

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

F. G. K.

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 06 / June 1891, pp 269 - 270

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00167344, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00167344

How to cite this article:

F. G. K. (1891). Notes on the Text of the 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. The Classical Review, 5, pp 269-270 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00167344

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

results by a careful reading of Lucian's *Deorum Dialogi*, selected as containing but little narrative. In those Dialogues he finds in all 154 Aorists Indicative. Of this total 83 are in narrative passages; four refer to a definite time just past; twelve may be

translated indifferently by the Simple Past or the Perfect; one may be best rendered by the Present (*ἐγέλαισα*, 'you make me laugh'); but 'the remaining fifty-four seem to me *all* to require, or at least to prefer, the Perfect in English.'

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE FIRE-SIGNALS IN THE *AGAMEMNON*.

To the EDITOR of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

MAY I say a word respecting the references to this matter on pp. 220 and 238 of the last number of the *Review*? There seems to be some danger that the question may be misapprehended. What is the farthest distance at which a bonfire can be seen, is a question which has, I conceive, no bearing at all upon the story of Aeschylus. For myself at least, so far from asserting that a bonfire upon Athos could not be seen from Makistos, I have expressly assumed that it could. The impossibility which I (and, so far as I know, all others before me) attribute to the story, is an impossibility relative to the whole circumstances given. That impossibility would not be affected in the least, if it were known that the poet had himself seen a bonfire across the interval marked; and it would remain, even if such a bonfire had been seen and interpreted as a signal.

Quite apart however from the *Agamemnon*, it is a historic question, at what intervals fire-

signals have been or are likely to have been established. And upon this we may observe, that the limit is not the longest distance at which the fire may possibly be seen, but the distance at which it is fairly certain that the fire will be seen, and seen unmistakably. To establish a signal beyond this limit would be worse than useless. Does this condition allow an interval of 100 miles, or of 50 miles, or of anything near that distance? Surely we can all say from our own experience, that to arrange a chain of beacon-signals, and to leave in it deliberately a gap of 100 miles, would be sheer insanity. Everything must yield to evidence; and when or if evidence shall be produced that a chain of beacons with such a gap in it was established by the Greeks or others, we shall allow that, however unwise, the thing was done. Meanwhile we shall presume that it never was.

A. W. VERRALL.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE ἈΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

THE following is a list of the passages in which a fresh revision of the MS. has established readings different from those given in the printed text, or has made it possible to fill up lacunas which were there left blank or only tentatively supplied. Corrections which have already been mentioned as certain in the notes which the editor of the *Classical Review* has permitted me to add to the suggestions sent to him are not repeated here. There still remain some passages in which further study may discover the true MS. readings:—

P. 3, l. 14. [ἴ]στασαν. There is room for [καθί]στασαν in the lacuna.

P. 5, l. 2. ἐν [ἀρχῇ ἐγένετο δευ]τέρα. I think ἦν should be substituted for ἐγένετο. The other letters printed between the brackets are faintly legible, and are written in a very straggling manner.

P. 6, l. 17. ἐς. MS. χρόνον (written in abbreviated form).

P. 17, l. 6. κατεκύρωσε. MS. κατεκύρωσεν.

P. 22, ll. 1, 2. τοῦ[τους ἐκλή]ρουν. Perhaps τοῦ[τοῖς] ἐ[πε]κλήρουν. Between τοῦ and ε there is only space for one letter, but something has been written above the line, and perhaps the scribe wrote τοὺς first, and corrected it to τοῖς. In ch. 59 (p. 147, l. 15)

the phrase ἐπικληροῦσι ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τὰ δικαστήρια occurs, which is partly parallel.

P. 24, l. 8. ἐς τὰ τε ἄλλα καί. MS. probably καὶ τὰ τε ἄλλα.

P. 27, l. 14. σταθμόν. MS. σταθμά.

P. 42, l. 10. Ἀνακείω. The first letters are faint and roughly formed, but I feel tolerably satisfied that the reading is Θησείω.

P. 43, l. 7. εἰρή[καμεν]. I think εἰρήται [ῥῆ], if the hiatus is allowable.

P. 43, l. 9. θ[εσμοῖς]. MS. ἄλλοις.

P. 43, l. 12. ὥστε δια[μπε]ρὸς ἐγεργούνται. MS. ὥστε διατρέφεσθ' γεωργούντας. The first γ was at first badly formed, and a second has been written above it.

P. 44, l. 1. διαλ[λάττ]ων. I do not think there is room for so much in the lacuna, and διαλ[ύ]ων should probably be read, though the υ must have covered a good deal of ground.

P. 45, l. 4. [ὠφέλησεν]. MS. προ[σ]ήγετο. I see Mr. Richards has proposed προσηγάγετο in the last number; but though the space between the ο and γ is rather wide for two letters, it will hardly hold four.

P. 48, l. 19. ἀγενεῖς. MS. probably ἀσθενεῖς, which has the advantage of giving an improved sense to ἅμα. The first σ is, however, strangely formed, and part of the θ is obliterated.

