

Thucydides had Homer in mind in his work,¹⁰ and to back up the natural presumption that a writer as complex and self-conscious as Thucydides must have intended the resemblances between his Cleon and his Pericles, it can now be suggested that his model in this was Homer's treatment of Thersites' echoes of Achilles.¹¹

As well as confirming that the Cleon/Pericles echoes were intentional, the model also helps us to see how Thucydides' audience would have understood them, since there are clear indications of how the Achilles/Thersites echoes were understood in antiquity. Commenting on the latter, Eustathius writes (209.10–11):

Θερσίτης δὲ διὰ τὸ ἄκαιρον τοῦ λόγου καὶ διὰ τὴν πῆρωσιν περιφρονηθεὶς οὐκ εὖ ἀπαλλάξει, ὡς καὶ ἐν ταῦθα προσαρμόσαι τὸ τραγικόν: 'λόγος γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς ἔκ τ' ἀδοξοῦντος ἑλθὼν', τοῦ Θερσίτου, 'καὶ ἔκ δοκούντος', τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως, 'οὐ ταῦτ' ἔδυνήθη'.

The tragic passage which Eustathius quotes in garbled form is Eur. *Hec.* 294–5:

... λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξοῦντων ἰὼν
καὶ τῶν δοκούντων αὐτὸς οὐ ταῦτ' ὀφείλει,

and he refers to it as an economical way of conveying the standard ancient assessment of the Achilles/Thersites echoes, namely that the same words in Achilles' mouth and in Thersites' mouth did not have the same validity. Eustathius can do this all the more easily because the 'substance' of the two lines of the *Hecuba* '... was a commonplace both in the fifth century and later';¹² and from the Thucydidean point of view it is particularly interesting that the scholia on his contemporary Euripides take such tragic passages as referring to fifth-century Athenian politics.¹³ It looks as though the commonplace and Thersites' exemplification of it were already linked and standard by Quintilian's time and as such capable of subtle *variatio*. Cf.

idem dictum saepe in alio liberum, in alio furiosum, in alio superbum est. verba adversus Agamemnonem a Thersite habita ridentur: da illa Diomedii aliive cui pari, magnum animum ferre prae se videbuntur. (*Inst. Or.* xi 1.37),

where there is a pointed failure to mention Achilles, himself also a notoriously flawed character. Libanius later achieves his original effect when using the concept by reversing the standard form of the topos through mock-innocent irony:

καίτοι πῶς οὐ δεινόν, ὅταν μὲν Ἀχιλλεὺς λέγῃ, μὴ εἶναι τὸν λόγον ἀνόητον, ὅταν δὲ ἕτερος; (Foerster viii p. 248. 9–11).

¹⁰ In *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung*, SB Heidelberg 1972, 1 Abh., Hermann Strasburger has many valuable observations on this topic. He rightly sees the influence of Homer on Thucydides as part of more general influence on all ancient historiography.

¹¹ Given that Hellenistic literary practices are frequently also found in earlier literature (see K. J. Dover, *Theocritus: Select Poems* [Macmillan 1971] lxxvi–lxxii; F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* [Cambridge 1979] 8–10) it may not be entirely fanciful to see what Thucydides does, i.e. imitates verbatim in one speech of Cleon three passages from one speech of Pericles, as *aemulatio* in the form of *imitatio cum variatione* of his Homeric model, who in one speech of Thersites imitates two lines from two different speeches of Achilles.

¹² Jocelyn on Ennius *fr.* 84.9 *q.v.*, citing Eur. *Andr.* 186–7; *fr.* 327; *Tr. Gr. inc. Fr.* 119; and Cic. *S. Rosc.* 2.

¹³ So Jocelyn *loc. cit.*

In the set of terms explained above, Thucydides' original audience was meant to conclude that what Pericles said was right simply because he was Pericles and that what Cleon said was wrong, even if it was the same as what Pericles said, simply because Cleon was Cleon. The similarity or identity of the sayings would therefore have served to underline the contrast between the characters of the two men already established as dissimilar. Here the Stobaeus extract quoted above, which notes that excellence of spirit does not sit well upon a fool, is much to the point.

