

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](#)



F. Müller's Seventh Book of Thucydides *Thukydidēs VII. Erklärende Ausgabe für den Schul- und Privatgebrauch* von Dr Franz Müller. Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh. 1889. Pp. v. 208. Mk. 1.80.

Charles Forster Smith

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 05 / May 1890, pp 207 - 209

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190250, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190250

How to cite this article:

Charles Forster Smith (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 207-209 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190250

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

89, 5 Steup reads *μὴ μέλλοντάς τι ἄξιον τοῦ παραλόγου πράξειν* for the MSS. *τοῦ παρα πολὺ*. Stahl brackets these words on the ground that the Scholiast did not find them, but Steup objects that he may have found them and not have understood them, which is very probable. The note on c. 89, 6 *τῷ οὐκ εἰκότι πλέον πεφόβηται ἡμᾶς ἢ τῇ κατὰ λόγον παρασκευῇ* remains unsatisfactory. Böhme's translation of the latter part, 'als sie uns fürchten würden, wenn wir verhältnissmässig (so stark wie sie) gerüstet wären,' comes to this, that 'the enemy fear us more with a small force than they would if we had a large one'—a strange paradox indeed. Classen falls back on the assumption that the text is in some way corrupt, but I do not see why we cannot translate, 'they are filled with fear of us owing to the improbable, (i.e. they never expected we should fight them), more than owing to the preparations we are likely to make.' *τῇ κατὰ λόγον παρασκευῇ* is due to Thucydides' love of antithesis and is effective in Phormio's mouth, even though no reinforcements could reach him before the battle. The enemy certainly were afraid that, unless they forced on a battle at once, reinforcements would arrive. (Cf. c. 85, 6 and 92, 6 *fol.*) In c. 93, 5 *ἀποπειράσαι τοῦ Πειραιῶς τοῦ λυμένους τῶν Ἀθηναίων*, the last four words are certainly spurious, as Naber says. In order to explain their presence

Stahl is reduced to the supposition that they are intended to distinguish the Athenian from the Corinthian Piræus. Now, apart from the fact that the two places are differently spelt, what reader of Thucydides in his senses could imagine that the Peloponnesians were going to make an attempt on a Corinthian port? At c. 93, 3 *ἐπεὶ οὐτ' ἀπὸ τοῦ προφανοῦς τολμήσαι ἂν καθ' ἡσυχίαν, οὐτ' εἰ διεννοῦντο μὴ οὐκ ἂν προαισθῆσθαι* (so Steup rightly, for Classen's *προαίσθησθαι*), Classen himself abandoned the idea that there is a contrast here between an open and a secret attempt on the Piræus. Steup now suggests that Thucydides wrote only *ἐπεὶ οὐτε τολμήσαι ἂν, οὐτε εἰ διεννοῦντο, μὴ οὐκ ἂν προαισθῆσθαι*. That is to say *ἀπὸ τοῦ προφανοῦς* is a gloss on *τολμήσαι*, and *καθ' ἡσυχίαν* a misplaced gloss on *διεννοῦντο*. But Steup's *διεννοῦντο* must be exchanged for Stahl's correction *διανοῦντο*, and then the sentence is restored.

I have only been able to mention a few of the places in this book where corruption probably exists. There are many others where difficulties are either certainly or possibly due to the insertion of editorial notes, and often the very difficulties pointed out in this most serviceable edition themselves suggest means by which they may be removed.

E. C. MARCHANT.

F. MÜLLER'S SEVENTH BOOK OF THUCYDIDES.

Thucydides VII. Erklärende Ausgabe für den Schul- und Privatgebrauch von Dr. FRANZ MÜLLER. Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh. 1889. Pp. v. 208. Mk. 1.80.

THE notes on this book are, if not fuller, at least of a more critical character, where occasion requires, than those of the editor's previous editions of ii. (ch. 1—65) and vi. Müller rightly thinks that, if Thucydides is to receive in the curricula of German gymnasia attention commensurate with his worth and dignity, a commentary must have in view not simply the explanation of difficulties in the syntax and the sense, but must also help to a thorough understanding of the contents of the book by discussing and grouping the matters of chief moment, by guidance in the analysis of the speeches, and by preparing the way for a good translation.

The text follows in the main that of Stahl's 'still unsurpassed *editio stereotypa*

1874,' deviations being indicated immediately below the text space. Very many, if not most, of the deviations simply follow, as Müller states, changes made by Stahl himself in the Poppo-Stahl edition of 1882. Notwithstanding his conservative standpoint the editor acknowledges—what every earnest student of Thucydides feels sooner or later—a growing respect for and confidence in Stahl's views, and this not in textual criticism alone.

