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](#)

Notes on the Text of the 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ

Harold N. Fowleb

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 05 / May 1891, pp 224 - 229

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00167095, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00167095

How to cite this article:

Harold N. Fowleb (1891). Notes on the Text of the 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. The Classical Review, 5, pp 224-229 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00167095

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

based on *capital value*. If we compare the two systems, we see (putting a drachma for a medimnus) that Solon's first class means a revenue of 5 minas a year. What would be the value of a property yielding 5 minas a year in Solon's time we can only roughly estimate. Certainly it would be more than 10 minas. If then we accept the reading *δέκα μνών* in this passage we must suppose that Solon considerably raised the qualification for the archonship. This is extremely unlikely. We should rather suppose him to have somewhat lowered it. I have little doubt that we should read here *οὐκ ἔλαττον ἑκα<τὸν> μνών ἐλευθέραν*. We are expressly told (p. 22, cf. p. 119) that the principle that the *ταμίαι* should be appointed from the first property class was recognized, at least nominally, in all ages of the constitution. A property of ten minas would not even gain admission to the third Solonian class. On p. 11, line 3 perhaps we may leave out *ἢ* after *ἔλαττον*, as H and *ἐκατὸν* may be a dittography.

E. S. THOMPSON.

P. 5, l. 2. This theory as to the origin of the office of Polemarch is alluded to in Schol. Plat. *Phaedr.* 235 D *ὁ πολέμαρχος ἐστὶν ἄρχων ᾧ κατηγογῶν τοὺς ξένους· ἐστὶ δ' ὥσπερ λοχαγὸς τοῦ βασιλέως, ὃς καὶ ἀπόντος αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελείται τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς μυστηρίων προνοεῖται καὶ τὰς θυσίας τὰς πατρίους διοικεῖ. ἄρχων δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐπὶ ὧν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ οἷς πᾶσι καὶ ἑορταὶ καὶ θεοὶ οἷς θύουσι καὶ δίκαι τινες ἀπονέμονται. οἱ δὲ θεσμοθέται ἕξ εἰσι τὸν ἀριθμόν, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ ὁ τόπος ὅπου συνήσαν καὶ ἐσितούντο θεμιστίον (θεσμοθετεῖον) ἐκαλεῖτο.*

P. 10, l. 2, p. 11, l. 3. The ten minae and one hundred minae must stand in some relation to the division into classes. According to Boeckh's explanation of the Solonian property schedule (*Staatshaushaltung* I³. p. 579 sqq.), a man with an estate of 'not less than one hundred minae' would belong to the Pentakosiomedimni. That generals and hipparchs should be drawn from the wealthier members of the first class seems appropriate

enough. But there is a difficulty about the 'ten minae.' According to Boeckh's theory persons whose estate was only ten minae would be *θῆτες*: he takes 150 drachmas as the lowest income of a *ζευγίτης*, multiplies by twelve to get the capital that such an income would represent and supposes that of this sum, i.e. of eighteen minae, only five-ninths was taxable so that the scheduled capital of the poorest *ζευγίτης* was ten minae. That there was some definite relation between the lowest income of a *ζευγίτης* and the sum of ten minae is clear from Pollux 8, 130, οἱ δὲ τὸ *ζευγῆσιον* τελοῦντες ἀπὸ διακοσίων μέτρων κατελέγοντο ἀνάλισκον δὲ μνᾶς δέκα, but the present passage is a strong confirmation of Grote's criticism (II. p. 490) of Boeckh's 'rather complicated' calculations: the ten minae in the text must surely be real capital, not taxable capital. If then we are at liberty to conclude from the obscure phrase of Pollux that a man possessing an estate of ten minae would be enrolled in the third class, we find ourselves confronted with the startling result that under this Draconian constitution the first three classes were eligible to the places of the nine archons and the treasurers!

W. WYSE.

C. 52. The explanation of *ὁμολογῶσι* (p. 127, l. 16) given in the *Saturday Review* seems very doubtful when we compare Aesch. in *Tim.* § 113, οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσι τῶν κλεπτῶν τοὺς μὲν ὁμολογοῦντας θανάτῳ ζημιοῦσθαι, τοὺς δ' ἀρνούμενους κρίνεσθαι.

H. RICHARDS.

See also Demosth. 24, 65, ὥσπερ τοίνυν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τῶν περὶ τὰλλα κακούργων τοὺς ὁμολογοῦντας ἀνεὺν κρίσεως κολάζειν οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσιν, οὕτω δίκαιον καὶ τοῦτον, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς νόμους κακούργων εἰληπται, μὴ δόντας λόγον μὴδ' ἐβελήσαντας ἀκοῦσαι καταψηφίσασθαι ὡμολόγηκε γὰρ [θατέρῳ] τῷ προτέρῳ νόμῳ ἐναντίον τόνδε τιθεῖς ἀδικεῖν. κακούργοι is the technical term for κλέπται, τοιχωρύχοι, λωποδύται, βαλαντιστοίμοι, ἀνδραποδισταί. Cf. Meier and Schomann, *Att. Proc.*² p. 85 sqq.

