

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THUCYDIDES 1. 74. 1 AND THE USE OF ἙΣ WITH NUMERALS

THUCYDIDES 1. 74. 1

At Thucydides 1. 74. 1 some Athenian ambassadors speaking to a meeting of the Peloponnesian League at Sparta in 432 are made to boast of the outstanding contribution their city had made to the repulse of Xerxes:

τρία τὰ ὠφελιμώτατα ἐς αὐτὸ παρεσχόμεθα, ἀριθμὸν τε νῶν πλείστον καὶ ἄνδρα στρατηγὸν
 ξυνετώτατον καὶ προθυμίαν ἀοκνοτάτην. ναὺς μὲν γὰρ ἐς τὰς τετρακοσίας ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους
 τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, Θεμιστοκλέα δὲ ἄρχοντα . . . προθυμίαν δὲ καὶ πολὺ τολμηροτάτην
 εἰδείξαμεν. . . .¹

Gomme, in his note on this passage, raised three questions regarding the numerical justification here offered of the claim that Athens contributed “the largest number of ships” to the war effort. (1) If the speaker (i.e., Thucydides) had in mind Herodotus’ figure (8. 43–48 and 82), namely, a total of 378 Greek ships at Salamis, of which 200 (180 manned by Athenians and 20 lent to the Chalcidians) were Athenian, is it too much of an exaggeration for an orator to say that the Athenians contributed “a little less than two-thirds” of the whole fleet (given in round figures as 400 ships)?² (2) Should it concern us that Thucydides gave the total as

1. All quotations from Thucydides not otherwise attributed are from H. S. Jones’s OCT, emended and augmented by J. E. Powell (1942).

2. The variant reading *τριακοσίας* appears in some manuscripts; see J. Classen and J. Steup (eds.), *Thukydides*, 8 vols. (Berlin, 1892–1922), and A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1945–70), ad loc. If that is what Thucydides wrote, then he was following the Aeschylean (see n. 3) rather than the Herodotean tradition. There is no conclusive paleographic argument to decide the question: if Thucydides wrote *τριακοσίας*, the variant *τετρακοσίας* will have arisen from an editor who wanted to make him agree with Herodotus; if the original reading was *τετρακοσίας*, one can assume that an editor corrected this to *τριακοσίας* to agree with Aeschylus and the authors who followed him. Note, however, that if Thucydides’ orator thought that the total number of ships was 300, then his description of the Athenian contingent as *ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους τῶν δύο μοιρῶν* of this total makes sense only if he excluded the 20 ships lent to the Chalcidians, thus reducing the Athenian contribution to only 180. That an orator in a mood of patriotic exaggeration should have neglected to include every ship that Athens could possibly claim seems unlikely, and decisive in favor of *τετρακοσίας*.

Herodotus’ figures have provoked much discussion in themselves, because the first four contingents are the same in the lists for both Artemisium and Salamis (8. 1 and 8. 43–48) and because of the discrepancy in the latter passage between the sum of the individual contingents detailed (366) and the total given by Herodotus (378); see R. W. Macan (ed.), *Herodotus: The Seventh, Eighth & Ninth Books* (London, 1908), ad loc., for possible solutions to this problem. Dispute has also focused on whether Aeschylus, who gave 310 as the size of the whole Greek fleet at Salamis (*Pers.* 338–40; see n. 3), is to be believed in preference to Herodotus. C. Hignett, *Xerxes’ Invasion of Greece* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 209–10, and A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* (London, 1962), pp. 441–43, are both inclined to accept the suggestion of W. W. Tarn, “The Fleet of Xerxes,” *JHS* 28 (1908): 219, that the figures in the list at Hdt. 8. 43–48 are “campaign totals, the sum total of the individual ships of each state commissioned during the summer of 480 B.C.” If this is correct, then Aeschylus’ 310, which Tarn, Hignett, and Burn all calculate to be approximately correct on other grounds, can be accepted without hesitation as the total for the Greek fleet at Salamis. The orator in Thucydides, who was speaking in general terms, naturally referred to Herodotus’ campaign total (378) rather than to the figure (310) attached specifically to Salamis by Aeschylus.

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

400 ships, while Aeschylus, Demosthenes, and Nepos gave it as 300?³ (3) What exactly is the construction of ναὺς . . . ἐς τὰς τετρακοσίας ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους τῶν δύο μοιρῶν?

Gomme argued that neither (1) the degree of exaggeration in this statement (200 is only 53 percent of 378) nor (2) the existence of another, lower, figure in some accounts was sufficient reason to doubt the correctness of the text. The grammatical question (3), however, he found problematic. In fact, he pronounced the text on this ground unacceptable, and suggested two possible emendations. His comment shows that he took ἐς τὰς τετρακοσίας to modify ναὺς, a reading that causes confusion, as he says, by frustrating the reader's expectation that the first accusative will be the direct object of the verb (παρεσχόμεθα, understood from the previous clause). Another difficulty is that, if one takes ἐς as qualifying the numeral (τετρακοσίας) in the sense of "about," nothing remains to indicate the relationship between the two accusatives (ναὺς . . . ἐς τὰς τετρακοσίας and ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους <ναὺς> τῶν δύο μοιρῶν).

