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](#)

ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΙΣ, 'Inventory,' in Herodotus and Thucydides

S. Casson

The Classical Review / Volume 35 / Issue 7-8 / November 2021, pp 144 - 145

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00015249, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00015249

How to cite this article:

S. Casson (1921). ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΙΣ, 'Inventory,' in Herodotus and Thucydides. The Classical Review, 35, pp 144-145 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00015249

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

EURIPIDES, *MEDEA*, LL. 560-561.

EARLE long ago remarked that in Jason's words,

καὶ μὴ σπανίζοιμ᾽ ἑσθ' αὖτις, γινώσκων δὲ
πένητα φεύγει πᾶς τις ἐκποδὼν φίλος

the word φίλος at the end was weak and seemed to introduce an unnecessary restriction. He therefore suggested (*Classical Review*, vol. x, p. 3):

πένητα φεύγειν πᾶς τις ἐκποδὼν φιλεῖ.

Would it not be simpler to read

πένητα φεύγει πᾶς τις ἐκποδὼν φίλον,

as being closer to the reading of the MSS.? The nominative φίλος can easily be explained by its following so soon after πᾶς τις, with which a scribe would tend to construe it. The conception of the 'poor friend' who is a burden on others is well known, and the suggestion receives some support from Eur. *El.* 1131:

πένητας οὐδεὶς βούλεται κτᾶσθαι φίλους.

G. R. DRIVER.

ARISTOPHANES, *ACHARNIANS*, ll. 68, ff.

καὶ δὴτ' ἐτρυχόμεσθα διὰ Καῦστρίων
πεδίων ὁδοιπλανοῦντες ἐσκηνημένοι,
ἐφ' ἄρμαμαζῶν μαλθακῶς κατακέμενοι,
ἀπολλόμενοι.

68 διὰ Bergk. παρὰ τῶν R. διὰ τῶν vulg.

So the Oxford editors. Recent editors and commentators (with the exception of Van Leeuwen) have preferred the plural form Καῦστρίων πεδίων to Dindorf's παρὰ Καῦστριον πεδίων or Blaydes' παρὰ Καῦστριον πόταμον, but none of them appears to have observed the justification for their preference. The road to Susa indeed passed through two 'plains of the Cayster' within two hundred miles of the Aegean, and the two alternative branches by which it led from Ephesus to the Anatolian plateau actually parted in one Καῦστριον πεδίων and reunited in another. If he took the Hermus Valley way, the traveller from Ephesus mounted the valley of the Cayster and dropped down over the watershed to Sardis by the route described in Herodotus V. 100. Thence, by a road coinciding in part with the Royal Road of the Persian kings, and in part with the modern railway, he travelled to the valley of the East Phrygian Cayster, which extended from Akroenus to Philomelium. If he chose the more southerly branch, along the Maeander Valley, he diverged at once from the Cayster Valley and travelled by Caeanae and Metropolis to Ipsus, where he entered the valley of the East Phrygian Cayster. At this point the two branches merged into the main highway through Phrygia Paroreios. Ipsus was identical with, or close to, the πόλις οἰκουμένη, called by Xenophon Καῦστρου πεδίων (*Anabasis* I. 2. 11). At this well-known road-junction Cyrus met the Cilician Epyaxa. Both the Hermus Valley and the Maeander Valley routes, and especially the latter,

were tolerably familiar to the contemporaries of Aristophanes. It was by the Maeander road that Alcibiades was travelling in 404 B.C., when he was murdered just before reaching the valley of the East Phrygian Cayster, and Ramsay finds an indication of the use of this road as early as the sixth century in a fragment of Hipponax (*Historical Geography*, p. 37; cf. p. 30, where 'Maeander' is a slip for 'Hermus', and p. 35 f.). Rivers in Anatolia have a way of forcing themselves on the traveller's attention, and the double occurrence of the name 'Cayster' must have struck many a Greek ambassador and trader. Van Leeuwen's note, '*Caystri pedium urbis Phrygiae nomen apud Xen. I. 2 § 11 hinc est alienum*,' is true only if we alter the text. If we are to understand the reading of the MSS. Xenophon's reference is very pertinent.

W. M. CALDER.

ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΙΣ, 'INVENTORY,' IN HERODOTUS AND THUCYDIDES.

