

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](#)



Stahl's Revision of Poppo's Thucydides, Book II *Thucydidis de hello Peloponnesiaco libri octo explanavit* Ebnestus Fridericus Poppo. Editio tertia quam auxit et emendavit Joannes Matthias Stahl. Vol. I. Sect. II. [Book II.] Leipzig: Teubner. 1889. pp. 260. 3 Mk.

Harold N. Fowler

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 06 / June 1890, pp 249 - 250
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190729, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190729

How to cite this article:

Harold N. Fowler (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 249-250 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190729

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

would not only be out of place here: there is no place for it in the Epistle. The person who had contracted the scandalous marriage has been expelled from the church. The Judaizing party are in rebellion, on other grounds. But the 'Antinomian' section of St. Paul's followers have made full and absolute submission. The crucial test of their submission was their treatment of the wrong-doer. They have expelled him, and expressed the deepest and fullest contrition for his fault, as in part their own. On this point St. Paul is not only satisfied, but abundantly and warmly grateful: *ἐν παντὶ συνεστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀγνοῦς εἶναι τῷ πράγματι. χαίρω, ὅτι ἐν παντὶ θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν.*

So much for the 'problem.' It may be that my solution of it is too bold; but this is better than ignoring it. It will be noticed that the suggestion of an error possibly much more ancient than our oldest MSS. is not altogether met by a reminder of 'the probability that copies of the Pauline letters were multiplied from the very first.' Of such letters as 'Romans' and 'Ephesians,' naturally: letters equally interesting, one of them to all European, the other to all Asiatic,

Gentile churches; and one of them possibly, the other certainly, addressed by St. Paul to more churches than one. But why also of this second letter to Corinth, so intimate, so personal, from the first line to the last?

I suppose the intermingling with 2 Cor. of this passage from the lost letter, if such it be, to have been accidental. Mr. Chase's quotation from Deut. xi. 16 suggests, however, another possibility. Some one, with a keen eye for verbal resemblances, reminded by St. Paul's *πλατύνθητε* of the *πλατυθῆ* of the Deuteronomist, and seeing some connexion between the heart's *πλατυσμός* enjoined by the former and the immoral *πλατυσμός* condemned by the latter, may have thought it edifying to insert the one passage (presumably also of St. Paul's writing) as an antidote to the other. Mr. Chase thinks that, if the passage in question were what I have supposed, it would contain the exact phrase *μὴ συναγαμίγνησθε πόρνους*. This objection would have been of more force if the question had been of a whole letter, supposed to be the lost letter, and not of a fragment.

R. WHITELAW.

STAHL'S REVISION OF POPPO'S THUCYDIDES, Book II.

Thucydidis de bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo explanavit ERNESTUS FRIDERICUS POPPO. Editio tertia quam auxit et emendavit JOANNES MATTHIAS STAHL. Vol. I. Sect. II. [Book II.] Leipzig: Teubner. 1889. pp. 260. 3 Mk.

THIS volume completes Stahl's revision of Poppo's Thucydides. As in the previous volumes, the original notes are for the most part retained, though the present editor has so revised the work as to make himself responsible for the whole, and to put upon it the imprint of his own scholarship. So in the first chapter, Stahl takes *ἐν ᾧ* in a temporal sense with *ἐνθὲνδε*, and thinks that the passage shows that Thucydides was acquainted with the whole course of the war. The text differs (besides corrections of orthography) in many cases from that of Poppo, the changes consisting for the most part in the exclusion of words which seem to have crept into the text from marginal notes. Examples of such exclusion are 4, 2 *τοῦ μὴ ἐκφεύγειν*, 4, 4 *λαθόντες καὶ*, 4, 5 *πλησίον*, 29, 2 *ὁ τοῦ Σιτάλκου πατήρ*, 29, 3 *ὁ Τηρέυς*, 89, 3 *ἐκάτεροί τι*, 96, 1 *ἐς τὸν Εὐξείνῳ τε πόντον καὶ*

τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον, and many others might be added. Other changes are made, sometimes for grammatical reasons, e.g. 3, 2 *κρατήσεν* for *κρατῆσαι*, 83, 3 *διαβάλλοντες* for *διαβαλλόντων*, sometimes because the sense or the connexion seems to demand it, e.g. 65, 12 *δέκα μὲν ἔτη* for *τρία μὲν ἔτη*, 2, 1 *τέσσαρας μῆνας* for *δύο μῆνας* (see below), 40, 1 *τὴν πόλιν ἀξίαν* < *νομίζω* > *εἶναι* where *νομίζω* is inserted by Stahl, 44, 1 *ἐντελευτήσῃ* < *ἡ εὐδαιμονία* > *ξυμετρήθη* where *ἡ εὐδαιμονία* is newly inserted. These changes, a complete list of which would occupy too much space, are all in the direction of a more consistent and comprehensible text, and they certainly render the text more readable. It is, however, by no means certain that Thucydides invariably expressed himself in the way most easily understood by modern readers, nor that he was always perfectly consistent in his mode of expression. So the change in 83, 3 mentioned above removes a grammatical solecism, but such a solecism is more likely to have been committed by Thucydides than by any copyist who transcribed the work at a time when the rules of grammar were much more carefully observed than

when Thucydides arose as the pioneer in the realm of Attic narrative prose. The chief (or I may say the only) fault of this excellent edition is this attempt to make Thucydides regular in his use of language, and even in this Stahl displays moderation.