Gomme's difficulty clearly stemmed from a misconstruction of ἐς. The clause reads satisfactorily if one takes ἐς not as qualifying τετρακοσίας ("about 400 [ships]") but in its basic meaning of "to" ("... [we supplied] a little less than two-thirds of the ships to the 400 [ships] that constituted the Greek fleet . . ."). This interpretation has been advocated by several editors,⁴ and must be correct. Others besides Gomme, however, have misconstrued this passage,⁵ and it is worth trying to identify what in its wording should have led people astray. One major problem is the ambiguity of ἐς when closely followed by a numeral, since in many such cases ἐς appears to be used, like περί, or ὡς, or μάλιστα, to qualify the numeral, in the sense of "about" or "approximately." And the fact that the figure which follows ἐς here (400) was a round approximation of the actual figure (378) made many scholars look for some qualifying word to signal this imprecision. Second, the proportional designation (ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους τῶν δύο μοιρῶν) attached to the Athenian contingent of the fleet generates an expectation of a partitive genitive specifying the whole fleet.⁶ Why did Thucydides not fulfill this expectation by writing ναὺς (or νεῶν) μέν γε τῶν τετρακοσίων ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους τῶν δύο μοιρῶν (sc. παρεσχόμεθα)? Partly, no doubt, because he felt that such an accumulation of genitives would be con-

3. For the variant reading *τριακοσίας* in Thucydides, see n. 2. Aeschylus' total for Salamis (*Pers.* 338–40) may be either 300 or 310, depending on whether the squadron of ten is taken as part of the 300 or as an addition to it. H. J. Rose, *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam, 1957), p. 116, argues for the latter interpretation; H. D. Broadhead, *The "Persae" of Aeschylus* (Cambridge, 1960), ad loc., for the former. Demosthenes (18. 238) and Nepos (*Them.* 3. 2) both state that Athens contributed 200 of a total of 300 Greek ships.

4. See J. J. Owen (ed.), *Thucydides I–III* (New York, 1858), p. 314; Classen–Steup, *Thukydides*⁶, ad 1. 74. 1. The occurrence of the definite article between ἐς and the numeral (ἐς τὰς τετρακοσίας) is another indication that ἐς here does not qualify the numeral: the definite article does not appear in this position in any of the twenty-six cases of qualifying ἐς in Thucydides (listed below, n. 14).

5. Both H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae ab Henrico Stephano constructus*, vol. 3, ed. C. B. Hase, G. Dindorf, and L. Dindorf (Paris, 1863), cols. 294–95, and A. Matthiae, *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1807), p. 845, cited this passage as an example of ἐς meaning "about." LSJ⁹, s.v. εἰς, III. 2, list Thuc. 1. 74. 1 separately, not as an instance of εἰς meaning "about"; but they group it with Thuc. 1. 100. 1, which surely is an instance of qualifying εἰς. T. Arnold, *The History of the Peloponnesian War by Thucydides* (Oxford and London, 1868), ad 1. 74. 1, argued that ἐς with numbers never means "about" but always "up to" or "as many as," translations which are no less inappropriate in this passage than "about," since they, too, are expressions normally used to qualify numerals (see n. 13).

6. Cf. Thuc. 2. 98. 4, where there is no other genitive to complicate the syntax.

fusing.⁷ But he was doubtless influenced also by the run of the previous sentence (*τρία τὰ ὠφελιώτατα ἐς αὐτὸ παρεσχόμεθα . . .*), where *παρέχεσθαι* is completed by *ἐς αὐτό*.⁸

Two other passages in Thucydides where *ἐς* introduces a numeral without qualifying it (6. 8. 1 and 8. 29. 2) provide an interesting comparison. In these passages, too, the prepositional phrase appears to have been used for greater clarity to replace a simple genitive or dative of the noun. In both cases the obscurity that motivated this change of construction was caused by the word *μισθός*, which can generate dependent genitives and datives of several types (as, e.g., to denote the recipient of the payment, or the task or the period of time for which he was paid).⁹ But in spite of this similarity of construction, 6. 8. 1 and 8. 29. 2 lack the same possibility of confusion as 1. 74. 1, for in neither of them is the figure known to be rounded, and therefore felt to require qualification, nor is the noun to which the figure applies omitted.¹⁰

ἐς AS A NUMERAL QUALIFIER

The confusion evident in the comments of editors and grammarians on the construction and meaning of *ἐς* at 1. 74. 1 prompts a more general investigation of how *ἐς* functions in passages where most would interpret it as qualifying the numeral. First, some general remarks about qualification. A numeral qualifier can be defined as an expression (consisting of one or more words) attached to a figure to indicate that that figure is something other than the precise figure which applied (or applies, or will apply) to any one actual case of the phenomenon described. Qualifiers are of two main types, "approximating" and "comparative," the former naming a figure as being in the neighborhood of the precise actual figure, the latter specifying that the figure mentioned lies above or below the precise actual figure. Thus, if "about 500" people are said to have died in an earthquake, the speaker is expressing the belief that the exact figure lies within a range extending not too far on either side of 500; the extent of the range is not defined, but varies, in practice, with the size of the number mentioned. If, on the other hand, the casualties are said to number "more than 500" or "somewhat less than 500," this comparative qualification signifies that the exact figure is believed to lie within a certain distance of 500, but only on one side of that figure. The simplest cases to interpret of both kinds of qualification are those where the speaker is clearly mentioning one figure (qualified) as a compromise among several different figures, as when he gives an average figure (e.g., that for the

7. This was Classen-Steup's explanation. Gomme, while denying that Thucydides would have taken such steps to avoid two genitives (on the rather insufficient ground that he did not do so at 1. 75. 1), apparently agreed that he would have expected a partitive genitive here.