P. 49, l. 8. κατεῖχεν. MS. κατέσχεν.

P. 49, l. 19. Λακεδήμονος. MS. Λακεδαί-
μονος.

P. 58, l. 2. δυοδεκάτῳ. MS. δωδεκάτῳ, though there has been a little confusion over the first syllable.

P. 58, l. 4. καταλιπόντες. MS. διαλιπόντες. [So W. p. 112.]

P. 67, l. 2. πολλῶν ἡθροισμένων. Read ἡθροισμένων πολλῶν. The words were at first written in the order as printed, but an α has been written over ἡθροισμένων and a β over πολλῶν, to transpose their order.

P. 74, l. 7. ἦ. MS. ην, of course wrongly.

P. 76, l. 7. πολέμων. MS. πολλῶν.

P. 100, l. 11. οὔδεις. MS. οὔδεις οὐδέν.

P. 101, l. 5. τάξωσι. MS. τάξωσιν.

P. 109, l. 6. ἐξάγουσι. MS. διάγουσι.

P. 113, l. 10. κλῆς. MS. κλεῖς.

P. 119, l. 8. κλ[ηρωτοῖ]. Read κλ[ηροῦται] δ', and transpose comma. [Cf. W. p. 116.]

P. 120, l. 5. τὰ . . . πεπραμένα. MS. τὰ εἰς [ῥ γ] ἔτη πεπραμένα. There is the mark of a numeral, and the figure looks most like γ, but it is very faint.

P. 120, l. 6. τῶν MS. apparently τῶν [ὀφ]ει[λε]τῶν.

P. 120, l. 9. τὸν τὰ πρ MS. apparently τὸν τε πριάμενον καὶ [ὀπόσου], or

[ὄσου], as it is doubtful whether the lacuna will hold six letters. [Cf. T. p. 181.]

P. 120, l. 17. πωλ[οῦσιν] Read πωλ[οῦσιν. ἔστι] δέ.

P. 120, l. 20. ε . . . [κατακυροῖ]. MS. apparently εἰσφέρει.

P. 121, ll. 2-5. This passage should apparently run παραδίδωσι τοῖς ἀποδέκταις αὐτὰ ταῦτα καθ' ἕκ[αστα τῶν] ἐπιστυλίων, ὧν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ δεῖ τὰ χρήματα καταβλη[θῆναι] [καὶ ἂ] παλειφθῆναι· τὰ δ' ἄλλα ἀποκείται χωρὶς ἵνα μὴ προεξαλ[εῖσθῃ].

P. 141, ll. 2-5. This mutilated passage should apparently run [ἐά]ν τις ἡ λ[η]τουρ[γ]η[κέν]αι φῆ π[ρό]τερον ταύτην τὴν λητουρ[γ]ίαν, ἢ ἂ[ν] τελεῖς εἶναι λελη[τουρ]γηκώς ἐ[τέραν] λητουργίαν καὶ τῶν χρόνων αὐτῷ [τῆς ἀτελ]είας μὴ ἐξεληλυθό[των, ἢ τὰ μ'] ἔτη μὴ γεγονέναι. The first part of this emendation is due to Dr. Sandys, p. 117.

P. 145, l. 6. . . . αἰ[ο]ι. The remains of letters visible here are sufficient to show that the word is not σκοταῖοι, though I cannot yet make out what it is. Moreover, as Mr. Paton has also pointed out, the procedure here spoken of is not that of the Areopagus.

P. 145, l. 14. ποιεῖται. MS. probably θύει μὲν.

P. 147, l. 15. πάντα. MS. οὔτοι τά.

P. 157, l. 5 [τῆς] φυλῆς ἐκάστης. MS. [τῇ] φυλῇ ἐκάστη.

P. 158, ll. 4, 5. κατὰ τὸ δικαστήριον εἰσαγγελία. MS. apparently καὶ εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον εἰσάγετ[αι].

F. G. K.

ON THE USE OF THE HIATUS IN THE ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

MR. NEWMAN has already in the *Classical Review* noticed that the author of the Πολιτεία has generally avoided hiatus. As the point may be of some help in determining the question of authorship, it is worth while calling attention to the facts.

(1) A definite rule is observed throughout the greater part of the work. Generally hiatus never occurs except in the following cases:—

(a) After καί, the article in all cases, numerals, and the following words: δέ, τε, τινά, ἔπειτα, εἴτα, ἀλλά, μήτε, μηδέ, πάντα, σφοδρά (37), διά, περί, μάλιστα. (I have not attempted to distinguish cases of hiatus and elision.) The rule as to μή is not quite clear.

Hiatus is avoided at a pause as well as in the middle of a sentence.

(β) There are a large number of passages, some of considerable length, quoted from laws and other documents; in these of course the rule does not hold. The contrast between them and the other parts of the work is in consequence very marked. (Cf. e.g. ch. 28 with the latter part of 29.)

(γ) There are also a considerable number of what may be called technical expressions; in these hiatus is not avoided. These include all expressions used for fixing a date: e.g. ἐνθὺς δὲ τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἔτει ἐπὶ