

ymnaean territory from a point to the south of the ὄρμος Μακρονγιαλοῦ, there are no true harbours along this stretch of coast, merely open roadsteads. This is true of Aghios Stephanos, Palios, and Tsoniá. The one possible exception is Limanion: and by underwater inspection I established that the Limanion harbour mole is of relatively modern construction, so that this, too, in antiquity was a mere ὄρμος. Now though in Methymnaean territory, the harbour in which Euxitheos's ship sought refuge was, as Antiphon makes clear, a good distance from Methymna itself. There thus remains only one possible candidate: the beautiful natural harbour of Skala Sikamineas, so well sheltered from northern storms, and so mild of climate in winter, that it is known locally as Little Egypt. The mole reveals squared ashlar blocks and other dressed stones that date back at least to the Hellenistic period. Better known as the setting for Stratis Myrivilis's novel *Ἡ Παναγία ἢ Γοργόνα* [*The Mermaid Madonna*], Skala Sikamineas, with its whitewashed chapel and fishtail ikon, can now claim at least one brief moment of notoriety in the classical period too.³⁵

PETER GREEN

The University of Texas at Austin

who confirmed, from personal experience, the severe storms that can develop in the Gulf of Kalloni from winds off the surrounding mountains. The Gulf is regarded by sailors very much as an extension of the sea rather than as a mere inland lake.

³⁵ This paper, in a slightly different form, was originally presented at the annual meeting of the AIA in New Orleans, December 1980. I am greatly indebted to the University Research Institute of the University of Texas at Austin for funding the field trip to Lesbos during which the topographical investigations described above were carried out. I have benefited from discussion of the problems involved with various friends and colleagues, both in Greece and the U.S.A., and from correspondence with Dr Hugh J. Mason of the University of Toronto. None of the above-mentioned should be held responsible for any errors that may remain: these can safely be ascribed to my own sloth, carelessness, or obstinacy.

Bentley, Philostratus, and the German Printers

Referring to a copy of F. Morel's edition of Philostratus (Paris 1608), which contains MS notes by Richard Bentley and bears the shelfmark 679.g.13, the *British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books* clxxxix (London 1963) Col. 253 states:

Imperfect; wanting all that in the preceding copy follows the work of Eusebius against Hierocles. The first four leaves are inserted from another edition, and between the fourth and thirteenth page the leaves are wanting.

To the best of my knowledge, the true nature of the inserted leaves has not been noticed hitherto. The reason may be the Catalogue's emphasis on the incomplete state of this copy: readers will naturally have turned, in the first place, to the complete copy which also contains MS notes by Bentley (shelfmark 678.h.8). It must have been the latter (or possibly C.48.1.3, where all Bentley's notes are copied in the more distinct handwriting of C. Burney) that was consulted, e.g., when C. L. Kayser prepared his critical edition of *Vita Apollonii* (Zürich 1844).¹ In the complete copy the marginal notes of

¹ P. xv with n. 2 Cf. also Kayser in his Heidelberg edn of *Vitae Sophistarum* (1838) xxxviii f., and *RE* xx.1 (1941) 174.

Bentley continue—although with great variations in frequency—right through the works of Philostratus, providing MS collations as well as numerous emendations to the text.

But what of the copy first referred to? It contains, indeed, four printed pages (not 'four leaves') from 'another edition'; to be exact, specimen pages for Bentley's own critical edition of Philostratus—which never appeared!

That this is so should be evident from the following description. The four pages contain the first three chapters of *Vita Apollonii* (i 1–3, ending with τῷ γὰρ Νινίῳ), the Greek text printed in the outer column, the Latin version in the inner, and notes at the bottom of the page. Two different founts have been used for both the Greek and the Latin text.² The wording of the Latin largely coincides with the corrections to Morel's version which Bentley himself has written between the lines in the complete copy of Philostratus, and the Greek text is also often changed in accordance with the marginal notes in that other copy. Moreover, the format of the critical notes printed at the bottom of the four pages corresponds well to that of the handwritten notes which we find from p. 13 on in our incomplete copy. Incidentally, these notes as well as the revision of the Latin translation and the cancelling of Morel's headings to the chapters are to be found only in a small part of the copy, pp. 13–29 and 37–65, corresponding to *Vita Apollonii* i 8–15 and i 18–ii 4. The rest of this incomplete copy (including its continuation in another volume, shelfmark 679.g.14) contains no notes at all in Bentley's hand.

Obviously, the incomplete copy is identical with the copy intended for the printer of the new edition. Whereas the complete copy contains all Bentley's work on the text through the years, the incomplete one represents—as far as his notes go—the final stage before the edition went to the press. The first twelve pages are missing because they have already been sent to the printer. The four printed pages inserted in their place are what Bentley received back. But is this all that was printed (the twelve missing pages contain four more chapters), and why was the edition never completed?