8. *Αὐτό* has no definite antecedent, but refers generally to the Greek victory over Xerxes. Other examples of *παρέχεσθαι ἐς* (or *εἰς*) with a noun denoting the group to which something was supplied are Thuc. 6. 83. 1 (another Athenian orator alludes to the same episode in Athens' history in very similar terms, substituting "the Greeks" for "the 400 ships" as the object of *ἐς*) and Xen. *Anab.* 6. 2. 10 (. . . *μυθμίαν δύναμιν παρεχόμενος εἰς τὴν στρατιάν*—the closest parallel to Thuc. 1. 74. 1).

9. Cf. Thuc. 1. 143. 2 and 8. 97. 1 for other solutions to the same problem. For other passages where Thucydides seems to have altered his syntax to avoid piling up genitives or datives, see Dover's notes ad 7. 28. 3 and 6. 4. 6 (citing 5. 33. 1, where Gomme-Andrewes had not suggested this possibility, 6. 18. 6, and 7. 71. 5).

10. There are problems of text and arithmetic at 8. 29. 2, but they do not affect this argument.

tribute received by Athens annually; at Thuc. 2. 13. 1, *ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ* is an approximating qualifier) or mentions the highest or lowest figure ever reached in a certain circumstance (e.g., the estimate of the maximum time for which people predicted that Athens might withstand Peloponnesian invasions; at Thuc. 7. 28. 3, *οὐδείς . . . πλεόν* is a comparative qualifier). Less straightforward, though more common, are cases where the reference in the speaker's mind to more than one figure is implied rather than stated. He may be indicating the range within which several possible figures in a single instance are felt to lie (e.g., at Thuc. 5. 74. 3, *περί* names 500 as the midpoint in the range of figures considered possible for the Lacedaemonian dead; and at 4. 72. 1, *οὐκ ἔλασσον* names 6,000 as the lower limit of the range of possible figures for Brasidas' hoplite troops) or a nodal point near which the exact but uneven figure is known to lie (e.g., at Thuc. 1. 118. 2, *μάλιστα* names 50 years as the midpoint of a range of periods within which the exact figure, probably 48 or 49 years, lies).¹¹

Most qualifying expressions, in English or in Greek, belong to one of these two major types. Thus, "about," "in the neighborhood of," *περί, μάλιστα* are approximating qualifiers, whereas "at least," "a maximum of," "almost," *οὐκ ἐλάσσους, πλείους* are comparative qualifiers.¹² If we ask, however, to which type the preposition *ἐς* belongs, we find ourselves in a difficulty. *Ἐς* is, of course, a very common preposition, which has many uses; but the one that comes closest to its use as a numeral qualifier is that in which it designates a limit of some kind (e.g., Hdt. 1. 52 *ἐς ἐμέ*, "down to my time"; Thuc. 1. 51. 3 *ἡ ναυμαχία ἐτελεύτα ἐς νύκτα*, "the sea-battle drew to an end toward nightfall").¹³ If *ἐς* were used to qualify numerals in this "limiting" sense, it would have much the same force as those comparative expressions which name the upper rather than the lower limit of a certain numerical range (like *οὐ πλείους* or *ἐλάσσους*). In some passages this is fairly clearly the case, but in others it seems at least doubtful. Furthermore, this interpretation runs counter to the equation that is often assumed between *ἐς* as a numeral qualifier and words like *μάλιστα, ὡς*, and *περί*, which are approximating rather than comparative qualifiers. What are we to make of this apparent contradiction? In order to suggest a solution it will be necessary to examine the twenty-six passages in Thucydides (apart from the three already discussed, 1. 74. 1, 6. 8. 1, and 8. 29. 2) where *ἐς* occurs in combination with a numeral,¹⁴ and to compare the use of *ἐς* here with that of approximating qualifiers such as *μάλιστα, ὡς*, and *περί*.

There is one passage where *ἐς* makes sense only if taken in that limiting sense which resembles comparative qualification. At 4. 118. 3, Thucydides quotes a clause of a truce between the Athenian and Peloponnesian alliances stipulating

11. The passages cited in this paragraph are more fully discussed in my paper, "Qualification of Numerals in Thucydides," forthcoming in *AJAH* 3 (1978).

12. See the paper cited in the preceding note.

13. Cf. R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, vol. 2.1 (Hannover and Leipzig, 1890), p. 469, on *εἰς* used to qualify numerals: "zur Angabe des quantitativen Zieles, bis auf, bes. bei ungefähren Zahlangaben." The translations proposed by Arnold, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, ad 1. 74. 1, of qualifying *εἰς*, "up to" and "as many as," are of this limiting type.