W. WYSE.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

The following list contains the emendations received by the Editors between March 21 and April 18, excepting those which had been anticipated in former numbers. Each emendation is assigned to its author as follows:—

J. van Leeuwen* (**L.**), T. Nicklin (**TN.**), W. R. Paton (**WRP.**), E. Poste (**EP.**), H. Richards† (**HR.**), E. S. Thompson (**EST.**), W. Wyse (**W.**). The notes signed **K.** have

* *Mnemosyne* xix. Pt. 2, pp. 169—190.

† Partly in *Academy*, April 18.

been added by Mr. Kenyon, who has kindly compared the emendations with the papyrus.

Reviews have appeared in *Mnemosyne* xix. Pt. 2, in the *Athenaeum* for April 4, and in the April numbers of the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*. The first three lay stress on the historical difficulties of the treatise, the last argues mainly on the ground of language that it cannot have assumed its present shape before the first century B.C. The translation by Kaibel and Kiessling has appeared. Van Herwerden has abandoned his intention of bringing out an edition.

P. 2, l. 1. If νεκροί is right, it needs an article. **HR.**

P. 7, l. 8. θεσμοθέται needs an article. **HR.**

P. 9, l. 10. αὐτή. Perhaps αὐτοῦ. **HR.** The MS. apparently has αὐτ' (i.e. αὐτῆς). **K.**

P. 10, l. 14. For δέκα μῶν read ἕκα<τόν> μῶν. **EST.** See note above, p. 224 a.

P. 11, ll. 5—8. Read τοιούτους δὲ δεῖν εἶναι καὶ τοὺς πρυτάνεις <καὶ τούτους> καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς καὶ τοὺς ἱππάρχους <ἀρχεὶν ἡρημένους ἕκαστον ἔτους μέχρι εὐθυνῶν λογιστὰς δέκα ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τέλους δεχομένους. The πρυτάνεις here we may assume to be the πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκραριῶν (so Stein rightly for ναυκράρων), Herod. v. 71, cf. p. 23. The higher officials are not, as with Solon, responsible to the poorer classes. **EST.**

P. 13, l. 7. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς σώμασιν, κ.τ.λ. These words have so little in common with the rest of the chapter that I doubt their genuineness. l. 10 is not in their favour. **HR.**

P. 14, l. 5. For καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἤλανε read καὶ προῖαν καταπραίνει. **EP.** The MS. will not admit of this. **K.**

P. 16, ll. 11—12. For [ἄμα]τ' ἐξὸν αὐτῷ [τ]οὺς [νόμ]ους ὑποποισάμενον τυραννεῖν, read (with Blass) ὥστ' ἐξὸν αὐτῷ τοὺς ἑτέρους κ.τ.λ. τοὺς ἑτέρους prepares for the following ἀμφοτέροις, and gives a suitable object to ὑποποισάμενον. **EP.**

P. 16, l. 13. Surely ἀπέχ[θ]εσθαι is not at all certain. I do not think the passage on p. 28 is parallel. Here ἀμφοτέροις must be τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τῇ πόλει, and βοηθήσαι is the word required. After the hole in the papyrus cannot οἰσθῆναι be read? If so, it remains to determine what the word beginning with α is. **WRP.** οἰσθῆναι cannot be read. I think αρε and θα are quite certain, and there is not much doubt about the χ and σ. **K.**

P. 16, l. 15. σμικροῖς καὶ βαν[αῦσο]ις. **WRP.** Not impossible. **K.**

P. 19, l. 2. There is room for μὲν after πεντακοσιομεδίωνων, and it would be an im-

provement. **WRP.** There is not room for μὲν. The termination of πεντακοσιομεδίωνων is quite traceable in the original. **K.**

p. 20, line 2.—εἰκὼν Διφίλου. Instead of inserting Ἀνθεμίωνος perhaps it is simpler to strike out Διφίλου. The first line of the epigram may have been Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίων τήνδ' <εἰκόνα> θεοῖς ἀνέθηκε. We may assume that the citation in Pollux is taken from this place, and not copied independently from the inscription. Against such an ending as τόνδ' ἵππον θεοῖς ἀνέθηκε there is (besides the spondaic word in the 4th foot) the fact that it was not a statue of a horse, but a statue of a man with a horse by him (παρέστηκεν). **EST.**

P. 24, l. 3. Is οἶον certain? I seem to make out π[ο]λλαχ[ό]θι. **WRP.** Not impossible, but the αχ in particular is extremely problematical. **K.**

P. 24, l. 7. There is room for ἐπὶ { τὸ } or { τῷ }

νομοφυλακεῖν. **WRP.** I doubt if there is room for τῷ, but τό is perhaps possible. **K.**