If this type of moral evaluation seems strange to us, it may be worth remembering that it was a normal ancient way of looking at such matters. Already in Homer himself there is an ethical code in which the character of the agent is seen as primary. 'Good' actions can only be performed by a 'good' man.¹⁴ The Eustathian comment is thus true to Homer. The developed moral philosophy of Aristotle rationalised this traditional Greek moral view: in his ethical theory virtue is preeminent, and it consists in a disposition towards good actions, which take their moral status from the agent's virtuous character.¹⁵ Stoic moral philosophy took the view to extremes. Both good and bad actions alike were indissolubly connected with the goodness and badness of the agent.¹⁶

To sum up: if the suggestion offered in this note is correct, four points can be made:

(1) the notion that Cleon's echoes of Pericles are accidental or meaningless can now be absolutely ruled out;

(2) an interesting literary feature of Thucydides, namely allusion to Homeric models in his portrayal of historical characters, has been detected;

(3) Thucydides intended his readers to keep Thersites in mind when evaluating Cleon and wanted to associate Pericles with Achilles;

(4) Thucydides is assuming as the background to his character portrayals a standard ancient type of moral assessment, in which actions and words take their worth from that of the actor or speaker.

FRANCIS CAIRNS

University of Liverpool

¹⁴ But not the reverse since a 'good' man *can* perform evil actions. The difficulties of Homeric ethics are well known (*cf.* e.g. A. Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility* [Oxford 1960]; A. A. Long, 'Morals and Values in Homer', *JHS* xc [1970] 121–39); but I hope that the formulation here would be acceptable to all sides.

¹⁵ Cf. e.g. W. D. Ross, *Aristotle*⁵ (Oxford 1949) 192–7.

¹⁶ Cf. H. von Arnim, *SVF* (Leipzig 1924) iv, index s.vv. σοφός, φαῦλος.

Periplus Maris Erythraei: Notes on the Text

The sole reliable text of the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* is H. Frisk's, published in 1927.¹ He not only re-examined the one important manuscript that has survived but brought to bear his knowledge of the language of the Greek papyri of Egypt, which is close kin to that written by the plain-spoken captain or merchant who com-

¹ *Le Périphe de la Mer Érythré*, Göteborgs Högskalet Årsskrift xxxiii (Göteborg 1927). A translation based on this text has recently appeared: *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, trans. with comm., G. W. B. Huntingford, Hakluyt Society, series 2, cli (London 1980).

posed the *Periplus*. As a result, he was able to eliminate in passage after passage the freewheeling emendations introduced by nineteenth-century editors² and return to the wording of the manuscript.

In the past few years a number of places that escaped Frisk's eye have been rescued from meddlesome emendation, notably by G. Giangrande.³ Here are three more whose manuscript reading has suffered much tampering and yet makes excellent sense with either no change or very little.

(i) *Periplus* 30 (Frisk p. 10, lines 13–16)

The island of Dioscurides (Socotra in the Gulf of Aden), we are told, produces much tortoise shell from turtles of various kinds—the 'genuine' (*alēthinē*, presumably the hawksbill turtle; see below), 'land' (*chersina*), 'white' or 'light' (*leukē*), and 'the oversize mountain type with an extremely thick shell'⁴

οὐδὲ τὰ παρὰ τὴν κοιλίαν μέρη μὲν τὰ ἐγχρῆζοντα τομῆν οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται, καὶ πυρρότερα ὄντα: ὀλοτελῶς δὲ τὰ εἰς γλωσσόκομα καὶ πινακίδια καὶ μαγίδια ἐγχρῆζοντα καὶ τοιαύτην τινὰ γρύτην κατατέμενται.

Müller eliminated τὰ ἐγχρῆζοντα, adopted a suggestion of Bernhardt (1850) to change πυρρότερα to στερρότερα, and revised the second half of the sentence to read: ὀλοτελῶς δὲ τὰ εὐχρηστοῦντα εἰς γλ. καὶ πιν. καὶ μαγ. καὶ τοιαύτην τινὰ γρύτην κατατέμενται, translating the result 'cujus partes quidem ventri proximae sectionem non admittunt, quum duriores sint, quae vero ad usum commoda sunt, integrae in arcas et capsulas et tabellas pugillares inque aliam ejus generis supellectilem secantur'.