14. The twenty-six passages are the following: 1. 100. 1, 1. 115. 4, 3. 20. 2, 3. 70. 6, 3. 85. 1, 3. 107. 3, 3. 111. 4, 3. 114. 4, 4. 48. 1, 4. 80. 4, 4. 118. 5, 4. 124. 1, 5. 3. 4, 5. 6. 5, 6. 67. 2, 7. 1. 5, 7. 19. 3, 7. 30. 3, 7. 32. 2 (2 cases), 7. 33. 1, 8. 10. 3, 8. 21. 1, 8. 32. 2, 8. 44. 4, 8. 73. 2.

that the latter shall use oared ships only “up to a burden of 500 talents.” This framing of a prescription to apply to all cases of a certain activity for some future period naturally requires neither an exact figure (“500 T”), which would be inappropriately precise, nor an approximate figure (“about 500 T”), which would be inappropriately vague, but a maximum limit, defining a permissible range of figures. A comparative qualifier (“not more than 500 T”) would have served equally well. In a second passage *ἐς* has generally been glossed with a comparative qualifier. At 4. 124. 1, the qualifying expression is *ὀλίγον ἐς*, a combination of words that seems not to occur as a numeral qualifier elsewhere in Thucydides or any other author, but which most editors have interpreted as equivalent to *ὀλίγη ἐλάσσους*.¹⁵ In these two passages, then, *ἐς* functions more like a comparative than an approximating qualifier.

In the other twenty-four passages the use of *ἐς* is harder to categorize. First, there are a number of passages where the figure introduced by *ἐς* appears to be specified as the total obtained by adding together several groups of people or ships. At 8. 10. 2–3 this is particularly clear because the prepositional phrase, *ἐς ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα*, makes sense only if taken adverbially to express the result of the action described in the participle (“... the Athenians later manned other ships in addition, to a total of 37 . . .”), instead of adjectivally as modifying *ἄλλας* (sc. *ναῦς*). In this sentence the substitution of a simple approximating qualifier (e.g., *περί ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα*) would necessitate the adjectival interpretation of the prepositional phrase, which would change the meaning completely.¹⁶ In seven passages (1. 100. 1, 3. 107. 3, 4. 124. 1 [discussed earlier], 5. 34, 6. 67. 2, 7. 19. 3, and 7. 30. 3) the figure introduced by *ἐς* modifies a list of two or more nouns, which are summed up by a collective word (e.g., 3. 107. 3 *λοχίζει . . . ὀπλίτας καὶ ψιλοὺς ξυναμφοτέρους ἐς τετρακοσίους*).¹⁷ Although such summary figures are sometimes given elsewhere in Thucydides either absolutely (e.g., 7. 1. 5 *Ἱμεραῖους δὲ ὀπλίτας καὶ ψιλοὺς ξυναμφοτέρους χιλίους . . .*) or qualified by another word (e.g., 8. 100. 3 *διακομισάντες ἕκ τε τῆς Κύμης προσεταιριστοὺς ὀπλίτας ὡς πεντήκοντα καὶ τῶν ἕκ τῆς ἠείρου μισθωσάμενοι, ξύμπασιν ὡς τριακοσίους . . .*).¹⁸ It does seem reasonable to regard the seven passages cited as extensions of that adverbial use of summary *ἐς* at 8. 10. 2–3 which is not found with any other qualifier. In three other passages (3. 70. 6, 7. 1. 5, 8. 21. 1) either the enumeration of the constituents of the group or the collective word is absent, but a similar summary motivation may perhaps still be inferred for the use of *ἐς*.¹⁹

15. See LSJ⁹, s.v. *ὀλίγος*, IV, and Classen–Steup, *Thukydides*³, ad loc.

16. Most of the manuscripts omit *ἐς* in this passage, although it is found in one papyrus (see the OCT apparatus criticus). Most editors have preferred to take the omission as a scribal error (an easy haplography after *προσπληρώσαντες*) because the attachment of the number to *ἄλλας*, which would result from the omission of *ἐς*, as also from its replacement by *περί*, would produce a second constituent of thirty-seven ships in addition to those already manned by the Athenians, instead of a total fleet of thirty-seven ships. The smaller total accords better with the other information supplied in these chapters about naval resources on both sides; see Classen–Steup, *Thukydides*³, ad 8. 10. 2–3.

17. At 1. 100. 1, *ἐς διακοσίας* summarizes not two nouns but the objects of two verbs (*εἶλον . . . καὶ διέφθειραν*), which are collected by the adjective, *τὰς πάσας*.

18. Perhaps the use of *ὡς* to qualify another figure earlier in this sentence prompted Thucydides to repeat it later in the summary situation.

19. Classen–Steup, *Thukydides*³, ad 7. 1. 5, observe that the 1,000 Sicels here mentioned must be the total obtained by adding together several small contingents from different places, perhaps differently armed.