P. 24, l. 8. [ῆ]ς τὰ τε ἄλλα ἐφεώρα καὶ τὰ μέγιστα. Can this be read? In any case it would appear that in this passage δίκαια should be restored between καὶ and τὰ. It might easily, if written Δκα, have dropped out. **WRP.** I do not think this can be read, and I think τὰ πλείστα can be made out. δίκαια (if contracted) would be written ΔΙΚ'Α. **K.**

P. 24, l. 10. κυρί[α] οὐ[σ]α μετὰ νε[κ]ρῶν αὐτοῦ δήμον κολάζειν? **WRP.**

P. 26, l. 2. τῷ βουλομένῳ τιμωρ[εῖν]. **WRP.** τιμωρεῖν or τιμωρεῖσθαι is possible. **K.**

P. 26, l. 8. τὰς is surely wrong, the τ cannot be read. πολ]λὰς? **WRP., HR.** Possible. **K.**

P. 27, l. 12. παρα[πλήσ]ιον is most doubtful. I seem to see καὶ ἐβδομήκοντα, and τρεῖς καὶ is required here. **WRP.** I cannot see καὶ, and π' seems clear, though the rest of the word is very doubtful. **K.**

P. 28, l. 2. μερίδες instead of μναῖ. **WRP.** I think not, though μναῖ is not certain. **K.**

P. 28, l. 4. πάντες is wrong, there is no π. Is the word αἰεῖ? **WRP.** The word is, I think, αὐτῷ. **K.**

P. 28, l. 5. ἐπιτιμῶντες seems very doubtful. Is not μεταρ[ρ]υθμ[ί]ς [ζ]ο[ν]τες possible? It would suit the parallel passage in Plutarch. **WRP.** ἐπιτιμῶντες is traceable in the original. μεταρρυσμίζοντες is not possible. **K.**

P. 28, l. 17. ἡγοούμε[ο]ς δ' ἄρα φεῖξ[ε]σθαι τήν] δια[βολή]ν [ἀμ]φοτέροις ἡλλοτριώθη. This seems to me to give the right sense, and to be nearer the MS. than the printed text.

WRP. I think this is too long, and παραλλαξ seems to me clear, and also ἡναντιώθη. **K.**

P. 29, l. 14. For οἱ δ' ἐφ' ἀρπαγαῖσιν ἦλθον ἐλπιδ' εἶχον ἀφνεάν, κἀδόκου, read οἱ δ' ἐφ' ἀρπαγαῖσιν ἄλλως, κ.τ.λ., 'downright plunder.' **EP.**

P. 30, l. 1. αὐτῶν. Perhaps αὐτός. **HR.**

P. 30, l. 6. For ἄλλα δ' αὖ μάτην ἔερδον, read ἄλλα δ' ἂν μάτην ἔερδον. **EP.**

P. 30, l. 11. ἐλευθερωθέντων δὲ διὰ τὴν σεισασχθείαν. Ought not διὰ here to take the genitive? Cf. note on p. 91, l. 7. **HR.**

P. 30, l. 12. Read

ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν οὐνεκ' ἐξανήγαγον
δῆμον, τοιούτων πρὶν τυχῶν ἐπαυσάμην,

Λ.

ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν οὐνεκ' οὐ ξενήλατον
δῆμόν τι τούτων πρὶν τυχεῖν ἐπαυσάμην,

I leave τι τούτων alone as conceivably right, though doubtful; οὐ of course goes with ἐπαυσάμην. **EST.**

P. 31, ll. 1—2. For

συμμαρτυροίη ταῦτ' ἂν ἐν δίκῃ χρόνον
μήτηρ μεγίστη δαιμόνων [ν' Ὀλυμπίων

read

συμμαρτυροίη ταῦτ' ἂν ἐν δίκῃ Κρόνου
μήτηρ μεγίστη δαιμόνων τ' Ὀλυμπίων. **EP.**

P. 31, l. 3. For ποτε read τότε. **HR.**

P. 34, l. 2. ἐξήλασθη is as barbarous as ἀπεχθεσθῆναι (p. 28, l. 20). **HR.**

P. 36, l. 6. Read προσεκεκλήντο. **Λ.**

P. 39, 2. For ἐξαράμενος read ἐξαρτη-
σάμενος, 'having hung up.' **HR.**

P. 39, last line but one. Perhaps δὲ δωδεκάτῳ was a mistake for δὲ δεκάτῳ, and δεκάτῳ itself a mistake for τετάρτῳ owing to the two numerical meanings of Δ. **EST.**

P. 41, l. 4. κατήγαγεν. As this word is not very applicable to Phye, perhaps we ought to read εἰσήγαγε. **HR.** I think the word begins with σ'. ? συνεισήγαγεν. **K.**