Fabricius went further in the same direction, adopting readings that Müller had discussed in his commentary but prudently left there; he arrived at a version which he rendered 'deren werthlose Theile um den Bauch sich nicht zerschneiden lassen, da sie eben zu hart sind; vollständig aber werden die brauchbaren Theile zu Kästchen, Täfelchen, Schalen und anderer derartiger Waare zerschnitten'.

Frisk's handling of the passage was no less violent: he deleted both occurrences of ἐγχρῆζοντα, kept Bernhardt's change of πυρρότερα to στερρότερα, and introduced yet another of Bernhardt's suggestions, the insertion of νῶτα after ὀλοτελῶς δὲ τὰ. Thus he produced a text which Huntingford (n. 1) has translated 'the parts towards the belly do not allow of cutting on

account of their toughness; the <backs> are cut up for boxes, plates, cake dishes, and other similar things'.

All such emendation not only strays far from the original but is inspired by a misconception: that there are differences in the hardness of a turtle's armor. In fact, the horny shields that are stripped off to form what we call tortoise shell, whether from the carapace or the plastron, do not significantly vary in thickness or hardness, certainly not enough so that one area will resist cutting and another not.

Let us abandon then, once and for all, Bernhardt's misguided στερρότερα and restore the manuscript's πυρρότερα. The plastrons of turtles are yellowish rather than red, but πυρρός may be used of that color; the yolk of an egg, for example, called τὸ ὠχρόν by Aristotle (*HA* 559a) is τὸ πυρρόν in Hippocrates, *Mul.* ii 171.

Commercial tortoise shell today comes from a single source, the handsome shields of the hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), a large sea turtle, and is used mostly for smaller objects: combs, brushes, and personal adornments such as rings, brooches, and the like. The Romans, as is clear from *Periplus* 30, utilized the shell of several varieties of turtle, terrestrial as well as aquatic,⁵ and used it above all for large objects, for veneering beds, sideboards, dining couches, doors, etc.⁶ Now, since the second half of the sentence under discussion clearly refers to cutting up into pieces suitable for small objects, the first logically should refer to the opposite; in other words, τομῆ in the context should refer to the normal cutting given to tortoise shell, into big plaques for veneering. These particular plastron shields not only were ill-suited for this but, as the final phrase indicates, they had yet another drawback, their color.⁷

Thus we can translate the passage exactly as it appears in the manuscript:

of which the parts over the belly, whichever are useful, do not take [regular] cutting; besides, they are rather tawny. On the other hand, whatever can be used for small boxes, small plaques, small disks, and similar items, gets cut up completely.

(ii) *Periplus* 40 (Frisk p. 13, lines 28–9)

The Gulf of Barake (Gulf of Cutch on the northwest coast of India), our author reports, is extremely rough, with whirlpools and eddies. Moreover, 'the bottom in some places has sheer drops, in others is rocky and sharp,

ὥστε τέμνεσθαι τὰς παρακειμένας ἀγκύρας ἀντέχειν ἀποκοντουμένας, ἃς δὲ καὶ συντριβομένας ἐν τῷ βυθῷ'.⁸

² E.g., C. Müller in *Geog. Gr. Min.* i (Paris 1853) 257–305 (the standard text until the publication of Frisk's); B. Fabricius, *Der Periplus des Erythraischen Meeres* (Leipzig 1883).

³ *Mnemos.* xxviii (1975) 293–5; *JHS* xcvi (1976) 154–7.

