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](#)

Schmidt's Corcyrean Studies *Korkyräische Studien: Beiträge zur Topographie Korkyras*. Schmidt Von Bernhard. Leipzig: Teubner. 1890. 2 Mk. 40.

H. F. Tozer

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 53 - 54
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993211, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993211

How to cite this article:

H. F. Tozer (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 53-54 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993211

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SCHMIDT'S CORCYREAN STUDIES.

Korkyräische Studien: Beiträge zur Topographie Korkyras. Von BERNHARD SCHMIDT. Leipzig: Teubner. 1890. 2 Mk. 40.

A PARADOXICAL thesis is apt sometimes to call forth a clearer statement of the truth, and this is what seems to have happened in the present instance. Dr. Bernhard Schmidt visited Corfu and explored its antiquities as long ago as the year 1878, but the results of his investigations remained unpublished until Müller-Strübing, who in 1885 produced a considerable impression adverse to the credibility of Thucydides' account of the siege of Plataea, proceeded in the following year, in the *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, to attack his narrative of the Coreyrean seditions on the ground that it is not historical, but a fanciful picture, and that the notices of Corcyra which it contains are full of inaccuracies. The object of the present work is to establish the exactness of that author's descriptions, and by so doing to render it probable that the scenes described as enacted there are not imaginary. Dr. Schmidt goes so far as to think it not unlikely that the historian was personally acquainted with the place, and suggests that he may have stopped there on the way to Sicily, which island he is supposed by many authorities to have visited, on account of his accurate delineation of the topography of Syracuse, which seems to be that of an eye-witness. But, if he did so, this must have been while he was an exile from Athens; and it is highly improbable that under these circumstances he would have ventured to set foot in a city which was then in close alliance with that state.

The site of ancient Corcyra has long been well ascertained. It occupied the hilly peninsula, now called Palaeopolis, which lies to the southward of the town of Corfu, and terminates at the well-known point of view which at the time of British occupation was known as the 'One-gun Battery,' and now is named *τὸ Κανόνι*. On the western side of this stretches a long shallow inlet, with a narrow entrance, which was the Hyllaic harbour of antiquity, while the second harbour mentioned by Thucydides, which we know from elsewhere to have been called the harbour of Alcinous, lay to the north of the city, facing the mainland of Epirus. The level isthmus which intervenes between the innermost waters of these must have been

narrower in ancient times than it is at the present day. A third harbour, which could be closed, is mentioned by Scylax, and this may have corresponded to the bight which is still in use on the northern side of the modern citadel. To the north of this again lay the island of Ptychia, which is now known as Vido. It may be remarked, in passing, that the last-mentioned name is explained in one of Dr. Schmidt's notes, on the authority of a local antiquary, as being derived from that of the former possessor of the island, the Venetian Guido (Vido) Malipieri. We do not know whether attention has before been drawn to the similarity of position of this city and its two main harbours to that of Syracuse, which was founded by the Corinthians about the same period. Dr. Schmidt has ingeniously—perhaps rather fancifully—adduced this similarity, together with the importance of Corcyra as an intermediate station between Sicily and the mainland of Greece, as evidence in support of the tradition mentioned by Strabo—which differs somewhat from the received story—that Archias, the founder of Syracuse, when on his way to Sicily, left behind his companion Chersicrates to occupy this place.

An important point in the topography, in respect of which Dr. Schmidt differs from his predecessors, is the position of the station of the Coreyrean war-ships. This has generally been regarded as the head of the Hyllaic harbour, but Dr. Schmidt, while he accepts this view for the earlier period, maintains that at the time of the Peloponnesian war they were stationed by the outer harbour, and that the arsenal was also in that quarter. The Agora (Thuc. 3. 72) he places about midway between the two harbours, on gently-sloping ground. But the most debatable question in connexion with the narrative of Thucydides is what is meant by 'the island in front of the Heraeum' (Thuc. 3. 75). Most of the authorities, including Prof. Partsch, have maintained that by this description Ptychia is intended; but to this Dr. Schmidt rightly objects that in Thuc. 4. 46 the name of Ptychia is given, and that, had that been the island meant in the earlier passage, the name would certainly have been given there also; and he with good reason rejects Müller-Strübing's attempt to explain this away by saying that Thucydides had learnt the name in the inter-

