebant e toto proventu unam partem, sibi habebant

quattuor partes.' He then refers to a place in Polybius, which appears to be i. 72, where Polybius represents the Carthaginians as most cruel for levying from the cultivators, after the first Punic war, *half* of the produce, it being implied that the amount usually claimed by the state was one quarter. And this (it may be remarked) was in the land of the *Libycae areae*! Naber proceeds: 'Itaque Attici coloni, qui solum arabant sterile, misera erant conditio' etc. In *métayer* systems, it is true, the portion of produce claimed by the landlord is often more than a half; but in estimating the practical working of any such system we must know, not only the quality of the soil, but also what part the landlord bears in providing cattle, implements, manure, etc., and this part is often a large one (Mill, *Pol. Econ.* Book ii. chap. 8). Enough has been said to show that the payment of one-sixth may be felt as a hardship. But we may go farther. It is quite possible for a rent of one-sixth to be a perfectly fair rent in ordinary years, and yet for there to be a difficulty in meeting it in exceptional years. And the grievance, as Dr. Sidgwick has shown, was in the fearful power the law gave to a creditor over any man who, from any combination of circumstances, was unable to meet his liabilities. It was, in fact, rather an Arrears Bill than a Land Bill that Solon introduced. Liddell and Scott may therefore be left uncorrected in their article on *ἐκτεμóροι*. But they seem to uphold the opposite view in their article on *μορτή*.

Much interesting matter remains as to the relation of the *ἐκτεμóροι* to the *πελάται*, about which the authorities differ, some making the *πελάται* synonymous with the *ἐκτεμóροι*, others making the *πελάται* labourers for wages. Should not the word be connected with *πολέω* rather than with *πέλας*, *πελάτης* standing to *πολέω* somewhat as *πενέστης* to *πονέω*? But this is matter for philologists.

E. S. THOMPSON.

NOTE ON CURTIUS X. 1, 19.

IGITUR Mesopotamiae praetoribus imperavit, materia in Libano monte caesa devehctaque ad urbem Syriae Thapsacum septingentarum carinas navium ponere: septiremis

omnes esse deducique Babylona. Cypriorum regibus imperatum, ut aes stuppamque et vela praeberent.

In this passage the word *septiremis* or VII

remis, as the MSS. give it, is undoubtedly corrupt for the following reasons :

In the first place *septiremes* or *hepteres*, as they were called, were very rare, and it is not probable, not to say impossible, that Alexander would have built a whole fleet of them. Secondly, there are no other instances, as far as I know, of such an enormous fleet consisting wholly of the same sort of ships : always to the *triemes* was added a small number of ships of a larger size. So there is no warrant for suggesting another cipher for VII. Finally our suspicion is roused on learning that *septiremes* is an ἀπαξ εἰρημένον in Latin literature, especially as the MSS. only give VII *remis*. The corruption of the word being unquestionable, let us follow the order of Curtius' tale about the building of that fleet.

Firstly Alexander commands that timber should be cut and transported to Thapsacus for the building of seven hundred ships. Further that all those ships should be VII *remes* and be brought to Babylon. Finally

the Cyprian princes are ordered to furnish the metal, oakum and sails.

Hence we see that Curtius has informed us of the sources of the timber, metal, oakum and sails, i.e. of nearly all the materials needed for the construction of ships. Nearly all, I said, for whence came the oars, the principal means of locomotion? That nothing is said about them is the more astonishing as the origin of the sails, that played a so far inferior part in ancient navigation, is duly noted. For by ordering that the whole fleet should consist of *septiremes* Alexander has not yet inferred that the oars should be added too.

I firmly believe that this neglected information is hidden in the words VII *remis omnes esse*. Therefore *remis* is to me not the latter part of an adjective but abl. plur. of the substantive *remus*, and so the assumption is near at hand that VII in the MSS. is a corruption of *cum* or of *in* after the analogy of *in armis esse*.

P. H. DAMSTÉ.

LEIDEN, 15 October, 1894.

NOTE ON CIC. *TUSC.* I. 22, 50.

QUASI vero intellegant, qualis sit in ipso corpore, quae conformatio, quae magnitudo, qui locus : *ut*, si iam possent in homine vivo cerni omnia, quae nunc tecta sunt, casurusne in conspectum videatur animus *an* tanta sit eius tenuitas, ut fugiat aciem.

This passage has caused some difficulty. The defenders of the MS. reading take *ut* in the sense of 'for example.' Chase's note is : 'I agree with Hottinger, Orelli and Moser, in regard to the rendering to be given *ut* in this passage (cf. Cic. *Part. Or.* 19, 65) :—[as if they understand], *for example*, whether etc. Lambinus conjectured *aut* for *ut*, which is adopted by Wesenberg, Baiter and Seyffert; Heine omits *ne* after *casurus*, and puts a colon after *animus*.' Tischer-Sorof⁸ reads for *ut* *aut*, and for *an* *ac non*. This reading is based on Koch *Coniectanea Tulliana*, p. 37 (1868), and Weissner in the *N. Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädag.* p. 298 ff. (1869). *Ac non* for *an* seems possible from the palaeographic point of view; Koch cited as a parallel passage *Fam.* iii. 2, 2 : pluribus verbis ad te scriberem, si aut tua humanitas longiorem orationem expectaret aut id fieri nostra amicitia pateretur aut res verba desideraret *ac non*

pro se ipsa loqueretur. Weissner cites *Sext. Rosc.* 33, 92 : quasi nunc id agatur, quis...occiderit, ac non hoc quaeratur eum etc. Objection can be taken to *ut* 'for example.' L. and S. s.v. *ut* ii. A. C. cite only Cic. *De Or.* 3, 29, 112 and Quint. 8, 3, 89; 4, 3, 12, where on the face of it *ut* might mean *for example*, introducing a dependent sentence. In reality it does not. In Cic. *Part. Or.* 19, 65 it is even further from doing so. Certainly none of these passages is similar to the sentence before us.

I suggest therefore the following interpretation : *ut* (*sc. intelligenter*) etc. : 'and so they would understand, if they could penetrate into the secrets of a living man, whether the mind seems likely to come into our ken, or its delicacy is such as to escape our vision.' By this interpretation the sense comes out at the same place as in the explanation of Chase. The MS. reading is retained by a natural interpretation of *ut*, and the triple change of *ut*, *ne* and *an* is avoided. Granting all that may be claimed on palaeographic grounds for *ac non* instead of *an*, and admitting that *ne* would be brought into the MSS. from *an*, we still have the third difficulty of *ut* for *aut*.