The texts and notes are followed by three appendices. Of these II. (ad 52, 3 et 84, 1) and III. (ad 102, 3, 4) are retained from Poppo's edition of 1866; appendix I. treats *de temporum ratione Thucydidea*, and is divided into two sections: (1) *de annorum in aestates et hiemes distributione*, and (2) *de belli Peloponnesiaci initio*. In section I Stahl adopts the now generally received opinion, that *summer* in Thucydides includes spring, and begins at the vernal equinox. This opinion is supported by discussion of the passages in which the beginning of spring is mentioned. It is, however, in conflict with the statement, II. 75, 3, that the Peloponnesians were engaged for seventy days in building the mound at the siege of Plataeae. For the expedition against Plataeae was made ἀκμάζοντος τοῦ σίτου (II. 79, 1), *i.e.* about eighty days (though it may well be less) after the beginning of spring. Before active operations were begun negotiations were carried on (II. 71, 72) and messengers went to Athens (73) and returned (74). Then the Peloponnesians cut down trees and built a palisade about the city, after which they worked (says our text) seventy days at their mound and tried to take the city with the aid of machines (75, 76). They then tried to set fire to the town. When all other means had failed, they set about building a wall of circumvallation (after having dismissed the greater part of their army, as our texts read, but Stahl rejects this clause), making brick from ditches which they dug, one on each side of their wall (78, 1). This wall surrounded the entire town, was double, and had high towers, besides dwellings for the garrison (III. 21), so that it must have taken much longer to build than the first mound. This wall was finished about the middle of September (περὶ ἀρκτούρου ἐπιτολής, II. 78, 2). Now if the expedition was undertaken in June, ἀκμάζοντος τοῦ σίτου, and seventy days were occupied in building the mound, besides the time necessary for the previous negotiations etc., very little time remains for the building of the wall. Stahl therefore thinks

the building of the mound occupied not seventy days, but nine (θ' for σ'), which comparison with similar works elsewhere mentioned shows to be sufficient. Whatever we may think about the particular emendation suggested, Stahl's arguments against the common reading are sound. Stahl further shows that by the expression (V. 20, 1) καὶ ἡμερῶν ὀλίγων παρενεγκουσῶν days to be subtracted from, not added to, the ten years' period are meant. Thucydides includes autumn in the summer (II. 31, 1; III. 18, 3; 100, 2; VII. 79, 3; VIII. 108, 2), and autumn was reckoned as the period from the morning rising of Arcturus to the morning setting of the Pleiades, *i.e.* from about the middle of September to the tenth of November. The winter then lasted from about the tenth of November until the beginning of spring. This is confirmed by plentiful reference, and seems indubitably correct.

The attack upon Plataeae, which Thucydides regards as the beginning of the war, was made at the beginning of spring (II. 2, 1), a few days before the full of the moon (II. 4, 2), which was in that year on the night of April 6-7. Then the reading in II. 2, 1 Πυθόδωρου ἔτι δύο μῆνας ἀρχοντος Ἀθηναίων cannot be correct if the Athenian archons began their year of office in the month of Hecatombaeon, for Hecatombaeon began in 431 B.C. on August 1st, *i.e.* four months after the beginning of April. Hence Stahl reads after Krüger τέσσαρας μῆνας. It also follows from V. 20, 1 that the beginning of the war was four, not two, months before the beginning of Hecatombaeon. In II. 2, 1 Stahl reads (after Lipsius) μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ποτιδαίᾳ μάχην μηνὶ ἕκτῳ < καὶ δεκάτῳ >, for the attack upon Plataeae was not six, but sixteen months after the battle at Potidaea. This appears from *Inscr. Att.* I. 179, for the battle at Sybota was about the middle of Metageitnion B.C. 433, and that at Potidaea soon after, *i.e.* early in the winter of 433-432. Stahl's discussion touches also upon several other points. This appendix is a valuable contribution to the literature of Thucydidean chronology, and adds not a little to the value of a book which would be excellent without it. Stahl's Thucydides is indispensable to students of that author, all of whom will rejoice that the work is now completed.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.