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](#)

Schoemann—Lipsius' Greek Antiquities *Griechische Alterthümer* von G. F. Schoemann, vierte Auflage neu bearbeitet von J. H. Lipsius. Erster Band ; Das Staatswesen. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1897. 12 M.

A. H. J. Greenidge

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 03 / April 1898, pp 167 - 169

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025798, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025798

How to cite this article:

A. H. J. Greenidge (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 167-169 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025798

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

612. ὡς δ' ἄπαξ τὸ πρῶτον ἄκουσ'† ἐψόφησεν
ἀμπελος...
οὐκέτ' ἦν οὐδεὶς ὁ παύσων, ἦδε δ' ἠφανί-
ζετο.

612. ἄκουσ'] codd. except *Parisinus* B which
has ἤκουσ'.
ἠχοῦσ' Fl. Christianus. *τμηθεῖω*' Reiske.
ἠβῶσ' S. Widman.
ἀφθεῖς Blaydes, (adopted by Her-
werden.)

All these proposals depart too far from the reading in the manuscripts to explain the corruption satisfactorily. All assume that ἄκουσ' is the only corrupt word in the line. The only scholar who has suspected that the corruption has gone further is Richter who proposed ὡς δὲ πὺξ τὰ πρῶτα πληγείω' or ὡς δὲ π. τὸ πρῶτον ἀλγοῦσ' 'inepte' according to Blaydes who adds 'sine causa in ὡς ἄπαξ τὸ πρῶτον offendit.' R.'s conjectures were hardly felicitous, but I think he was rightly 'offended' with the phrase ὡς ἀπ. τὸ πρῶτον, which seems as intolerable in Greek as 'when once for the first time' would be in English. I can find no closer parallel to it than the fragment of Sophocles quoted in Plutarch *Q.C.* p. 732 D, ἅπαντα τὰ γένητα <τὰ γένη τοῦ codd.> πρῶτον ἦλθ' <ἦλθεν codd.> ἄπαξ. Believing τὸ πρῶτον to be corrupt I should like to suggest that the line be read

ὡς δ' ἄπαξ τὸ πῦρ ἀκούουσ' (or ἀκούσας')
ἐψόφησεν ἀμπ.

In V. τὸ πρῶτον is usually written τὸ πρ ῑ and more often than not the ῑ is written above the line. A careless or ignorant scribe could easily mistake τὸ πῦρ for this compendium of τὸ πρῶτον, especially as in such handwriting as that of the scribe of the Venetus the letter υ is so closely looped into the letter following that πρ and πῦρ are often hardly distinguishable.

The corruption of ἀκούουσ' or ἀκούσας' to ἄκουσ' will on this view be the result of an ignorant attempt to mend the metre. With this alteration the line becomes as natural as *Acharn.* 923 κείπερ λάβοιτο τῶν νεῶν τὸ πῦρ ἄπαξ.

In 871 sq. I should like to suggest an alteration in the *personae* so that the passage should read,

TPYT. ἴθι νῦν ἀποδῶμεν τήνδε τὴν Θεωρίαν
ἀνύσαντε τῇ βούλῃ—OIK. τίς αὐτῆ;
(Dobree)

<TPYT.> τί φῆς;
αὕτη Θεωρία 'στιν. <OIK.> ἦν ἡμέεις
ποτε

ἐπαίωμεν Βραυρωνάδ' ὑποπεπωκότες;

F. W. HALL.

SCHOEMANN—LIPSIIUS' GREEK ANTIQUITIES.

Griechische Alterthümer von G. F. SCHOEMANN,
vierte Auflage neu bearbeitet von J. H.
Lipsius. Erster Band; Das Staatswesen.
Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
1897. 12 M.

THIS book is a worthy product of an age of re-editing, of a generation which seeks to save great scientific works from becoming partially obsolete. This process is, for obvious reasons, more necessary in Greek Constitutional History than in most kindred subjects; and all who value Schömann will be thankful that this service has been performed, and should be grateful that it has been entrusted to the hands which produced the second edition of the *Attische Process.* But the problem of re-editing was not quite the same in the two cases. The *Griechische Alterthümer* was a work of a more literary and in the best sense 'popular' character, and it required larger additions

