

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 Πολιτεῖς 1F77α xs1F080 θηναῖς 1F77ων

J. B. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 02 / March 1895, pp 106 - 108

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201303, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201303

How to cite this article:

J. B. Bury (1895). Notes on the Πολιτεῖς θηναῖων. The Classical Review, 9, pp 106-108
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201303

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

It is usual to consider χρόνου corrupt, and Meineke's ὁμοῦ has found many believers. Of these I am not one, and even doubt whether χρόνου may not be defended. Chaeremon is one of the most artificial poets of the later kind of tragedy, meant like *Philip van Artevelde*, and *Bothwell*, not for acting, but reading. The poet, speaking of maidens in the maturity of their charms, describes them as fruit darkening with the perfect vine-blossoms of time, i.e. with the hue or tinge that maturity brings to female beauty. Such language belongs to a late stage of poetry, and may be compared with Propertius' *mortis lacrimis*, tears of death=our tears when dead, or tears after death.

Chaeremon 13.

κόμαισιν ὥρων σώματ' εὐανθή ῥόδα
εἶχον, τιθήνημ' ἔαρος ἐκπρεπέστατον.

σώματ' is, I think, wrong, and I doubt its being a corruption of στέρματ'. It is more likely to stand for χρώματ', a word and idea of which Chaeremon is particularly fond. Roses are called the season's diverse hues, because their colours vary with the successive times at which they flower. Or ὥρων may be personal, the Hours; roses,

which are the hues that deck the Hours in successively changing tints.

Carcinus *fr.* 8.

ἐν δρᾷ μόνον ἴδιον (αἰ. ἡδίων) ὦν ποιεῖ φθόνος.
λυπεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸ τὸ κτήμα τοὺς κεκτημένους.

Porson corrected ἴδιον to δίκαιον. It might be, I think, σπουδαῖον. Then, λυπεῖ γὰρ οὖν τὸ κτήμα.

Python *fr.* 1.

ἐστὶν δ' ὅπου μὲν ὁ κάλαμος πέφυκ' ὄδε
† φέτωμ' ἄορνον.

Possibly πτέρωμ' 'a wing—but not of birds,' i.e. a building.

Sosiphanes *fr.* 1.

μάγοις ἐπαυδαῖς πᾶσα Θεσσαλὶς κόρη
ψευδὴς σελήνης αἰθέρος καταβάτης.

Perhaps ψεύδει σελήνην αἰθέρος καταβάτιν.
Sositheus 2.

τῇ μᾶ δ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
δαινυσί τ' ἔμπης συντίθησιν εἰς τέλος.
Possibly δαινὺς ἐπ' ὀμπνῇ συντίθησ' οἶνον γάνος.

Adespot. 458.

αἰὶ δ' ὀρώντι τ' ὀξὺ καὶ τυφλὸς ἦν.

This should be, I imagine,

αἰὶ δ' ὀρών τις ὀξὺ καὶ τυφλὸς περ ἦν.

'He (Oedipus) ever had a kind of sharp sight even in his blindness.'

ROBINSON ELLIS.

NOTES ON THE Πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων.

15 § 1. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὡς ἐξέπεσε τὸ δεύτερον ἔτει μάλιστα ἐβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον—οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον κατεῖχεν.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff is unquestionably right in his judgment that the text is corrupt. The statement is that the duration of the second ἀρχή of Pisistratus was six years—a year longer than the first ἀρχή, and little or not at all shorter than, on this supposition, the third ἀρχή must have been [17-(6+5)=6]. If so, οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον is simply nonsense. Wilamowitz hesitatingly proposes τρίτῳ; but the change of the numeral is, as he confesses, arbitrary, and there is no palaeographical motive. Besides, even two years is too long. Herodotus in his account (i. 61) gives no definite note of time, but the whole impression of his narrative is that the retirement of Pisistratus followed hard upon his restoration, certainly well within the space of a year. And the phrase οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον leads us to expect here a statement confirming the impression we had before received from the dateless record of

Herodotus. We expect to read: 'In the twelfth year after he first seized the tyranny, he was restored... Then when he went into exile a second time, in the twelfth year after he seized the tyranny'—'Oh, but'—objects the reader—'that was the year in which he was restored.' 'Certainly,' replies Aristotle, 'but he was only in power a short time.' That is what γὰρ (in the light of the Herodotean passage) seems to imply.