There are three passages in which *ἐς* qualifying a number occupies a syntactical position used by Thucydides for no other approximating qualifier. In these passages (3. 114. 4, 7. 33. 1, and 8. 44. 4) *ἐς* introduces not just a numerical adjective, but an adjective plus a noun, and the whole phrase stands in loose apposition to another noun of more general meaning, which it amplifies or further specifies. Thus, at 3. 114. 1, *ἐς τριακοσίους ὀπλίτας* gives more information about the *φυλακή* sent out by the Corinthians; at 7. 33. 1, *ἐς πέντε ναῦς* similarly describes the *ναυτικόν* of the Geloans; and at 8. 44. 4, *ἐς δύο καὶ τριάκοντα τέλαντα* specifies the amount of the *χρήματα* collected by the Peloponnesians.²⁰ Here, then, it seems likely that *ἐς* was used primarily because it made possible the addition of numerical information to a statement that would have been syntactically complete without it, though more general in import.²¹ I suggest that this use of *ἐς* is an extension of its "summary" function (detected earlier, p. 331, at 8. 10. 2–3, and with less certainty in a slightly different kind of situation in ten other passages).

There are five passages where a figure is qualified by a second qualifying word in addition to *ἐς*.²² At 3. 20. 2, 7. 30. 3, and 7. 32. 2, we find *ἐς . . . μάλιστα*, and at 3. 111. 4 and 8. 21. 1, *ἐς . . . τις*.²³ Such combinations of two independent qualifiers occur only eight times altogether in Thucydides, the three cases not involving *ἐς* being 3. 98. 4, 4. 8. 6 (both *περί . . . μάλιστα*) and 1. 18. 1 (*μάλιστα . . . καὶ ὀλίγω πλείω*). One would like to be able to explain why Thucydides qualified these eight figures doubly and what made him favor *ἐς* as the first of the two qualifiers in five of the cases. As regards the second question, it is clear that the normal function of a qualifier in a sentence (i.e., whether it is a preposition, an adverb, or an adjective, and whether it can stand at the beginning of a phrase) will determine generally which qualifiers can be conveniently combined; the combinations found tend to be of a preposition (*ἐς* or *περί*) with an adverb (*μάλιστα*) or an adjective (*τις*—note that both *μάλιστα* and *τις* are postpositive words). But these grammatical considerations do not explain why Thucydides used *ἐς* more often than *περί*, in the prepositional position, or why only *ἐς* is paired with *τις*. Some light can perhaps be shed on this by a scrutiny of the five cases where *ἐς* is coupled with another qualifier. Did Thucydides double his qualifiers in order to define with extra

20. At 3. 114. 4, the numeral seems to come rather as an afterthought, at the end of the sentence. At 7. 33. 1 and 8. 44. 4, it appears that Thucydides put first the general word (*ναυτικόν* or *χρήματα*), to which the numerical detail was then attached by *ἐς*, because he wanted to have a balanced contrast between two or more elements in the sentence. In the former passage *ναυτικόν τε* balances *ἀκοντιστάς . . . καὶ ἱππίας*; in the latter there is a larger contrast between *χρήματα μὲν ἐξέλεξαν* and *τὰ δ' ἄλλα ἡσύχαζον*. Thus, in both these cases the balanced structure of the sentence, once established, dictated the use of a qualifier like *ἐς*, which could attach a phrase consisting of numeral + specific noun (namely, *ναῦς, τέλαντα*) to a more general noun.

21. Thuc. 4. 48. 1 somewhat resembles the three passages just discussed; it, too, has *ἐς* introducing a noun as well as a numerical adjective, and the sentence seems to require a similar degree of syntactical independence in the prepositional phrase. If, for example, *περί* were substituted for *ἐς*, the phrase would attach itself closely to *τοὺς ἐν τῷ οἰκῆματι*, in which case this whole group of words would logically have to be taken as the object only of the participles *ἐξαγαγόντες καὶ διαφθείραντες*; thus, in translation, "[The Corcyraeans] escaped notice when they took out and put to death in this way about 60 men of those inside the building." As the sentence stands, however, while *ἐς . . . ἄνδρας ἐξήκοντα* must refer to those killed, *τοὺς ἐν τῷ οἰκῆματι* can be taken with both *ἐλαβον* and its participles: "[The Corcyraeans] escaped the notice of those inside the building when they took out and put to death in this way up to 60 men [from among them]."

22. Thuc. 4. 124. 1 (see p. 331), where the unique expression *ὀλίγου ἐς* appears, is hardly a parallel case, since *ὀλίγου* is nowhere found as an independent qualifier.

23. On *τις* used to qualify numerals, see Classen–Steup, *Thukydides*³, ad 3. 68. 3, 7. 34. 5.

precision the degree and/or the type of uncertainty or rounding he was attaching to the figure in question?