to be made to it—additions which could not well be specified by the sometimes convenient square brackets; hence the alterations in the present work have been incorporated in the text, and the notes have been fused with those of the original author. Only those who have attempted to bring a book 'up to date' know how difficult it is to secure uniformity of style in such a case. This task the editor has most successfully accomplished; the new matter has been skilfully interwoven with the old, and the occasional inequalities observable in the work are due to the fact that re-writing has been indulged in only where it was absolutely necessary. Some of the earlier portions of the book which deal with the general political development of Greece give the impression of not always containing the newest information. An editor may afford to neglect the passing vagaries of the archaeologist, interpreter and emender; but

fresh sources of positive information might have been referred to in notes and appendices. The latter might have been placed at the end of the work and consequently the editor's statement that the first sixteen sheets of the book were in print as early as 1891 furnishes no reason for a treatment of the connection of Greece with the East from sources almost purely mythological and linguistic (pp. 10 ff.), for touching on the art of Homeric times without any reference to its probable prototype (p. 73 ff.), or for discussing the antiquity of writing in the Greek world without any appeal to the startling discoveries of recent years (p. 16). The occasional need of appendices is still more observable in the later portion of the work. As an instance we may cite the treatment of the Draconian constitution, which is drawn from the *Athenaiôn Politeia*. The editor accepts it in its entirety (p. 339); in a short note he regards it as an afterthought of Aristotle's but as one whose details are sufficiently credible to be inserted without qualification in Schömann's text. Nowhere, however, is there any indication of the reasons for the controversy that has gathered round this suspicious chapter. Occasionally the brevity of the notes makes the editor's reasoning extremely difficult to follow. The discussion of the Athenian *Strategi* (p. 457) is a case in point. The view is adopted that the Athenians sometimes violated their constitution by appointing one 'member of the *collegium*' (presumably, therefore, after election) as its head. Yet the editor employs Beloch's instances, which show several cases of one tribe producing two *strategi*, as a proof that there was no election ἐξ πάντων. If the occasional head was chosen ἐξ πάντων, then these instances are intelligible; they are incomprehensible if he was a member of a *collegium* chosen in the ordinary tribal way. But, apart from such trifling obscurities, which may be merely the result of undue reticence, the work is, so far as I am able to judge, extremely clear and accurate. The only inconsistency which I have observed is the treatment of Draco as merely a codifier in the early portion of the treatise (p. 163), while his πολιτεία is discussed in the later; the only slip (one present in Schömann's third edition of 1871), the attribution of Teleclus' conquest of Geronthrae to the strange date *circa* 700 B.C. (p. 208). The description of the reforming King of Sparta as Agis III. (p. 301) is not quite accurate unless one adds 'of the Eurypontid house.'

The portions of Schömann's work which have attracted most attention and which—although in my opinion they yield in point of perfection to his account of Homeric society—have perhaps proved of most general utility, are the detailed descriptions of the constitutions of Sparta and Athens. Criticism of this new edition is hardly possible with respect to the first of these communities; for, although certain judicious amplifications have been introduced by the editor, I have not noticed any alteration of Schömann's views on the details of the Lacedaemonian polity. His description of Spartan social life is as excellent as before, the constitution he sketches as mysterious as ever. The Kings still preside over the council and share with the Ephors the presidency of the assembly: while the Ephors themselves still wield vast coercive and executive powers unconnected with their dependence on the Gerousia and Apella. But, as a simplification of the Spartan constitution can rest only on conjecture, there is no solid basis for a criticism of views which give us scattered glimpses of uncoordinated powers as the only issue of the evidence available.

With Athens the case is different. One's chief attention is naturally attracted to the mode in which a great student of Athenian constitutional law has dealt with the *Athenaiôn Politeia*, and to the question how far he has felt himself at liberty to incorporate the information given by this treatise in what was one of the most authoritative accounts of the constitution of Athens. The secret is soon revealed, for the editor's faith in this treatise is unbounded. He accepts even the view that the prae-Solonian Areiopagus was composed of ex-Archons (p. 507); this body he dissociates from the Ephetae and (setting aside the evidence of Pollux) thinks that these judges never sat on the Hill. He holds to the number 6,000 for the dicasts of the fifth century (p. 518) and the sole concession that he makes to Fränkel's discovery is to reproduce Gilbert's view as to the modification in the constitution of these courts which was effected at, or shortly after, the archonship of Eucleides. But, although too much faith may have been at times reposed in what professes to be history but is often reconstruction, the evidence is handled with great critical and literary skill, and it may be interesting—even in cases where the uncertainty is too great for criticism to be possible—to cite some of the editor's views on certain controverted points. Of the alternative accounts of the limitation of the Athenian