P. 41, l. 7. Omit θανυμάζοντες. **HR.**

P. 42, l. 5. λαβὼν ? ἀναλαβὼν. So perhaps p. 45, l. 1. **HR.**

P. 44, l. 7. For τὸν πᾶ[τταλον] ἐκέλευεν [ἔρ]εσθαι, read τὸν παῖδα κ.τ.λ. **Λ.** Not impossible. **K.**

P. 44, l. 18. διὰ τὸν φόβον would be better than διὰ τῆς ὕβρεως. Cf. ὑπεξαιρούμενοι τὸν φόβον, p. 25, l. 12. **HR.**

P. 45, l. 4. προσηγάγετο would be better than ὠφέλησεν. Pisistratus did not 'benefit' people by friendly intercourse: he conciliated them: cf. p. 52, l. 7. **HR.** προσήγετο seems to be the MS. reading, but προσηγάγετο is perhaps possible. **K.**

P. 45, l. 22. For προαγαγόντες read παρα-
λαβόντες. **HR.**

P. 46, l. 2. Herodotus (5. 94) calls Hegesistratus παῖδα νόθον γεγονότα ἐξ Ἀργείης γυναικός, because after the middle of the fifth century (cp. p. 74, l. 4), women of foreign blood certainly could not occupy at Athens the position of a lawful wife: the children of a ξένη were both νόθοι and ξένοι. The same distinction is present to the writer: he contrasts 'the wedded wife' of Athenian birth with the 'Argive woman.' The reading need not be altered. Thucydides on the other hand (6. 55) seems to include Thessalus among the legitimate sons of Pisistratus (τῶν γνησίων ἀδελφῶν). **W.**

P. 46, l. 2. Ἡγησίστρατος ᾧ παρωνύμιον ἦν Θετταλός. παρωνύμιον = ἐπωνυμία (cf. p. 117, l. 10) is cited by L. and S. from Plutarch only, and the words ᾧ...Θετταλός are not unlikely to be an adscript. **HR.**

P. 46, l. 4. ᾧ ὄνομα ἦν Γόργυλος is perhaps an adscript. It can hardly stand between θυγατέρα and Τιμωνάσσαν. ἐξ Ἀργεῖος seems superfluous, like ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, p. 94, l. 7. **HR.**

P. 47, l. 8. For μετὰ πολιτῶν πολλῶν, read μετ' ὀλίγων ἄλλων. Cf. p. 52, l. 2. **HR.**

P. 48, l. 17. τοῦ τυράννου. We want τῶν τυράννων, not only because the plural is always used (p. 48, l. 11; p. 52, l. 5; p. 59, l. 3; p. 61, l. 1); but for the sake of the plural verbs following. **HR.** Is not the singular used to avoid the awkwardness of τῶν τῶν τυράννων φίλων? **K.**

P. 49, l. 22. δι' αὐτῶν. Read δι' αὐτῶν. **HR.**

P. 50, ll. 15—16. For εἰς τοῦτ' εὐθέως προὔτρεψε, read εἰς ὃ (or ἔστε) τελευτῶσα προὔτρεψε. **EP.**

P. 55, l. 2. οὐ συνέπιπτεν. The sense requires οὐκ ἂν συνέπιπτεν. **HR.**

P. 59, l. 4. For ὅσοι μὴ συνεξαμάρτανον ἐν ταῖς παραχαῖς, read ὅσοι μὴ συνεξαμάρτοιεν κ.τ.λ. **EP.**

P. 60, l. 1. Read (nearly agreeing with **LW.** and **JWH.**) ὑπὸ τοῦ δημοῦ πεντακοσιο-
μεδύμων τότε. **Λ.**

P. 61, l. 7. ὡς ἐφάνη τὰ μέταλλα τὰ ἐν Μαρωνείᾳ. This statement is altogether at variance with that of Xen. *de Vect.* 4. § 2, that the mines were of immemorial antiquity, and the word ἐφάνη, as Mr. Wyse has pointed out, is oddly used. Perhaps we should read something like ὡς <λυσιτελέστερα> ἐφάνη τὰ μέταλλα. Cf. Xenophon's words 4 § 4, πολλαπλασία ἢ ἀργυρίτις ἀναφαίνεται; § 6, ἀργυρίτις δὲ ὅσῳ ἂν πλείων φαίνεται; § 31, δῆλον ὅτι λυσιτελέστερα ἂν τὰ ἔργα γίνοιτο. **HR.**

P. 65, l. 1. For τότε μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου read τὸ μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου. **EP.**

P. 65, l. 7. ἐξαπορησάντων. Perhaps διαπορησάντων. 'Vidi ἐξ et δι confusa in plerisque omnibus scriptoribus Graecis . . . In [Plutarchi] Alcibiade 5, pro ἐξαπορήθησαν scribe διπορήθησαν.' Cobet, *V. L.* pp. 219—220. **HR.**