And so, I believe, Aristotle wrote, though he expressed it somewhat differently. The difficulty in the text is due to the presence of an explanatory interpolation. We meet in the case of the immediately preceding date (14 § 4) a clear instance of such interpolation. There a scribe, not understanding that ἔτει δωδεκάτῳ referred to the starting-point of the πρώτη κατάστασις, introduced the erroneously explicit μετὰ ταῦτα and so wrought confusion in the sense. So here. Aristotle wrote: 'when he was expelled for the second time in the seventh year (after his first exile)—(the year of his restoration?—certainly) for he held the power for only

a short time.' The copyist, not seeing that the 'seventh year' was the same as the preceding 'twelfth year,' reckoned from a different starting-point, introduced *μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον* to render explicit what was not quite clearly stated. So we should read:

ὡς ἐξέπεσε τὸ δεύτερον ζτεὶ μάλιστα ἐβδόμῳ,
—οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον κατεῖχεν.

Thus we obtain the following dates:

First ἀρχή: 5 years (561/0—556/5).
Second ἀρχή: part of a year (550/49).
Third ἀρχή: 12 years (540/39—528/7).

First exile: 6 years (556/5—550/49).
Second exile: 10 years (550/49—540/39).

Total: 33 and part of a year (561/0
—528/7).

It is easily seen that, on this plan of reckoning, the total period of ἀρχή might be variously reckoned at (a) seventeen and a fraction or roughly seventeen, and (b), by counting the first and the third ἀρχή as having lasted each for some months beyond the round number of years, at nineteen. (a) is represented by the passage in the *Politics*, viii. 1350b; and also results if we subtract the sixteen years of exile from thirty-three; (b) is adopted in 17 § 1.

22 § 2. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ζτεὶ πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν ἐφ' Ἑρμοκρέοντος ἀρχόντος τῇ βουλῇ τοῖς πεντακοσίοις τὸν ὄρκον ἐποίησαν... ἔπειτα τοὺς στρατηγούς ἡρῶντο... ζτεὶ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα δωδεκάτῳ νικῆσαντες τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην κ.τ.λ.

There is not necessarily a chronological mistake here. The date of Hermocreon's archonship (504—503) only concerns the introduction of the Oath for the Five Hundred. Subsequently the ordinance for the election of the strategoi was passed, namely in 501—500, the twelfth year before Marathon (490—489). The passage is usually interpreted as if it were ζτεὶ δὲ πέμπτῳ... ἀρχόντος πρῶτον μὲν τῇ βουλῇ... ἔπειτα δέ...; which would imply an inconsistency.¹ The only difficulty is the discrepancy between Aristotle and Dionysius, who gives Akestorides as the archon of 504—3 (v. 37).

26 § 1. κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους συνέπεσε μὴδ' ἡγεμόνα ἔχειν τοὺς ἐπικειστέροους

¹ On that supposition the best correction would be (not to stir πέμπτῳ but) to alter ἔπειτα to ἐπειτα <δ' ζτεὶ ἡ>—the eighth year μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν.

ἀλλ' αὐτῶν προστάται Κίμωνα τὸν Μιλτιάδου νεώτερον† ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὄψε προσελθόντα.

For the genuineness of the suspicious word Mr. Walker (*Class. Rev.* vi. 98) has made the best case that can be made, maintaining that in estimating the chronological difficulty we must not go by the received dates of this period, but must first draw the conclusions which are implied by the supposed presence of Themistocles at Athens in 462. But even if we granted—what we need not grant—that Aristotle altered his chronological view of the period so as to harmonize with this anecdote, we should not get rid of the objections. For there is something very suspicious, as Mr. Sandys rightly pointed out, in the combination νεώτερον καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὄψε προσελθόντα. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf hardly goes too far in calling it 'unsinn.' He supports the emendation νωθρότερον with great ability (*Aristoteles und Athen* ii. 136), though he admits that it is 'ein grobes Wort und von dem Euphemismus der attischen Eleganz weit entfernt.' The reference to *Rhetoric* ii. 1390b will persuade many; and perhaps rightly. But the correction is not so certain that it may not be worth while to put forward another conjecture which is palaeographically easier and gives equally good sense. The author evidently means to say that Cimon had no political shrewdness or tact, and this natural lack was not in any measure compensated for by sheer dint of political experience. He was devoid of that σύνεσις which marked, for instance, Themistocles. I therefore propose:

ΜΙΛΤΙΑΔΟΥ ΑCYNΕΤΩΤΕΡΟΝ

i.e. Κίμωνα τὸν Μιλτιάδου ἀσυνετώτερον ὄντα.

The resemblance of the first letters of the word ACY to the last letters of the foregoing word, ΔΟΥ, misled the scribe into omitting them; and the surviving *vox nihili* νεώτερον could become nothing but νεώτερον.

30 § 3, 4. καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν βουλευεῖν δὲ ἢ ἀνδοκῇ αὐτοῖς ἀριστα ζεῖν κ.τ.λ.