monarchy he thinks the Aristotelian theory of 'assessors' the more probable, and he holds that for the posts of Archon and Polemarch all the Eupatridae were from the first eligible (pp. 330 and 336). In treating of Draco's constitution he takes the view that the legislator gave active citizenship to those who could provide themselves with a panoply (p. 339). He does not discuss the moot question of the tense (*ἀπὸ δέδοτο*, *Ath. Pol.* 4); but, in spite of the form of the expression, he is probably right in his interpretation. The pluperfect implies the first and most fundamental of the changes; 'political rights had been given' to this class—before the other more detailed regulations treated in the chapter were realised. In § 2 of this fourth chapter he reads *διεγγυῶν* and *δεχομένους* and thinks that the passage means that the (*ex*-) *strategi*, *hipparchi* and *prytaneis* had to give a guarantee for their successors, each of the latter having to furnish a security of the same census. It is certainly a singular institution, for there is no evidence that the principal of nomination, which (according to the Roman expression *qui periculo suo nominat magistratum*) would seem to be the only justification for such responsibility, was recognised in the Draconian constitution. In the account of the limits within which the ostracised man might dwell (*Ath. Pol.* 22) it is refreshing to find *ἐντός* restored for *ἐκτός* (p. 426). I have always felt that the motive for the regulation was the danger of communication between the individual ostracised and Persia; the government cared nothing how far West he went. In the account of the admission of classes to the archonship the undoubtedly correct view of the change bought about by Aristides' *psephisma* is adopted, *viz.* that the measure allowed the enrollment of movable property in the census (p. 356). Less certain is the view that it was Aristides who admitted the *hippeis* to the archonship and the *thetes* to the boule; for these changes are less implicitly contained in Plutarch's version of that statesman's measure. But the latter admission would have accorded well with the circumstances of the decree. In the treatment of the revolution of 411 (p. 361) the 5,000 of *Ath. Pol.* 30. who actually appear for a moment on the scene, seem to be identified with the same number which was to be chosen as the privileged class (c. 29), whereas they must have borne a greater resemblance (as Dr. Kenyon and Dr. Sandys have remarked) to οἱ πεντακισχίλιοι οἱ ἐκ τῶν ὀπλῶν of c. 33.

In dealing with recent speculations on points of Athenian history the editor is judiciously conservative. The Asiatic origin of the Ionians, whether as a race or as an aggregate of mixed elements, finds no favour in his eyes, and he will not even derive these late arrivals at Athens—the names of the Ionic *phylae*—from an eastern source (pp. 328–329). It is strange, however, that he should have stated as a fact the extremely probable but quite unprovable hypothesis that the γένη of Athens were composed only of Eupatridae, the Geomori and Demiurgi being outside the clans (pp. 334 and 339). But his most remarkable abandonment of traditional views is found in his acceptance of Wilamowitz's idea that the *διωβελία* introduced by Cleophon was a gigantic pension scheme giving each Athenian two obols a day (pp. 358 and 477). It may at once be granted that, as two obols were paid by the state at Athens for very different purposes, the word *διωβελία* has no certain and constant signification. But the least probable of all its meanings is a payment which, as Beloch has shown (*Griech. Gesch.* ii. p. 77), would, on the most modest computation of the number of recipients, have come to 240 talents a year. By the side of such a sum the 16 talents, 47 minae and 87 drachmae spent on the *διωβελία* in the four prytaneis of 410 B.C. (C. I. A. I. n. 188) would have been a mere trifle. No mention is made, in this connection, of the mystical *διωβελία* Ἀθηναῖαι Νίκει of three years' later (C. I. A. I. n. 189 a); yet, if that contested reading is correct, we should naturally understand, by this *διωβελία* at least, a dole for sacred purposes. Beloch's view, that the two obols of the former year were, in the main, jury-pay, is not in itself improbable: for, after the fall of the Four Hundred or of the succeeding government of the Five Thousand, payment may have been made to the dicasts at this rate; but what renders this interpretation of the passage in the *Ath. Pol.* (c. 28) unlikely is that 'the *διωβελία* now first introduced' is described without any explanation or qualification whatever, as though it were something still in force at the time when the treatise was written; yet the jury-pay of this period was three obols (c. 62). The *διωβελία*, too, of Aristotle's *Politics* (ii, 7, 19), which is adopted as a means of equalising property and which leads its unworthy recipients to demand still more, rather tends to show that, when the Aristotelian school used this word without qualification, they were thinking of the theoric fund. A. H. J. GREENIDGE.