P. 66, l. 5. For πολέμια ἀσκῶν read πολεμικά δοκῶν, which will make it unnecessary to insert δοκῶν afterwards. **HR., EST.**

P. 67, l. 14. Omit καὶ before τῶν συμμάχων. **Λ.**

P. 68, l. 5. συνέστησαν for -σαντο. **Λ.**

P. 69, l. 11. περιεῖλε ? περιεῖλετο, as in p. 72, l. 6 ; p. 75, l. 3. **HR.** Compare, however, p. 42, where we find παρελόμενος, l. 6, and παρείλεν, l. 8. **JBM.** I do not think παρείλεν is certain : it might be παρείλε[το] ; the termination is very faint. **K.**

P. 70, l. 3. For γενομένου read γινομένου. **HR.**

P. 71, l. 7. τοὺς ἀφαιρεθέντας τῆς βουλῆς. The genitive seems hardly possible, whatever participle we read. Probably τοὺς αἰρεθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς. **HR.**

P. 72, l. 13. I read κατὰ τοὺς εἰκαίους τοῦτους. The ἐπιεικέστεροι had a leader, but had no leader who was a match for the demagogues. **WRP.** I have no doubt about καιροῦς. There is a flaw in the papyrus which has caused miswriting, but the word finally stands κ^κ (= καιροῦς). **K.** What is wanting is an epithet for ἡγεμόνα in l. 14. **HR.**

P. 72, l. 16. Between καὶ and πρὸς a word is inserted above the line. I think it is μόγισ. **WRP.** This is in the same flaw of papyrus, in the line below the last, and I feel sure that there is no additional word, but only a blot. **K.**

P. 73, l. 6. Possibly ἔστε ἀναλίσκεσθαι. **WRP.** Possibly ; but as the first letter is destroyed there is no MS. evidence of it. The facsimile is a little deceptive here, I think. **K.**

P. 73, l. 8. **Λ.** defends the reading against **W.** Cannot the MS. be defended in the sense 'In other matters they did not observe the laws as faithfully as in former years, but they left the election of the archons untouched—although in the sixth year they introduced changes even here' ? **TN.**

P. 75, l. 9. For ἐνέστη read συνέστη. *Non de instante sed de orto bello agitur.* **Λ.**

P. 75, l. 11. For προηρείτω read προήγετο. **HR.**

P. 76, l. 1. τοὺς πολλοὺς stood originally in the text. τοὺς has been erased, but both this and the ὑπὸ τῶν δῆμων on p. 74, l. 1, should, I think, be retained in the text. The

copy of the treatise, with which the writer subsequently compared his own, need not necessarily have been more authentic than that which he transcribed, although he doubtless regarded it as such. **WRP.**

P. 76, l. 6. Cannot συμβουλευσάντος be read, and in l. 7 ὅστις ? **WRP.** συμβουλευσάντος is right, but not ὅστις, I think. **K.**

P. 76, ll. 6—9. συμβουλευόντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου . . . ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἡτῆατο δίδοναι τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ αὐτῶν, κατεσκεύασε μισθοφορὰν τοῖς δικασταῖς. **Λ.** reads αὐτοῦ governing δίδοναι by ἡτῆατο. But the text is right if we put a comma after ἡτῆατο and govern δίδοναι by συμβουλευόντος. **JBM.**

P. 76, l. 7. Read Δάμωνος Δαμωνίδου. The name of Pericles' adviser was certainly Damon (cf. e.g. Plut. *Per.* c. 4, *Nic.* 6, *Aristid.* 1). Oncken (*Athen und Hellas*, 2, p. 12), pointed out that Plut. *Per.* c. 9, Δαμωνίδου (*sic* MSS.) τοῦ Οἰῆθεν, seemed an error. There remains some doubt about τοῦ Οἰῆθεν. Steph. Byz. s.v. *Οα has : ὁ μέντοι δημότης *Οαθεν λέγεται. Δάμων Δαμωνίδου *Οαθεν. (*Οαθεν is the better form, *Bull d. Corr. Hell.* 1889, p. 348.) *Οα belonged to the tribe Pandionis and must be distinguished from *Οη or Οἷη of the tribe Oeneis (Ross, *Demen* p. 128). Sintonis in Plut. *Per.* 9 ultimately restored *Οαθεν, and I am disposed to think he was right ; but proof seems hardly possible. In any case, whether we keep Οἰῆθεν or not, the article after Δαμωνίδου is contrary to usage if Δάμωνος precedes. Cp. Kreh, *De Crateri ψηφισμάτων συναγωγῇ*, p. 101, Sauppe, *Die Quellen Plutarchs für das Leben des Pericles* (1867), p. 17. **W.**

