



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

their linguistic coloring, and another of our oldest monuments, 'La Passion du Christ,' is a mixture of French and Provençal.

It is therefore legitimate, in the present instance, to admit this influence, and it is gratifying to note that in this case old texts do support an argument that is based upon a dialectic fact.

CHICAGO, Oct. 22, 1894.

RENÉ DE POYEN-BELLISLE.

NOTES ON THUCYDIDES, I 8. 1; I 9. 3; I 28. 3.

Thucydides, in speaking of the purification of Delos by the Athenians, says (I 8. 1) that over half of the dead buried in the island were found to be Carians, *γνωσθέντες τῇ τε σκευῇ τῶν ὀπλων ξυντεθαμμένη καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ ᾧ νῦν ἔτι θάπτουσιν*. This Jowett renders: "They were known by the fashion of their arms which were buried with them, and by their mode of burial, the same which is still practised among them." If this were what Thucydides intended to say, he would naturally have written, if the word *σκευή* could mean fashion in the sense attributed to it by Jowett, *τῇ τε σκευῇ τῶν ὀπλων τῶν ξυντεθαμμένων κτέ.*, for it is the arms, not the fashion of the arms, that were buried. The note in Morris's edition reads: "*ξυντεθαμμένη*: attrib. to *σκευῇ*," referring to c. 7, §1, where an attributive participle is placed after its noun without repetition of the article, and to a note on c. 11, §3, which reads: "Thuc. often places an attrib. partic. after a noun which is attended by other modifiers. Cf. c. 90. 7; 96. 8; III 54. 18; 56. 5; 67. 11. So Dem. XX 76, *ταῦτα ἐλάττω φανῆναι τῆς ἐν ἐκάστῳ νῦν περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξης ὑπαρχούσης*. XVIII 126." This note implies the same interpretation as Jowett's translation.

The correct interpretation is given in Stahl's note: "agniti habitu armorum, seu armatura quippe quae cum iis sepulta esset." Stahl cites some instances of the use of *σκευή* in a sense similar to that which he assigns to it here, but he does not go far enough. In fact, I have not found any instance of *σκευή* in the sense of *fashion*. It means everywhere in Thucydides, and, so far as I have been able to discover, in every other author, *equipment*, *costume*, *outfit*, and the like, i. e. not merely the *fashion* of arms, garments, ornaments, etc., but the objects themselves, so that *σκευή τῶν ὀπλων* means *outfit of arms* or *military outfit*. This statement is sufficiently confirmed by looking up the references

in L. and S.'s Lexicon, or those in Stephanus' Thesaurus. Stahl at the end of his note cites the opinion of Campe, obs. crit., p. 10 sq., "that the Carians were recognized by the mere fact that their arms were found in the graves; for the Greeks were not accustomed to bury arms with their dead." This opinion of Campe is correct if applied to the Greeks of the time of Thucydides; at least, it is supported by modern excavations. In the Mitth. d. k. deut. arch. Inst., Athens, 1893, pp. 73-191, Brueckner and Pernice describe in detail the cemetery just outside the walls of Athens. In graves of the 'Dipylon period,' which cannot reach down lower than the end of the seventh century B. C., some blades of swords and daggers and some spearheads were found, but the later graves are without weapons. As these investigators say (p. 147), "wir wüssten kein späteres attisches Grab, in welchem Waffen gefunden worden wären." They cautiously limit their statement to Attic graves, though this limitation is hardly necessary, as scientific investigation of graves of the classical period is almost confined to Attica. In the Mitth., 1886, pp. 15-46, F. Dümmler describes and discusses remains of pre-Hellenic population in the Cyclades, taking his data from graves at Amorgos and Melos. In these graves a few isolated daggers and spearheads were found, and, according to report, a silver helmet was found in a grave at Amorgos some thirty years before. Dümmler very properly says that if the population of these islands was Carian, we should expect, according to Thucydides, "eine reiche regelmässige Beilage von Waffen," and partly, as it appears, because such a rich deposit of weapons is lacking, he is inclined to assign these graves to Leleges. At any rate, Dümmler seems to understand Thucydides to mean what an unprejudiced reader would naturally gather from his words, that the Carians were recognized by the fact that their military outfit was buried with them. It is perhaps worth while to mention that Blümner's statement in Baumeister's Denkmäler, article 'Bestattung,' p. 305, to the effect that weapons were buried in the graves of the Greeks, needs correction.

Thucydides, I 9, 3, after having told how the Pelopidae gained their power, proceeds: *ἃ μοι δοκεῖ Ἀγαμέμνων παραλαβὼν καὶ ναυτικῷ τε ἅμα ἐπὶ πλείον τῶν ἄλλων ἰσχύσας τὴν στρατείαν οὐ χάριτι τὸ πλείον ἢ φόβῳ ἐναγαγὼν ποιήσασθαι.* The difficulty lies in *καὶ ναυτικῷ τε ἅμα.* Here Classen regarded *τε* as the conjunction, taking *καὶ*—*ἅμα* not as a copula, but as an adverb emphasizing the new element of power.