⁴ The species in question may well be *Geochelone pardalis babcocki*, the leopard tortoise. There are no tortoises on Socotra today and only two genera in the area of Africa nearest it. Of these one species is the leopard tortoise, which grows to more than two feet in length and so favors mountainous areas that some call it the mountain tortoise. Presumably it existed on Socotra in Roman times. For a full description see A. Loveridge and E. Williams, *Revision of the African Tortoises and Turtles of the Suborder Cryptodira*, Bull. Museum of Comp. Zoology, Harvard College cxv. 6 (1957) 235–51. I have handled the shields of a specimen; they are distinctly thicker than those of the hawksbill turtle. I owe thanks to Dr Richard Zweifel of the American Museum of Natural History in New York for much generous help.

⁵ The *chersinae* of Pliny, *NH* ix 38 and the *cherson* of Martial xiv 88 must be terrestrial types of some kind.

⁶ Plin. *NH* ix 39, xxxiii 146; Dig. xxxii 100.4; Mart. ix 59.9. For a useful summary with full citation of sources, see H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern* ii (Leipzig 1879) 375–8.

⁷ καὶ ὄντα troubled Frisk, who suggested in his apparatus either eliminating καὶ or assuming a lacuna. But the *Periplus* offers two other instances of καὶ used as a connective with a participle: 16, ἀνθρωποὶ ἀρόται κατοικοῦσιν καὶ κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἕκαστος ὁμοίως τιθέμενοι τυράννοι 'men who are plowmen (cf. *Mnemos.* xxviii [1975] 294) live there and each acts like a king over his own land'; 22, ἔστιν δὲ τύραννος καὶ κατοικῶν αὐτὴν 'there is a king and he inhabits it' [sc. the capital city].

⁸ Frisk emended συντριβομένας to συντριβεσθαι on the grounds that the word is correlative with τέμνεσθαι and could well have been abbreviated in the exemplar and wrongly expanded under the

The word ἀποκοντώ is very rare, occurring only here and in Procopius, *Secret History* ix 62. Procopius, in cataloguing Theodora's obscene doings, tells how she would step on stage amidst the actors, *λορδουμένη τε καὶ τὰ ὀπίσω ἀποκοντῶσα*. Bernhardt, in his edition of the *Suda* (Halle 1853), in which, s.v. *λορδουμένη*, the above happens to be cited, commented at length on the meaning of ἀποκοντῶ; he concluded that Procopius was talking *de projectu partium posteriorum* and, by way of confirming the sense, cited our passage from the *Periplus* which he rendered 'ita ut ancorae navis retinendae causa projectae statim a saxis praecidantur'.⁹

However, other nineteenth-century savants refused to accept ἀποκοντῶ and simply emended it out of the text—improperly, as Frisk (115) pointed out. Frisk himself retained the verb, assigned it (99) the meaning 'jeter (l'ancre) à la mer', and took (65) ἀντέχειν as a final infinitive after ἀποκοντουμένας. This has been accepted by Giangrande, who renders the passage (*JHS* xcvi [1976] 155) 'so that the cables of the anchors . . . lying on the bottom alongside the ships (παρακειμένας), which anchors are dropped (ἀποκοντουμένας) in order to hold out against the current (ἀντέχειν; cf. ἀντέχουσιν at §46),¹⁰ are cut (τέμνεσθαι) or some of them are chafed on the sea-bed'.

Both Frisk and Giangrande give to ἀποκοντῶ the sense 'drop anchor'. Yet why should the author go out of his way to select so unusual a word to express so ordinary a meaning?¹¹ Surely βάλλω or καθήμι (Pollux i 103) or ἀφήμι (Plut. *Coriol.* 32) would have done, had he wanted merely to say 'drop anchor'. Procopius' usage would indicate that ἀποκοντῶ means 'thrust out', not 'drop'.

A standard procedure today for securing a vessel in a tideway, called 'mooring', is to set out anchors from both sides of the bow with an equal amount of cable to each; the vessel forms the apex, as it were, of an isosceles triangle, of which the anchors form the other two angles and the cables the sides. Anchors so set can aptly be described as παρακειμένας, for they lie more or less parallel with the vessel and not ahead as a single anchor does. In a dangerous anchorage it is standard procedure as well to give anchors plenty of scope, to let out a long length of cable—and this is what the words ἀντέχειν ἀποκοντουμένας must refer to: the anchors are 'thrust out to withstand (sc. the current)'. Giving plenty of scope allows the cable to lie flatter and thereby provides a better direction for the strain on the anchor. But the cable inevitably lies nearer the bottom, and, if this is rough and uneven, is exposed to the danger the author describes.

influence of the preceding participles (Frisk 115). Giangrande points out (*JHS* xcvi [1976] 155) that in the koine of this period infinitives and participles mingle as syntactical equivalents.