P. 76, l. 11. For δικασταῖς ἀφ' ὧν read δικαστηρίοις ἀφ' οὗ, thus supplying a subject for χεῖρω. **HR.**

P. 77, l. 7. Read τῶν εὐγενῶν <ὧν>. **HR.**

P. 77, l. 15. For ἐτέρων here and p. 78, l. 5, read εὐπόρων. **HR.**

Pp. 78, 79. Perhaps the διωβελία may be explained of the ecclesiasts' pay (in which case Zenobius' δικαστῶν will be nearer the mark than if it be really the θεωρικόν). Apparently Callicrates increased it to breaking point, so that it was abolished to avoid bankruptcy. Else how explain p. 79, ll. 3, 4 κἂν ἐξαπατηθῇ τὸ πλῆθος ? In this case Agyrrius reintroduced the measure in a modified form (note πρῶτος is used of Cleophon, p. 78, but not of Agyrrius, p. 106). This is confirmed by p. 106, l. 15 μισθοφόρον ἐκκλησίαν τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἀπέγνωσαν ποιεῖν, which suggests the existence of the practice some time before the revolution. **TN.**

P. 79, l. 4. προαγόντας in the MS. **WRP.** Possible, but hardly certain. **K.**

P. 80, l. 5. εἶναι or γενέσθαι has been omitted. **HR.**

P. 80, l. 8. For προάγειν read στέργειν. **HR.**

P. 80, l. 13. διαφοράν. Read συμφοράν. **HR.,** **Λ.**

P. 82, l. 7. Should not τινα be inserted? **HR.**

P. 82, l. 12. τὰ μὲν χρήματα <τὰ> προσ-
ιόντα. Omit χρήματα as a gloss. Cf. p. 101,
l. 1. ἀπὸ τῶν προσιόντων. **HR.**

P. 83, l. 12. May not τούτων refer to τοὺς
ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας? Then these are
the body from which the four councils of 400
each, generals, &c., must come, and the
ἐλληνοταμίαι may not at the same time be in
the council for the year. τῶν αἰὲ βουλευόντων,
p. 14, l. 6, is then the council for the year.
The principle seems to have been to have the
council for the current and three following
years always nominated, so that a man could
serve only once in four years. **TN.**

P. 85, l. 2. For νεῖμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους
πρὸς τὴν λήξιν ἐκάστην, read νεῖμαι δ' αἰὲ
ἄλλους πρὸς τὴν λήξιν ἐκάστην, i.e. after the
four sections had once held office, the next
sections, to prevent cabals and jealousies of
cabals, should be formed of new combina-
tions. This gives the key to the following
text, which requires to be treated with a
bolder hand. **EP.**

P. 85, l. 6. βουλευεῖν, ? βουλευέσθαι as in
l. 9. **HR.**

P. 88, ll. 1—5. For εἰς δὲ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον
ἵνα νεμῇθωσιν οἱ τετρακόσιοι εἰς τὰς τέτταρας
λήξεις ὅταν τοῖς ἀστοῖς γίννηται μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων
βουλευεῖν διανεμάντων αὐτοὺς οἱ ἑκατὸν ἄνδρες,
read εἰς δὲ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον ὅταν νεμῇθωσιν
οἱ τετρακόσιοι εἰς τὰς τέτταρας λήξεις, ἵνα μὴ
τοῖς αὐτοῖς γίννηται μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν βουλευεῖν,
ἄλλως διανεμάντων αὐτοὺς οἱ ἑκατὸν ἄνδρες
(the change of ἀστοῖς into αὐτοῖς is due to
Professor Tyrrell), i.e. care must be taken
that the sections are never composed of the
same members. **EP.** The sense seems to be
'The provisional council (of 400)—elected
for the first year forty from each tribe
(p. 86 fin.)—are not to be disqualified for
the regular council that is to be appointed
under the permanent system: let the 100
chosen to draw up the list of 5,000 (p. 83,
ll. 2—5) divide these 400 along with the other
qualified citizens into the proposed four
councils (p. 84 fin.—85, l. 6).' Perhaps some-
thing like ὅταν τὰ ἴσα αὐτοῖς γίννηται μετὰ τῶν
ἄλλων βουλευεῖν may underlie the corruption
—when the time comes for the provisional
council to sink into the general body of
councillors from whom the scheme proposes
each year to take 400 as council. **TN.**

P. 91, l. 3. τοὺς τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ νικῶντας looks
like an adscript. It is hardly compatible
with τοὺς μὲν οὐδὲ συναναμαχήσαντας. **HR.**

P. 91, l. 7. διὰ τοὺς παροργίσαντας. Is not
the genitive needed? Cf. note on p. 30, l. 11.
HR.

P. 92, l. 3. ἀφῶσι would perhaps be better
in itself and has the authority, such as it is,
of the scholiast's quotation. **HR.**

P. 93, l. 6. ὦν ἦν μὲν κ.τ.λ. Perhaps ὦν
ἦσαν. **HR.**

P. 94, l. 4. In τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον μέτριον
τοῖς πολίταις ἦσαν, for πολίταις read πολιτεύ-
μασιν. **EP.**