The doubly qualified figure at 3. 20. 2 refers to an episode in the siege of Plataea, a section of Thucydides' *History* exceptionally rich in detail of all kinds, including numbers. By putting together all the figures that relate to the garrison at Plataea (2. 78. 3, 3. 20. 2, 3. 24. 2, and 3. 68. 2) and paying careful attention to how they are qualified, one can infer that Thucydides probably obtained firm figures only for (a) the initial strength of the garrison (400 Plataeans + 80 Athenians—these are absolute, and should be precise, figures), (b) those who escaped to Athens, and those who were captured, in the mass breakout during the siege (212 escaped and 1 was captured—these numbers have obviously not been rounded), and (c) the number of Athenians executed by the Peloponnesians after the city surrendered to them (an absolute 25; contrast the qualified, apparently rounded figure for the Plataeans who were executed, *οὐκ ἐλάσσους διακοσίων*). For the rest, he had the more general recollection of those who escaped to Athens that “a few” had turned back in the attempt. That “roughly half” of those in Plataea withdrew from the escape attempt at the last minute may be Thucydides' own or his informants' estimate. If this is right, then the statement that *ἐς . . . ἄνδρας διακοσίων καὶ εἴκοσι μάλιστα* actually left Plataea on the way to Athens is Thucydides' calculation from the 212 + 1 + “a few” (= a minimum of 215) known to him from various sources. In that case, it seems probable that he thought 220 the maximum possible number who initially went over the walls of Plataea, and used *ἐς* therefore in its limiting sense to mean “up to” or “to a maximum of” (the usage at 4. 118. 3 and possibly also at 4. 124. 1). He added *μάλιστα* to show that the figure was arrived at by his own calculations, instead of being supplied directly by an informant.²⁴ As an additional reason for thinking that the figure 220 is the product of a fairly precise calculation, one may note that it is the only one of the twenty figures greater than 100 qualified by *ἐς* which is not a multiple of 100.

It may be significant that the figure qualified by *ἐς . . . μάλιστα* at 7. 30. 3 is a relatively small one (20), which is therefore unlikely to be much rounded. In this case (the figure refers to the Thebans and others who were killed attacking the Thracian raiders who had sacked Mycalessus) we have no information about the size of the group from whom the casualties fell. But since such a low number is bound to be relatively precise, one might guess that here, too, *ἐς* is used in its limiting sense to name what Thucydides regards as a maximum figure, and *μάλιστα* once again marks the figure as his own calculation. The other three cases of *ἐς* coupled with another qualifier (3. 111. 4, 7. 32. 2, and 8. 21. 1) do not lend themselves to such analysis, for the figures concerned cannot be argued to be especially precise, nor do we have sufficient information to infer how Thucydides might have made his calculations. 3. 111. 4 is interesting, however, for another reason, since the group of casualties among the Ambraciotes and their Peloponnesian allies referred to there by Thucydides himself as *ἐς διακοσίων . . . τινάς* is alluded to a few pages further on, at 3. 113. 3, by an Ambraciote herald, as numbering *διακοσίων μάλιστα*: the same figure is cited, but the qualifier is changed. Did Thucydides

24. For this implication of *μάλιστα*, see Dover, *Commentary*, ad 7. 42. 1, where the figure qualified (73) is so obviously unrounded as to rule out any straightforward approximating interpretation. See also the paper cited in n. 11.

intend to convey a difference of nuance? One cannot tell. Since no obvious reason for such a difference of view between the historian and the Ambraciote herald leaps to mind, one is inclined to think this may be more a case of literary variation, and to deduce from it that ἐς . . . τινος and μάλιστα here have much the same force.²⁵ Finally, we may note that two of these passages (7. 30. 3 and 8. 21. 1) have been discussed earlier (p. 331) as cases where ἐς appears to perform a summary function. Thus, the nuance expressed by the double qualification may not be precisely the same in all cases.

It is useful to compare the general profile of the qualifier ἐς in Thucydides with the profiles of the most common expressions of the approximating and comparative types (μάλιστα, ὥς, περί, and οὐκ ἐλάσσους, ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους, ὀλίγῳ πλείους). It will be clear that, although in many respects the three major expressions of each type diverge too much to permit the extrapolation of a "typical" approximating word or a "typical" comparative word with which ἐς could be compared, the comparison of ἐς with various particular expressions of both types is nonetheless illuminating in many ways.

Take first of all frequency of employment. In general, approximating qualifiers are used three times as often as comparative qualifiers (the total for approximating expressions, excluding ἐς, is 121 cases, as compared to forty of comparative type), and this generally higher frequency of approximating qualifiers is naturally reflected in the higher frequency of individual expressions of this type. 'Ες, used twenty-six times, falls between μάλιστα (47) and ὥς (19), while the commonest comparative expression, οὐκ ἐλάσσους, occurs eighteen times; the remaining figures are: περί (12), ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους (6), ὀλίγῳ πλείους (5).