val between the composition of the two books. Following Leake, he considers this island to have been the citadel-rock from which rise the twin peaks that give Corfu its name (στοὺς κορυφούς)—the *aëriæ Phæacum arces* of Virgil. The insular character of this is now due to the deep moat, by which it is separated from the neighbouring ground; but, even if this is purely artificial, and the ground was originally a peninsula and not an island—a point which we have no means of deciding—a similar canal may have existed in ancient times, to afford a passage through to the northernmost harbour. This view is confirmed by an inscription which speaks of a property existing 'in the island' (ἐν τῇ νήσῳ), as if there was an island, otherwise nameless, which went by that title.

The Heraeum, in default of any evidence as to its position, was placed by Leake on the modern esplanade, which lies to the westward of the citadel. In 1845, however, an inscription was discovered at the northern extremity of the hill on which the ancient city was built, marking the limit of the sacred enclosure of Akria—a title with which we are familiar in the form Ἀκραιὰ θεὸς to designate Hera at Corinth, the mother-city of Coreyra; and from this it is probable that the temple was situated in that neighbourhood. The identification is

an interesting one, and it suits the narrative of Thucydides excellently, because he implies that the Heraeum was within the city walls, but we can hardly agree with Dr. Schmidt that it favours his view of the position of the island. It is true that, on this supposition, the castle-rock is the only island for which a case can be made out, and we are willing to believe that this is the spot which the historian intended, notwithstanding the long distance which intervenes between the two places; but the expression τὴν πρὸ τοῦ Ἡραίου νήσον can hardly be said to strengthen his argument, for it ought to mean 'the island in front of'—not, as he explains it, 'the island opposite'—'the temple of Hera.' There is a passage in Diodorus (13. 48. 6), relating to the events that occurred in 410 B.C., which at first sight seems difficult to reconcile with this view of the site of the temple. For Dr. Schmidt's explanation of this, and for a criticism of the accounts in Xenophon and Diodorus of the events of 373 B.C., when the city was besieged by the Peloponnesians under Mnasipus, we must refer our readers to what he has written. The rest of the paper is occupied with a discussion of the difficult question of the position of Mount Istone, which was occupied by the nobles at the time of the sedition.

H. F. TOZER.

RHODE ON THE TUNNY FISH.

Thynnorum captura quanti fuerit apud veteres momenti examinavit PAULUS RHODE. Lipsiae: Teubner. 1890.

THE food-supply of the ancient world is one of the most important questions in classical antiquities, and that branch of it which relates to the supply of fish is certainly not the least interesting. From this point of view the tunny is deserving of careful study. Dr. Rhode observes that the two fishes which were in highest estimation among the Greeks and the Romans were the dolphin and the tunny; and that, while the former of these attracted men's imagination, the latter appealed to their appetites, and consequently the value set on the tunny has been the more permanent. Various writers have treated of this subject, from the time when Belon the traveller, in 1553, wrote his treatise *De aquatilibus*; but it had not been

thoroughly discussed before the appearance of the present essay, which tells us everything that can be discovered about it, and is a model of careful research and good arrangement. The writer begins by mentioning the different names by which this fish was known to the Greeks, and gives an account of its appearance and habits, as described by ancient writers, and of the fables which existed concerning it. Not the least curious of these was the widely spread belief that the tunny saw more clearly with its right than with its left eye—a fancy which seems to have originated in the supposed fact that the shoals, when passing through the Black Sea on their way to and from the Palus Maeotis, which was their great breeding-place, always followed the right-hand shore. But this statement is proved to be erroneous by Strabo's description of their return journey, according to which they took the same course