P. 94, l. 6. τε perhaps after Ἐφιάλτου.
Cf. note on p. 100, l. 2. **HR.**

P. 94, l. 7. Omit ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγον, or
'Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν. **HR.**

P. 96, l. 10. ἐκφέρειν. Read συμφέρειν. **Λ.**

P. 96, l. 15. οἱ τριάκοντα is clearly an
adscript. It is unnecessary and cannot stand
where it is. **HR.**

P. 99, l. 7. The writer must have said *in*
what the man whose name is mutilated was
second to none. Was ἀρετῇ lost through
Δημάρετον? **HR.**

P. 100, l. 2. τ' is impossible where it is,
but after πρὶν it would be an improvement.
HR.

P. 100, l. 5. ὁ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεὺς
should perhaps be omitted. He has already
been mentioned in l. 2. **HR.**

P. 100, l. 17. μενάντων, read μείναι τοὺς
δ'. **Λ.**

P. 100, l. 19. For αὐτοκράτορας ἐ[πὶ
πᾶσιν], read αὐτοκράτορας Ἐλευσίνι. **EP.**

P. 101, l. 6. οὗτοι, ? αὐτοί. **HR.**

P. 101, l. 13. πρὶν ἀπογραφῆται πάλιν ἐν
τῷ ᾧ αἰστέ κατοικεῖν. ἄν has already been in-
serted, but there are still two errors left.
Read πρὶν ἂν ἀπογραφῆ πάλιν ἐν τῷ ᾧ αἰστέ
κατοικῶν. **HR.**

P. 101, l. 16. For παρεληλυθότων read
perhaps κατεληλυθότων, comparing p. 103,
l. 6. **HR.**

P. 103, l. 17. ἐξήλειψαν. ? ἐξηλείψαντο. **HR.**

P. 105, l. 2. For πρώτη μετὰ ταῦτα
[ἐξ]έχουσα πολιτείας τάξις, read πρώτη μετὰ
ταῦτα εἶδος ἔχουσα πολιτείας τάξις. I think
the phrase εἶδος ἔχειν occurs in Aristotle, but
must content myself with referring to
εἰδοποιὺς διαφορά. **EP.** Read μετὰ ταῦτα
ὑπάρχουσα πολιτείας τάξις. **HR.**

P. 105, l. 9. Read δημοτικωτέρα<οὔσα>.
HR.

P. 106, ll. 1—2. In the phrase ἐν ᾗ πλείστα
συνέβη τὴν πόλιν διὰ τοὺς δημαγωγοὺς ἀμαρτάν-
ειν διὰ τὴν τῆς θαλάττης ἀρχήν, should not
ἐπικρατοῦντος τοῦ πλῆθους or something
similar be inserted after ἀμαρτάνειν? **EP.**

P. 106, l. 2. Should not the second *διά* be *κατά*? **HR.**

P. 108, l. 19. Read *ἐπὶ πάντας παραλαβόντες δ'*. Perhaps also *κοσμητήν* for [*ἐπιμ*]ελητήν **Λ.** Possible. **K.**

P. 110, l. 6. *πλὴν ταμίον στρατιωτικῶν*. The article has been so often omitted that we shall be safe in writing *τοῦ ταμίον τῶν στρατιωτικῶν*. So he is called p. 119, l. 16 and p. 124, l. 1. **HR.**

P. 117, l. 17. *μάλισθ' ὅσαι*. Read *μάλιστα δ' ὅσαι*. **HR.**

P. 122, l. 2. *οἷς ἀναγκαῖον ἐστὶ ταῖς ἀ[γορ]αῖς κατὰ τὸν ἐπώνυμον τὸν τῆς φυλῆς ἐκάστης καθῆσθαι*. *ταῖς ἀγοραῖς* cannot stand for *ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ*. Assuming ἐντὸς γ' [*ήμερῶν, ἀφ'*] *ἦς ἔδωκε τὰς εὐθύνας* to be right in l. 5, might we substitute *τρῆς ἡμέρας* for *ταῖς ἀγοραῖς*? **HR.**

P. 122, l. 12. *οἱ τὴν φυλὴν ταύτην εἰσάγουσιν*. *φυλὴν εἰσάγειν* is a unique expression. P. 146, l. 8 and p. 130, ll. 9-10 suggest that we should read *δικάζουσιν*. **HR., EST.**

P. 122, l. 15. Read *<κυρία>* ἢ κρίσις. **HR.**

P. 122, l. 20. For *ἀνάγουσι* read *ἐγκάουσι*. **HR., EST.**

P. 125, l. 1. *ἐντὸς σταδίων <ἐξ> ἀπὸ τοῦ τεύχους*. **Λ.**

P. 139, l. 14. *ἐφ' οὗ τὰ τόμ' ἐστίν* (adopting Bergk's emendation on Poll. viii. 86, and comparing Dem. xxiii. 68). **Λ.** Possible, and I think right. **K.**