Second, in range of employment, it is not surprising that the most general comparative expression, οὐκ ἐλάσσους, is used with the largest range of figures (from 25 to 150,000); this is presumably due to the tendency of such comparative expressions to be used rhetorically, as a means of emphasizing the magnitude of the figure qualified.²⁶ The more specific expressions, ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους and ὀλίγῳ πλείους, are used, as one would expect, with a much more restricted range of figures (from 50 to 1,000 and from 30 to 1,000, respectively). Among the approximating words, μάλιστα has by far the most extended range (from 2 to 6,000); by contrast, περί is rarely used with large numbers (range: from 13 to 5,000; but all cases except 7. 42. 1 are below 1,000), and ὥς appears with no figure higher than 300 (range: from 6 to 300). These differences in the range of figures with which μάλιστα, περί, and ὥς are employed can be explained to some extent by Thucydides' apparent preference for one word or another in qualifying different sorts of numerical information. Thus, μάλιστα is the only approximating word used to qualify figures of all three main types (those relating to time, distance, and groups of fighting men or ships); περί is used only once (in combination with μάλιστα at 4. 8. 6) of distance, while ὥς is never used of time. I suggest that Thucydides generally

25. E. C. Marchant, *Thucydides III* (London and New York, 1965), ad 3. 20. 2, cites Andoc. 1. 37 as a case where "ἐς τριακοσίων is presently repeated in the form μάλιστα τριακοσίων." In fact, μάλιστα (1. 38) is an insertion into the text made on the basis of a quotation of this passage by Galen; see D. MacDowell (ed.), *Andokides "On the Mysteries"* (Oxford, 1962), ad loc. (app. crit.). If the emended text is correct, this would be a clear instance of ἐ; and μάλιστα being used more or less interchangeably.

26. On this point, see the paper cited in n. 11.

avoided qualifying distance figures with *περί* and time figures with *ὥς* because of the possibility of confusion with other common spatial uses of *περί* and temporal uses of *ὥς*. 'Ες corresponds most closely to *μάλιστα* in the range of its figures (from 5 to 2,000), although a much smaller proportion of the figures with *ἐς* fall in the lower range of the scale (in only two cases does *ἐς* qualify figures of 20 or less, as compared to fourteen cases for *μάλιστα*; these figures represent, respectively, 7 percent and 30 percent of the totals for each word). It is significant that thirteen of the fourteen cases of *μάλιστα* with very low numbers relate to time or distance, types of figures which Thucydides never qualifies with *ἐς*, no doubt because of the ambiguities that might be generated by the common occurrence of *ἐς* in a non-qualifying sense in these contexts (cf. his avoidance of *περί* for distance and *ὥς* for time, pp. 334–35). Thus, the distribution of figures qualified by *ἐς* corresponds most closely to the distribution of the *μάλιστα* figures excluding those relating to time and distance. It appears that, when qualifying figures between 21 and 100 relating to groups of fighting men or ships, Thucydides had a strong preference for *ὥς* (10 cases); compare *μάλιστα* (3), *ἐς* (3), and *περί* (2). Thus, Thucydides did not use all the approximating words in his repertoire interchangeably, but made his selection in each case with regard to some fairly subtle differences of connotation between them. 'Ες appears here to correspond more closely to the pattern of approximating than of comparative qualifiers; but it, too, has its own distinctive pattern.

This same picture, of a general difference between most approximating qualifiers and most comparative qualifiers, but still a considerable variation in the employment of individual approximating words, among which *ἐς* seems to fall, emerges from a study of the degree to which the figures qualified by different expressions cluster at a few points on the scale, and the tendency of certain particular figures to occur very frequently with certain qualifiers. One can obtain a "cluster index" for any qualifier by dividing the number of different figures that appear with it by the total number of occurrences of that qualifier: a low figure will indicate a high degree of clustering, and a high figure the converse. This calculation produces high figures for the three comparative qualifiers, signifying very little clustering (*οὐκ ἐλάσσους*—17 figures in 18 cases = 94.4; *ὀλίγῃ ἐλάσσους*—5 figures in 6 cases = 83.3; *ὀλίγῃ πλείους*—4 figures in 5 cases = 80.0). The approximating qualifiers show greater variation, ranging from *περί*, with the highest index (11 figures in 12 cases = 91.6), through *μάλιστα* (31 figures in 47 cases = 65.9), to *ὥς*, with the lowest index (9 figures in 19 cases = 47.3); and, if one looks at the cases of *ὥς*, one finds in fact that over half of them (10 of 19) involve just two figures, namely, 50 and 300. It thus appears that figures qualified by approximating expressions tend to cluster considerably more than those qualified by comparative expressions. This may reflect only the generally greater frequency of approximating qualifiers (especially as *περί*, the one approximating word whose cluster index falls in the same range as those of the comparative expressions, is also the least frequently used), or it may show a greater tendency (in Thucydides or his informants) to think in certain stereotyped round numbers when laboring under a general uncertainty or imprecision. 'Ες has a cluster index of 61.5 (16 figures in 26 cases), which puts it closest to *μάλιστα* (65.9), and clearly among the approximating rather than the comparative expressions. A look at the list of figures that

occur more than once with each approximating qualifier discovers very little overlap between them: the only figures qualified more than once by each of two or more qualifiers are 60 (twice each by *μάλιστα* and *ἐς*), 120 (twice each by *μάλιστα* and *ἐς*), and 300 (twice each by *μάλιστα* and *ἐς*, and five times by *ὥς*). And each qualifier appears to have its own "favorite" figures: *μάλιστα* appears four times with 40, three times each with 7 and 400; *ὥς* appears five times each with 50 and 300; *ἐς* appears four times with 200 and three times with 500. Some of these patterns can be partly explained by Thucydides' preference for using certain qualifiers with certain types of information: thus, the three cases of 7 and the four cases of 40 qualified by *μάλιστα* all involve time or distance figures, and *μάλιστα* is by far the commonest qualifier used with figures of these types. But no such explanation will account for his apparent preference for *ἐς* rather than *ὥς*, *περί*, or *μάλιστα* with groups of 200 soldiers or ships. One wonders whether euphonic considerations generated by the rhythm and order of words in a particular sentence did not play a part here.