Müller is however more conservative than even the Poppo-Stahl edition, rightly retaining the vulgate in the following (among other) important passages: 6 § 1 *προέλθοι*, Classen and Stahl *παρέλθοι*; 10 ὁ τῆς πόλεως, St. [ὁ τῆς πόλεως]; 12 § 5 *ἐξουσία*, St. [ἐξουσία]; 13 § 2 *αὐτονομίας*, St. *αὐτονομίας*; 29 § 4 τῶν Θρακῶν, St. [τὸ τῶν Θρακῶν]; 29 § 5 *οὐδεμιᾶς ἥσων μάλλον ἐτέρας*, St. *οὐδεμιᾶς ἥσων [μᾶλλον ἐτέρας]*; 31 § 4 *καταλύνουσι τὸν πόλεμον*, St. [τὸν πόλεμον]; 36 § 5 *τῷ*

ἀντίπρῳρον ἐνγκροῦσαι (with Cl. for vulg. τὸ), St. ἀντιπρόρῳ ἐνγκροῦσαι; 37 § 3 ἱππίας τε πολλούς, St. ἱππίας τε <τούς> πολλούς; 39 § 2 τῶν πωλουμένων, St. [τῶν πωλουμένων]; 42 § 4 and 86 § 2 omits ταύτην which St. inserts; 49 § 1 omits ὑποχέρια, which St. inserts; 52 § 2 τῶν Ἀθηναίων, St. [τῶν Ἀθηναίων]; 64 § 2 καὶ νῆες, St. [καὶ νῆες]; 69 § 2 αὐτοῖς, St. [αὐτοῖς]; 85 § 4 Σικελικῶ St. [Σικελικῶ].

Not to be commended perhaps is the bracketing with Cl. of ἐπτά ἢ ὀκτὼ σταδίων in 2 § 4, certainly not the adoption there with Cl. from *Vat.* of παρά for κατὰ, and the bracketing with Cl. of μέχρι in 7 § 1, as also with St. of ἐν ὀλκάσιν ἢ πλοίοις ἢ ἄλλως ὅπως ἂν in 7 § 3. In 16 § 2 Müller rightly inserts with St. καὶ ἑκατόν, as in 49 § 1 he reads with the same ἐθάρσῃσε κρατηθείς. In 57 § 8 ἐκ Ναυπάκτου, which St. and M. adopt from *Vat.*, seems to be decidedly preferable to Cl.'s ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ ἐκ Ναυπάκτου; and in 63 § 3 it seems better with St. and M. to bracket πολὺν πλεῖον, than with Cl. οὐκ ἔλασσαν; as also in 79 § 1 to bracket ἐλθεῖν with the former, rather than to defend it with the latter.

In 13 § 2 Müller has found no better explanation of ἐπ' αὐτομολίας προφάσει than Cl.'s 'on any (favourable) occasion for desertion.' No remedy is found for τινὰ τριχῇ in 32 § 2, nor for ὀλίγων in 75 § 4, except to bracket them. In 43 § 2 παρασκευὴν τοξενμάτων the difficulty is left unsolved. In 63 § 4 δικαιούσαν, St.'s emendation for δικαίως ἂν, is not adopted, the two words being simply bracketed, with Cl., as corrupt. In 71 § 2 διὰ τὸ * * ἀνώμαλον is considered 'corrupt and beyond remedy.' As the larger critical editions however have never satisfactorily solved these difficulties, we ought not to expect too much of a commentary of more modest pretensions. But in all these, as in other difficult passages, the student is at least fairly treated and informed of the various remedies that have been proposed.

In 25 § 6 Müller seems to be right in thinking that ἀνέκλων means *pulled out*, or, if *broke off*, that from the small boats ropes were put round the pales and these then wound up and broken off by windlasses on the ναὺς μυριοφόρος. For in drawing horizontally the small boats would be too light to break off the pales. See my note in Appendix on 25 § 25 (end).

In 28 § 3 Müller reads, μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς ἐπείξεν ὅτι δύο πολέμους ἅμα εἶχον καὶ ἐς φιλονικίαν καθέσταντο ταυτήν ἣν πρὶν γενέσθαι ἠπίστησεν ἂν τις ἀκούσας, τό γ' αὐτοὺς πολιορκουμένους ... ἀποστῆναι ... ἀντιπολιορκεῖν

ποιῆσαι, taking with St. the inf. as appos. explanation of ἣν. In l. 18 he rightly follows St. in taking ὅσον = *quatenus*, and ὥστε (not ὅμως δέ which Cl. conjectures) as correl. proper to τοσοῦτον.

29 § 5 καὶ ξυμφορὰ τῇ πόλει...δευνή the MSS. reading is retained, as shown above, and the passage rendered essentially as Jowett translates. 31 § 4 καταλύουσι τὸν πόλεμον is retained in the text and rendered 'abandon warlike intentions,' but in the Appendix mention is made of L. Herbst's conjecture, καταλύουσι τὸν πλοῦν, after vi. 34 § 6 καταλύσαι ἂν τὸν πλοῦν and (Pseud.) Dem. 4 τὸ μὲν πλεῖν καταλέλυκα.

In 41 § 2 αἱ κεραῖαι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἑσπλων... ἐκώλυνον, on account of the difficulty in understanding how the two cranes could work across an interval of two plethra, Müller thinks the ἑσπλοι here are probably not the intervals between each two ὀλκάδες, but the various *entrances* (as viewed from the sea side) or exits of the palisade itself, in front of each of which a merchantman carrying a dolphin-bearing crane on each side was placed just far enough out to leave on each side a space opening into the ἑσπλους about as wide as the ἑσπλους itself. In this way, it is true, the working of the crane becomes intelligible, but it is strange then that in 38 § 3 Thucydides so emphasized the distance of the ὀλκάδες from each other without mentioning that this was just the interval between the ἑσπλοι or exits from the palisade.