P. 140, l. 5. Either read *ἐκαστος* for *ἐκάτερος*, or (which I prefer), omit *καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς* which is wanting in Harpocr. s.v. *πάρεδρος*. It is true we are told of a *πάρεδρος* to the *βασιλεὺς* in Ps.-Dem. c. *Neaer.* 72 and in an inscription *C.I.A.* II. 597, but it would seem that this was a later name for

the four *ἐπιμεληταί*, of whom we read in c. 57. **Λ.** *ἐκαστος* is right. **K.**

P. 140, l. 12. *τοὺς πλουσιωτάτους* is perhaps an adscript. A tragic chorus was not the most expensive liturgy. **HR.**

P. 141, l. 1. *τούτοις* has been corrected to *τούτους*, but would not *τούτων* be more correct? **HR.**

P. 144, l. 2. For *γερῶν* read *ιερῶν*. **HR.**

P. 145, l. 9. *καὶ οὐδ' εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν δίκαιον* (or perhaps *ἔξεστιν*) *ἐμβαλεῖν αὐτῷ*. Cf. Dem. xxiii. 37 *seg.* and 80. **Λ.** (Cf. **W.** on p. 118). *ἀγορὰν* and *δίκαιον* may be right, *ἔξεστιν* is impossible. **K.**

P. 147, l. 14. *ἂν τις τὸν ἐλευθέρον κακῶς λέγῃ*. Read *τιν'* for *τόν* as in p. 151, l. 10, &c. **HR.**

P. 148, l. 12. For *τό δ'* read *δὲ τό*. **HR.**

P. 149, l. 3. *ὁ μὲν νόμος <κύριος>*. **HR.**

P. 149, l. 17. *στρατηγούς δὲ καὶ πρότερον μὲν κ.τ.λ.* Read *στρατηγούς μὲν δέκα καὶ πρότερον μὲν κ.τ.λ.* Or we might do without the *καί*, as in p. 154, l. 4. **HR.**

P. 150, l. 2. For *δ[ημο]τῶν* read *ὀπλιτῶν*. **HR.**

P. 151, l. 4. *πρὸς τὰ παρόντα*. Perhaps *τὰ αἰὲ παρόντα*. **HR.**

P. 152, l. 7. Dr. Sandys says *δέκα* has dropt out before *φυλάρχους*. But read rather *φυλάρχους δέκα*, for in this treatise the numeral always comes last. **HR.**

P. 153, l. 2. We are tempted to give *ἐννέα ἀρχόντων* here and in p. 155, l. 5 an article (as Mr. Kenyon notes), but on p. 156 *ἀρχων, ἀθλοθέται*, and *Ἀμφικτύονες* are equally without it. **HR.**

P. 158, l. 4. *οἷς, ἡ ψ.* In p. 26, l. 11, *ὧν* should perhaps be *οἷς*. **HR.**

P. 162, l. 18. *τὸ αὐτοῦ*. Read *τὸ αὐτό*. **HR.**

RARE WORDS IN ARISTOTLE'S 'CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS.'

φυλοβασιλεῖς, p. 23, l. 4 and p. 145, l. 12. Found in Pollux, Hesychius, and Photius.

διδραχμον, p. 27, l. 13. Pollux and the Bible for *half-shekel*.

ἐπιδιανεμήθησαν, p. 28, l. 1. First found in Philo ii. 6, 51: *ἀγαθὸς ἰατρός διαμετρησάμενος τοὺς καιροὺς ἐπιδιανέμει τὰ σωτήρια*.

διαφράδην, p. 32, l. 1. 8. A new form. *διαφραδέως* is used by Hippocrates.

διαψηφισμὸν, p. 36, l. 10 (Dr. Sandys' emendation). Found in Athenaeus, p. 218a: *διαψηφισμὸς ὁ γεγόμενος κατὰ τῶν περὶ Ἑρασινίδην στρατηγῶν*.

παρώχλει, p. 44, l. 14. Theophrastus uses this form for *παρενοχλέω*.

φυλοκρινεῖν, p. 54, l. 3. This word occurs in some MSS. of Thucydides, Lucian, &c. See L. and S.

ἄπωθεν, p. 61, l. 5. Rather peculiar use of the word. Cf. Aristoph. *Pl.* 674: *ἄπωθεν τῆς κεφαλῆς*.

ἐξαπορησάντων, p. 65, l. 7. First found in Polybius iv. 34, 1: *οὕτως ἐξηπόρησαν*.

δεσποτικωτέρως, p. 67, l. 8. The comparative of this adverb does not appear in L. and S. Arist. *Pol.* iv. 10, 3, has *τὸ δεσποτικῶς ἀρχεῖν*.