To sum up, a study of the passages where Thucydides uses *ἐς* to qualify a number finds two (4. 118. 3 and 4. 124. 1) where *ἐς* definitely has comparative force, and a few others (e.g., 3. 20. 2, 7. 30. 3) where it may have comparative force. In another group of passages (8. 10. 3 and the ten others cited on p. 331) it seems reasonable to discern another facet of the original "limiting" sense of *ἐς*, by which it performs a summary function (meaning something like "to a total of"). So used, although the connection with the comparative use remains clear, *ἐς* comes closer in force to an approximating qualifier. It seems, however, that in such summary cases, as well as in cases where the phrase containing the qualified numeral was added almost as an afterthought to an already syntactically complete sentence (3. 114. 1, 7. 33. 1, and 8. 44. 4), Thucydides preferred to use *ἐς* rather than a more straightforward approximating qualifier, such as *ὥς*, *περί*, or *μάλιστα*. Similarly, he apparently liked using *ἐς* as the first of two qualifiers attached to the same number. But there remain many cases where one can discern no difference in meaning or construction between *ἐς* and *ὥς*, *περί*, or *μάλιστα*. These passages tend to support the common assumption that *ἐς* is in many respects merely another approximating qualifier.

More support for this assumption is provided by the comparison of the figures qualified by *ἐς* with those qualified by the three commonest approximating qualifiers (*μάλιστα*, *ὥς*, *περί*) and the three commonest comparative qualifiers (*οὐκ ἐλάσσους*, *ὀλίγω ἐλάσσους*, *ὀλίγω πλείους*). In frequency of use, range and distribution of figures qualified, and tendency of figures to cluster, *ἐς* stands clearly among the approximating rather than the comparative qualifiers. In addition, however, this general survey of the profiles of different qualifiers makes it plain that no two expressions even of the same type are exactly alike in usage. This confirms the conclusion suggested by the study of particular instances of *ἐς*, that Thucydides did not use all the approximating expressions available to him absolutely interchangeably but that a variety of considerations, including differences of connotation, grammatical function, and rhythm, probably influenced his choice in any given passage. The unique idiosyncrasy of *ἐς*, however, remains—that its usage overlaps that of comparative qualifiers (like *οὐκ ἐλάσσους*) at one end, and blends at the other into

that of approximating qualifiers (like *μάλιστα*). This helps to explain why editors and lexicographers have often had trouble in elucidating its meaning and use in particular passages.²⁷

CATHERINE REID RUBINCAM
Erindale College
University of Toronto

27. This paper was written with the support of a Canada Council Leave Fellowship. I am grateful to Joan Bigwood for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this paper, and to the journal's referees for some useful suggestions toward improving the argument.

THEOCRITUS, CALVUS, AND *ECLOGUE* 6

Of the six unconnected lines surviving from Calvus' epyllion, none is better known than the neoteric exclamation addressed to Io herself (Serv. Dan. ad *Ecl.* 6. 47 = Calvus frag. 9 Morel):

a virgo infelix, herbis pascereis amaris.

We are indebted to Servius Danielis; for, as has been noted,¹ it can be seen that in *Eclogue* 6 Virgil drew from Calvus' line to produce an acknowledgment of previous literary expression. Stewart observes that at *Eclogue* 6. 47 ("a, virgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit!") Virgil combined the first half of Calvus' line with the second half of a verse from *Eclogue* 2 (69 "a Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit"), a line whose antecedent is Theocritus *Idyll* 11. 72 (ὦ Κύκλωψ Κύκλωψ, πᾶ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι:). *Eclogue* 6. 47, then, is a recognition of the poet's literary predecessors, molded into a single Virgilian line.

But what of line 52 of the same poem?

a! virgo infelix, tu nunc in montibus erras.

Virgil does not lightly repeat himself, and we may ask why this line, with the alteration of the second half, reappears after five verses. It is true that there is a structural purpose to the repetition: lines 47–52 are, in fact, a self-contained panel.² But why the change in the second half ("tu nunc in montibus erras")? The motif of wandering is common in the *Eclogues*, particularly in *Eclogue* 6.³ For the moment, however, instances outside this poem will be important. First, *Eclogue* 2. 21:

mille meae Siculis errant in montibus agnae.

As Servius recognized, Virgil drew from, but altered, Theocritus (again the Cyclops poem) at this point:

1. Z. Stewart, "The Song of Silenus," *HSCP* 64 (1959): 190.
2. Briefly noted, together with other panels, by F. Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 13.
3. J. P. Elder, "Non Iniussa Cano," *HSCP* 65 (1961): 118–19, points to the numerous instances of *errare* in the *Eclogues*, particularly 6. 40, 52, 58, and 64. Is there significance in the distribution—an interval of twelve lines followed by two of six?