It is recognized that a sentence ends at βουλευεῖν, and that an infinitive has fallen out before δέ. βουλευέσθαι is adopted by Blass and Mr. Sandys, but does not account for its own omission. Read:

βουλ εὔειν. <κελ εὔειν> δὲ ἃ ἀν κ.τ.λ.

The change of ἃ to ἦ was a consequence of the omission of κελεῖν.

33 *ad fin.* πολέμου τε καθεστῶτος καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὅλων τῆς πολιτείας οὐσης.

It is remarkable that the particle γε does not occur in the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. Is it possible that we may have it here? πολέμου γε καθεστῶτος would be an improvement ('considering that there was war'), and would suggest the sense desired by Herwerden who proposed καίπερ πολέμου.

35 § 2. καὶ τοὺς τ' Ἐφιάλτον καὶ Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν καθεύλον ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν ὅσοι διαμφισβητήσεις εἶχον καὶ τὸ κῦρος ὃ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς κατέλυσαν ὡς ἐπανορθοῦντες καὶ ποιῶντες ἀναμφισβήτητον τὴν πολιτείαν.

Two distinct attacks were made on the Areopagus, the first by Ephialtes, the second by Pericles. There is now no justification for Sauppe's rejection of the words καὶ Περικλῆς in Arist. *Pol.* ii. 12 (1274a): καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν Ἐφιάλτης ἐκόλουσε καὶ Περικλῆς. The notice in our treatise, 27 § 1, τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἔνια παρείλετο saves, beyond dispute, the suspected words. But it is to be observed how the misinterpretation of such a phrase led to the false notion, found in Plutarch, that Pericles was the real mover in the attack which was headed by Ephialtes. The reform of Ephialtes was previous to the prominent appearance of Pericles on the political stage; but it is not unlikely that when Pericles resolved to 'dock' some of the few privileges which Ephialtes had left to the Areopagites, he did not make the motion himself but got another to make it for him. This is the only supposition on which we can explain the words in 35 § 2. What, we are entitled to ask, did they leave unstirred the well-known laws in which Pericles carried on the policy begun

by Ephialtes, and only remove those of the obscure Archestratus of whom or of whose laws we never hear elsewhere? The conclusion seems unavoidable that Archestratus was the instrument of Pericles, and that he is here mentioned because the laws were in his name.

But the sentence requires a slight emendation. According to the text of the papyrus τοὺς τ' corresponds to καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος κ.τ.λ. But it is clear that καθεύλον refers only to the Areopagitic laws, not to the Solonian which were preserved in the Prytaneum; and τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν cannot be separated from καὶ τὸ κῦρος, both depending on κατέλυσαν. It has been suggested that τ' should be omitted: but why should it have been inserted? The true restoration is

καὶ <τοὺς> Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους

47 § 5. εἰσφέρεται μὲν οὖν εἰς τὴν βουλὴν τὰ γραμματ[εῖα τὰ] τὰς καταβολὰς ἀναγεγραμμένα.

So Kaibel and Wilamowitz. But κ stands before τὰς in the papyrus. Read perhaps:

τὰ γραμματεῖα τὰ πεντεκαίδεκα.

1€ (as often 1C) might have become K. Fifteen γραμματεῖα have been mentioned: ten containing the instalments paid in each prytany; three for those paid three times a year; one for those paid in the ninth prytany; and one, in the case of the Basileus, specially reserved for the revenue arising from τεμένη (ἐν γραμματεῖοις λελεγκωμένους does not mean that he used more than one at a time).

J. B. BURY.

ON TIBULLUS I. 1, 2.

et teneat culti iugera multa soli.

In the *Classical Review*, May, 1894, p. 198, the reading *magna* is defended by F. K. Ball, with comparison especially of Ov. *Amor.* 3, 15, 12, and Statius, *Theb.* 5, 550.

1. The MSS. read as follows: *magna*, AVg; *multa*, G, Par. Fris. Diomedes (the MS. testimony is reversed in the note above mentioned); and the combination of both the excerpts with Diomedes is here on the whole to be preferred to AV.

2. *Iugera* occurs but four times in the Tibullus collection, as follows: (a) i. 1, 2 (this passage). (b) ii. 3, 42: *multa innumera iugera*. (c) iii. 3, 5: *multa iugera*. (d) i. 3, 75: *novem per iugera*. In these other cases the text is not in dispute, save that Baehrens characteristically wishes to change the *multa* at ii. 3, 42 to *culta*! *Multa* is therefore rather strikingly in harmony with the usage of Tibullus.

3. Similar are: Ov. *Fast.* iii. 192: *iugera pauca soli*; ex Pont. iv. 9, 86: *iugera multa*