In the difficult passage 48 § 6 St.'s text is followed, καὶ μὴ, χρήμασιν ἕως πολὺν κρείσσους εἰσὶ, νικηθέντας ἀπιέναι, 'and not, while they are far superior in point of money, to depart just after a defeat.'

In 50 § 3 παρεσκευάσθαι, Abresch's emendation, is adopted with St., but with a slight difference in the rendering. Müller understands thus: 'the *strategi* of the Athenians proclaimed to *all*, i.e. all the troops without exception, the proposed departure, as secretly as possible from the enemy, and to hold themselves prepared, whenever the signal should be given, i.e. to be ready'; in other words, the announcement of departure is made to the army, and they begin at once secret preparations. The army is now in the 'alarm-state,' on the 'alarm-signal' (ὅταν τις σημήνη) they make final preparations for leaving.

This is enough to give a fair idea of Müller's treatment of the most difficult passages. In the Critical Appendix considerable space is devoted to the results of the latest investigations, especially in refe-

rence to ship-building and naval matters. And in general it may be said that the editor shows a thorough acquaintance with the most recent as well as the older literature connected with book vii. An especial merit of his edition is the careful use made throughout of the *Topografia Archaeologica di Siracusa* by Halm and the two Cavallaris.

The notes are below the text, on the same

page, as in the German editions generally and the American 'College Series of Greek Authors.' They are in general concise, clear, and to the point. It need hardly be added that the reviewer considers this a most excellent school edition.

CHARLES FORSTER SMITH.

Vanderbilt University.

LUDWIG VON SYBEL ON THE *SYMPOSIUM* OF PLATO.

Platon's Symposion: ein Programm der Academie, von L. v. SYBEL. 1888. Marburg: Elwert. Pp. viii. 122. 3 Mk.

THAT the *Phaedrus* was a sort of inaugural discourse or Programme (whatever that may mean with reference to Athenian modes of life) is a suggestion with which scholars have been familiar from the time of Schleiermacher. In this 'Gratulationsschrift,' written to mark the Jubilee of his father the historian's doctorate, Herr von Sybel defends the like hypothesis respecting the *Symposium*. Not that he conceives the dialogue in the strictest sense to have celebrated the Opening of the Academy; for 385 B.C., the *terminus a quo* for the composition of the *Symposium*, is at least two years subsequent to the most probable date of the foundation of the school. But he contends with much plausibility for the position that this dialogue was in some way nearly associated with the early days of the Academy and conveyed to those most concerned an intimation (*φωτὰντα συνοίον*) of the life and doctrine to be looked for there. Whether the shrine of Eros, which in later times was so conspicuous amongst those olive woods, had existed in the earliest times or not, it may well be that the peculiar form both of the *Symposium* and of the *Phaedrus* was not unconnected with it. Be all this as it may, the writing now before us, a *brochure* of 122 pages, is well worth reading, and will sustain the author's reputation as a student of the highest literature as well as of the history of art.

The philosophical content of the dialogue, although clearly stated, is not treated as the principal thing, and the discussion of it towards the beginning of the little work is unfortunately less interesting and less satisfactory than what follows it. The author is not free from the tendency to over-systematization which is the bane of Platonic criti-

cism. His formal tabulations imply a preciseness of schematism which is foreign to Plato at his best.

It is in the second and third portions of the treatise, where he is dealing with the literary form and of the ethical spirit of the *Symposium*, that the genial force of this interpreter becomes clearly marked. Instead of the pedantic minuteness with which recent commentators have perplexed the student, by finding some rhetorical artifice or commonplace at every turn, till Plato's pages are with Rhythmik and Kolometry 'scribbled o'er,' Von Sybel justly throws into relief the special flourishes of Pausanias and Agathon. He estimates at its true value the frequency of anacoluthon, and assigns the proper reason for it:—

Die Sprache als Ausdrucksweise ist die beste Conversationssprache, welche im Bereiche des Griechischen jemals zu Papier gebracht worden ist. Ganz allein der Logik des Gedankens folgend bedient sie sich der möglicher Ausdrucksformen mit aller Freiheit. Zahllos sind im Symposion die Anacoluthien der Form, an keiner Stelle bleibt die Möglichkeit eines Zweifels am Gedankengang. Es ist ein Genuss den feinen Bewegungen dieser Sprache zu folgen (p. 97).

Our author has many subtle observations on the persons of the dialogue and their significance in leading up to, or in developing, the central thought. And he distinguishes with equal subtilty and accuracy between the husk and the kernel, the vehicle and the main lesson conveyed. It is impossible in a short notice to do justice to a work of which the parts are so intimately blended and so finely interlaced. Suffice it to say that in these few pages the contents of this important dialogue are enucleated and presented analytically in various novel lights with grace and skill, and that the whole interpretation is vitally suffused with a keen sense of the realities of Hellenic life, and of their world-historical significance.