IN the *Class. Review* for August, 1914, in a short article on the expedition of Xerxes to Delphi, I suggested that the word ἀποδείξις was sometimes used in the special sense of 'inventory,' and, as such, belonged to the technical language of military or legal phraseology. The Persian expedition was sent for the purpose of taking an inventory of the treasures of Delphi.¹ This process of inventory taking was, I suggested, a recognised military method of ensuring the neutrality of the party furnishing the inventory. If that party infringed its neutrality, everything set down in the list was seized by those who held the inventory. If, on the other hand, it maintained neutrality, it had the right to claim compensation, at the conclusion of hostilities, for anything that had been damaged or seized by the party to whom the inventory was furnished. An arrangement of this nature was explained in detail by Archidamus to the Plataeans in the third year of the Peloponnesian war.² If abstention from the war is desired, he says to them, ἡσυχίαν ἀγετε νεμόμενοι τὰ ὑμέτερα αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔσθε μὴδὲ μεθ' ἑτέρων, δέχεσθε δὲ ἀμφοτέρους φίλους, ἐπὶ πολέμῳ δὲ μηδετέροις. The Plataeans reply that their wives and children are in the charge of the Athenians, who might, therefore, not confirm their neutrality. Archidamus, to remove their apprehensions, tells them to hand themselves over to the care of the Spartans and carry out the following requirements:

1. To make a list of their landed properties—*γῆς ὅρους ἀποδείξατε.*
2. To make a list of their plantations and any other properties that can be catalogued—*δένδρα ἀριθμῶν τὰ ὑμέτερα καὶ ἄλλα εἰ τι δυνατόν ἐς ἀριθμὸν ἔλθειν (ἀποδείξατε).*
3. To depart wheresoever they please until the end of the war—*αὐτοὶ δὲ μεταχωρήσατε οὐκ ἀπολείπετε, ἕως ἄν ὁ πόλεμος ᾖ.*

¹ This view was first proposed by Mr. J. A. R. Munro, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.

² *Thucydides* II. 72.

He on his part undertakes :

1. To keep the listed property as a deposit—*ἐξομεν παρακαταθήκην*.

2. To pay compensation for use and depreciation of the occupied property—*ἐργαζόμενοι καὶ φορὰν φέροντες ἢ ἂν ὑμῖν μέλλῃ ἰκανὴ ἔσσεσθαι*.

3. To hand over everything again when hostilities have come to an end—*ἐπειδὴν δὲ παρέλθῃ, ἀποδώσωμεν ὑμῖν ἃ ἂν παραλάβωμεν*.

It seems, then, that the word *ἀπόδειξις*, which occurs in noun or verb form prominently in the Herodotean account of the Delphian expedition and in this passage of Thucydides, has a specialised meaning.

Further light is thrown upon the particular transaction which involved an *ἀπόδειξις* by a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Sulla* (12, 4). Sulla was preparing a large and important campaign. At the outset he approached Delphi as Xerxes had done. But in Sulla's time Delphian neutrality or partiality counted probably for less than it did in the days of Xerxes. Nevertheless Sulla is taking no risks. He hopes to control the shrine and at the same time, like Xerxes, he wishes to have the Delphian funds and properties as a financial reserve in case of trouble. He writes, therefore, to the Amphiktyons at Delphi, telling them to send the treasures of Delphi to him, and he sends Kaphis the Phokian to verify the amounts of such treasures—*ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τοῖς Ἀμφικτύουσιν εἰς Δελφούς διὰ τὰ χρήματα τοῦ θεοῦ βέλτιον εἴη κομισθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν· ἢ γὰρ φυλάξειν ἀσφαλέστερον ἢ καὶ ἀποχρησάμενος ἀποδώσειν οὐκ ἐλάττω*. He, on his part, undertakes to refund no less than he receives, assuming that he draws upon the Delphian moneys, at the conclusion of hostilities.

The duties of Kaphis must clearly have been to superintend the *ἀπόδειξις* of what was handed over.

Further interesting evidence as to this specialised meaning of *ἀπόδειξις* is found in the post-classical usage of the word itself. Ducange, in his *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis* gives one meaning of *ἀπόδειξις* as 'securitas, cautio de suscepta pecunia.' From Murray's *English Dictionary* (s.v. 'policy') it appears that the English word 'policy,' meaning a 'contract for insurance,' is derived from the mediaeval Latin *apódissa* or *apódixa*, a receipt or security for money paid, itself derived from the Greek *ἀπόδειξις*. The modern Greek usage of *ἀπόδειξις* in the spoken language has almost exclusively the meaning of 'receipt.'

Delphi thus took out a policy of insurance with Xerxes, as Plataea might have done with Archidamus. With Sulla there was less of a *quid pro quo*; Delphi had everything to lose. Sulla's system of insurance was cynically one-sided.