Krüger, v. Herwerden and Böhme omit $\tau\epsilon$. Stahl reads $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ for $\tau\epsilon$, as does also Herbst, Philol. XXIV, p. 720. Shilleto renders $\tau\epsilon$ 'too,' and Jowett, in a long note on this passage, pronounces in favor of the same rendering. As the clearest examples of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ — $\tau\epsilon$ occurring in the same clause, Jowett quotes VI 44. 3 and VIII 68. 2. In the first instance Jowett himself, in his note on the passage, suggests that the $\tau\epsilon$ may be a correlative of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, at the beginning of the next sentence. The same explanation is possible in the second case, where, however, Haacke, followed by Krüger and others, changes $\tau\epsilon$ to $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. Jowett does not make the use of $\tau\epsilon$ in the sense of 'too' very probable for Thucydides, and it seems to me that Herbst's objections to Classen's interpretation are well founded. I am inclined, therefore, to believe that $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\epsilon\zeta\tilde{\omega}$ or the like has fallen out, or possibly was originally intended and never written. This is a desperate solution of the difficulty, but perhaps as easy as any.

The Corcyraeans, in their speech at Corinth, offered to leave their differences to the decision of the god at Delphi, and protested against war, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\mu\eta$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ (Thuc. I 28. 3), $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omega\nu$ $\beta\iota\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$, $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\omicron\upsilon$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$ $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$, $\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$. No doubt, so far as I know, has ever been expressed as to the text. But interpretations are various. If $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ were omitted, all would be easy, but $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ can hardly have got into the text by mistake, and must therefore be explained. Arnold's note reads: "'to gain friends of a very different nature from their present associates,' that is, from the exiles of Epidamnus, with whom they were then acting in concert." He seems to regard $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ as an intensive adding force to $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, a use for which there appears to be no precedent. Krüger explains $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ as the Athenians and $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$ as the Peloponnesians. On $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ he quotes Gottleber, translating $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ *vielmehr* and adding "mit Stephanus auf $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ zu beziehen." But $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is incomprehensible unless $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ be included. Stahl says: " $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$ $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$, alios potius quam qui tunc essent." He mentions the opinion of Arnold and Goeller that the present friends are the Epidamnians and others in the neighborhood of Corcyra, but adds that perhaps the Peloponnesians are intended, because, although the Corcyraeans were not enrolled in the Peloponnesian alliance, the memory of their common origin was not lost, and they preserved some friendship with them as Dorians, for which reason the Lacedae-

monians and Sicyonians had accompanied them to Corinth. He then concludes: "ceterum μάλλον, πρότις, ad φίλους ποιείσθαι ἐτέρους pertinet; futurum enim esse aiunt ut cogantur alios potius amicos sibi conciliare." The only trouble with this is, that μάλλον is really not accounted for. ἐτέρους τῶν νῦν ὄντων (parallels for ἐτέρους with genitive are given by Stahl, Krüger and others) without μάλλον means 'alios potius quam qui tunc essent.' Morris's note says nothing about μάλλον, but gives references for the genitive depending on ἐτέρους, and explains that τῶν νῦν ὄντων "refers rather to the Lacedaemonians and Sicyonians, who were with them, than to the Illyrians, whom they would hardly call φίλοι." This last, which is also Stahl's opinion, is certainly correct, though not because they would object to calling the Illyrians φίλοι, but because the Corcyraeans wish to imply a threat that they will turn from their natural allies, the Peloponnesians, to the Athenians. And it seems to me that μάλλον helps this meaning and is otherwise useless. "We," they say, "shall be forced to make friends other than (i. e. different from) those who are now more (μάλλον) our friends," i. e. other than the Peloponnesians, who are more our friends by race and nature than are the Athenians, although we are not (31, §2) members of any alliance. The word μάλλον governs φίλων (supplied from the preceding φίλους) ὄντων.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.

NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES' CLOUDS.

- ΜΑΘ. ἐχθὲς δέ γ' ἡμῖν δεῖπνον οὐκ ἦν ἐσπέρας.
 ΣΤΡ. εἶεν· τί οὖν πρὸς τ᾽ ἄλφιτ' ἐπαλαμῆσατο;
 ΜΑΘ. κατὰ τῆς τραπέζης καταπάσας λεπτήν τέφραν,
 κάμψας ὀβελίσκον, εἶτα διαβήτην λαβῶν—
 ἐκ τῆς παλαιίστρας θυμάτιον ὑφείλετο.
 ΣΤΡ. τί δῆτ' ἐκείνον τὸν Θαλῆν θανμάζομεν;

—VV. 175-180.

G. Hermann first brought a measure of sense into this passage by his happy conjecture of θυμάτιον in line 179 for θοιμάτιον of the MSS, noting the sacrifice alluded to in Plato, *Lysis* 206 E. With θυμάτιον we have actual meat, and so we may put aside the scholia and the numberless interpretations founded on the MSS reading. Blaydes, indeed, reverts to θοιμάτιον (1890, *θυμ.* 1886), but with