⁹ The word also appears in Eustathius' *De Thessalonica urbe a Latinis capta* 96, used more or less in the same sense as in Procopius: Eustathius describes how the Normans, by way of insulting their captives, bared their rears, bent over to evacuate, and tried ἐξ ἐναντίας ἡμῶν ἀποκοντοῦν τὰ περιττὰ τῆς γαστρῆς.

¹⁰ The citing of ἀντέχουσιν at §46 as a parallel is misleading. Its presence there is the result of restoration; see below.

¹¹ Schmid in his review of Frisk's edition (*Philol. Wochenschr.* [1928] 788–95) was the first to point out (792) the inadequacy of Frisk's rendering of ἀποκοντῶ. He suspected—rightly, as we shall see—a distinction between παρακειμένας and ἀποκοντουμένας but the only restoration he could offer had, on his own admission, serious drawbacks.

The passage, therefore, can be rendered

so that the anchors lying parallel [i.e., dropped from the bows], thrust out to withstand [sc. the current], are cut loose, and some even get smashed on the sea floor.¹²

(iii) *Periplus* 46 (Frisk p. 15, lines 22–4)

The author's plain unvarnished style takes on color and drive as he describes the tremendous tides characteristic of India's estuaries, particularly the one where the key port of Barygaza was located (Broach on the Bay of Cambay). The rise and fall is dramatic, the inrush and outflow of incredible violence. Indeed,

γυνομένης γὰρ ὀρμῆς ἥδη περὶ τὴν πλήμην οὐδὲν παριεμένης αἱ κατέχουσιν ἄγκυραι.

And so, as a result, ships get carried headlong, tossed on their side, thrust aground on the shallows, etc.

The text in its present form is ungrammatical, clearly corrupt. Since the author obviously is telling us that anchors are of no help, Müller emended the last three words to οὐκ ἀντέχουσιν αἱ ἄγκυραι, translating the whole 'nam quum impetus undarum sub aestum sit nulla re frangendus, ancorae haud resistunt'. Fabricius and Frisk simply repeated Müller's text.

Though Müller's extensive revision can perhaps be defended on paleographical grounds, there is a much simpler and more obvious correction of the last three words, namely αἱ κατέχουσαι ἄγκυραι: the transformation of a participle to a finite form could have taken place, as frequently in this manuscript, through improper expansion of an abbreviation in the exemplar. Such a phrase would mean 'the restraining anchors', i.e., anchors specially set out to counter the extraordinary conditions, either extras over and above the number normally used¹³ or anchors dropped like those described in *Periplus* 40. Since the author's point is that even these will not hold, we must have a negative. But we need not restore one, as does Müller, since there is one available in the manuscript, οὐδέν. It follows that the participle after it, παριεμένης, must be corrupt. I suggest emending to παραμένουσιν; it has a good enough claim on the grounds of paleography and an excellent claim on the grounds of sense. The line, thus restored, states

For, once the thrust of the tide is under way, the restraining anchors do not stay in place.

New York University

LIONEL CASSON

¹² I owe thanks to my good friend and colleague, N. Lewis, for invaluable suggestions in connection with this passage.

¹³ Ancient craft carried many more anchors than their modern counterparts, which are generally content with three or four. The ship that carried St Paul to Malta had at least six (*Acts* xxvii 29–30). One ancient wreck had at least five, another eleven; cf. L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton 1971) 255–6.

The Paroeciographers on ΤΑ ΤΡΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΣΤΗΞΙΧΟΡΟΥ

As the last of his 'artis metricae scriptorum testimonia' for Stesichorus, 275 (b), Page¹ gives the following entry: 'Suda iv 586 A[dlr] s.v. τρία

¹ PMG p. 135.