S. CASSON.

ON SOME PASSAGES IN PLATO'S LAWS.

Laws II. 653D ὁρᾶν ἃ (δὴ Schanz) χρὴ πότερον ἀληθῆς . . . ὁ λόγος ὑμνεῖται τὰ νῦν, ἢ πῶς. For ἃ we might read *ἃ*, i.e. *πρώτον* : this is supported by the *πρώτον* in 654A *infra*.

II. 663D, Ε λυσιτελέστερον . . . ποτε καὶ δυνάμενον μάλλον ποιεῖν μὴ βίᾳ ἀλλ' ἐκόντας . . . τὰ δίκαια ; Stephanus proposed the insertion of *πείθειν* before *ποιεῖν*, and, however inelegant this may sound, something of the kind seems to be indispensable. I suggest, therefore, as an amendment, that *πείσαι* might be inserted after *καὶ*. The loss of *πείσαι* after *ποτε καὶ* would be another easy instance of the 'haplography' so frequent in the *Laws* (ΠΕΙCAI=TEKAI).

III. 693A διαπεφορμημένα καὶ συμπεφορμημένα κακῶς ἐσπαρμένα κατοικεῖται. It is scarcely surprising that Cobet took objection to *ἐσπαρμένα* and advocated its exclusion. But since it is hardly credible that anyone would be tempted to import the word, I regard it as more likely to be a corruption and suggest in its place *ἐφθαρμένα* : for the association of this with κακῶς cp. κακῶς οὕτως εἶναι διεφθαρμένα, 692D.

711C καὶ πῶς οἰόμεθα ταχὺ συνακολουθήσειν κτλ. Since we clearly need an answer here it implies assent on the part of Clinias, the form καὶ πῶς . . . ; cannot be tolerated. We might adopt Badham's καὶ πῶς «οὐκ» οἱ καὶ πάντως, but the corruption would be more easily accounted for by καὶ ἴσως. In 712A there is another case where πῶς (for which Susemihl conjectured καλῶς) might plausibly be supplanted by ἴσως.

V. 739E ἀθανάσιος ἐγγύατα καὶ ἡ μία δευτέρως. Although Burnet passes over it in silence, the phrase *ἡ μία δευτέρως* has given pause to others, notably Schanz and Ritter. But, so far as I know, nobody has yet seen that the true reading must be *τιμία δευτέρως*, 'second in order of merit' : the polities are being assigned their places in the scale of value (*τιμή*), see 739A *ad fin*. One may compare 728D *δεύτερον ἐτάχθη τιμῇ* κτλ. ; and, for the adverb, *αἰσχρὸν ἂν καὶ καλὸν δευτέρως* κτλ. 841B.

740E ἀπαντῶσαι «αἱ» δύνανται ποιεῖν δ λέγομεν. So Burnet, adopting Winckelmann's insertion of *αἱ*. Various other proposals have been made, but has anyone ever thought of *αἱ πάντως αἱ*? Since the relative has reference to a number of different antecedents, *πάντως* would seem an appropriate word.

747D μὴδὲ τοῦθ' ἡμᾶς λαμβανέτω περὶ τόπων ὡς οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄλλοι τινὲς διαφέροντες ἄλλων τόπων κτλ. The negative in ὡς οὐκ εἰσὶν cannot conceivably be right, although Burnet—while mentioning Ast's excision—lets it stand in his text. Since intrusions of οὐκ are certainly rare, if not unknown, in the *Laws*, I prefer to see here a corruption : the original was, I suspect, ὡς φύσει εἰσὶν—'some places have a natural superiority over others.' The loss of the two final letters of φύσει (another case of "haplography," that fertile cause of trouble) was the origin of the blunder. Moreover, while the sentence sounds false with οὐκ εἰσὶν, and feeble with a bald εἰσὶν, with φύσει it gains both truth and force.

VII. 772D, Ε ὅποτε τις . . . κατὰ νοὺν ἐαυτῷ . . . ἐξηγηρῆναι πιστεύει, γαμείτω κτλ. So the text runs, but it is obvious that an object is required for the infinitive. Are we to be left to supply it mentally, or is it not more probable that we should read πιστεύει «γάμου» γαμείτω κτλ.?

774C τὸ . . . μήτ' ἐκδιδόντι διὰ χρημάτων ἀπορίαν γηράσκειν τοὺς πένητας. Neither γηράσκειν nor διδάσκειν (a marginal substitute) seems to yield