The first question I shall have to leave open: perhaps some other library or private collector has the answer.³ The other one I shall discuss more fully. In fact, there occur at different places vague references to specimen pages of a Bentley edition of Philostratus having been circulated,⁴ and J. H. Monk, in his large biography of Bentley (2nd edn, London 1833), has his story to tell. In 1691, Bentley had undertaken to edit three authors: Philostratus, Hesychius, and Manilius (i 34). Arriving at the year 1694, Monk resumes (i 57 f.):

² The printer has demonstrated one of his Greek founts on p. 1–2, another on p. 3–4. The first Latin fount has been used on p. 1–3, the second on p. 4 only. The second Greek fount is *without ligatures*, apparently a very early example of its kind. I wish to thank Dr S. Fogelmark (Lund) for discussion and elucidation of this and several other points in the present paper.

³ The present writer, who is preparing a new critical edition of *Vita Apollonii* for the Bibliotheca Teubneriana (Leipzig), would be grateful to be notified if someone knows of the existence of more pages of Bentley's unfinished edition: Professor Tomas Hägg, Department of Classics, Sydneplass 9, N–5000, Bergen, Norway.

⁴ In Olearius' edn of Philostratus (Leipzig 1709) p. x, in Fabricius' *Bibl. Gr.* (cf. below), and in the Bentley Bibliography by A. T. Bartholomew (Cambridge 1908) no. 138.

The projected editions of Philostratus and Manilius were now in a state of readiness for the printer; but the increased expense of paper and printing in England, the consequence of war and new taxes, deterred him from publishing books, which from their nature could only meet with a limited sale at home, and for the exportation of which the circumstances of the time were unfavourable. Accordingly, he designed to print his Philostratus at Leipsic, and sent thither the early part of his text and notes for that purpose. But when he received the first sheet as a specimen, he was disgusted with the meanness of the printing, and resolved that his labours should not come forth to the world in so unseemly a dress. Indeed, it may be remarked that Bentley always placed a high value upon typographical elegance, and was more fastidious upon this head, than might have been expected from one who so well understood the intrinsic merits of a book. After some time he abandoned altogether the view of this publication, as Professor Wolf remarks, 'to the joy of Olearius of Leipsic, and of nobody else.' To this German, who undertook to publish the two Philostrati, he sent part of his apparatus, the collation of a manuscript belonging to New College *De Vitis Sophistarum*, and that of a Baroccian manuscript, both which he had made during his residence at Oxford. The edition of Olearius, which appeared in 1709, contains Bentley's notes as far as p. 11, taken from the first sheet just mentioned which had been circulated as a specimen.

This is certainly a good story, but I doubt that it is quite true. There are reasons to believe that Monk has combined the evidence at his disposal wrongly and that his conclusion about Bentley's esteem for 'typographical elegance' having won over his understanding for 'the intrinsic merits of a book' has no real foundation in this case. There were less capricious grounds for abandoning the project.

My reconstruction of the course of events, tentative as it must be, rests partly on the same evidence as Monk used, chiefly the (published) correspondence of Bentley, partly on the contents of the incomplete copy of Morel's Philostratus in the British Library, which Monk does not seem to have inspected. Already its contents as described above shed new light on the process; but there is still more information to be extracted from that same copy.

First, the four pages inserted into the copy are obviously identical with the specimen pages that, according to Monk and others, were circulated in the learned world and referred to in Olearius' edition. There may have been more pages (*cf.* Monk on Olearius), but these four were certainly part of the lot circulated. But the quality of printing displayed in the four pages, with the two different founts to choose between, does not seem so bad as to provoke the reaction described by Monk; rather the contrary. And it is hard to believe that Bentley should have had a specimen circulated that he himself strongly resented. Monk seems to be wrong in identifying the first specimen from the printer with the one that was circulated.

Second, there are two more leaves inserted before p. 13 of the copy. One is blank. The other one is of a smaller size than the surrounding leaves, is printed on

the *recto* only, has no pagina stated, but a column title: PHILOSTRATI DE VITA APOLLONII. It contains an extract from Book viii of *Vita Apollonii*, which reproduces the text and translation of Morel's edition, from the top of p. 393 through to p. 394, line 9, adding only a fair number of misprints. The quality of printing is poor, compared both with Morel and with the four preceding pages of Bentley. This could indeed be the specimen which Bentley rejected. In that case, the printer had simply been asked to choose a page from Morel at random, print it in the typography he suggested for Bentley's edition, and send it as a specimen—with the known result.

Combining the evidence of this page and that of the four others, we must conclude that Bentley did not after all give up his project just because he received an ugly specimen. On the contrary, he managed to achieve a higher standard of printing, and went on. In fact, his reaction in the letter to Graevius in May, 1694, is not quite as categorical as Monk would have it: *Philostrati specimen, quod a Lipsiensibus nuper accepi, non placet: repudio omne edendi consilium, nisi typos elegantiores paraverint.*⁵ This rather sounds like the reflection of a threat addressed to the printer, and possibly it had the intended effect. However, I leave it to others, better qualified, to judge whether the same printer produced both the first and the second specimen, and who the printer(s) were.⁶ As far as publishers are concerned, one may think of Th. Fritsch in Leipzig, who in 1691 had announced another edition-never-to-appear of Philostratus, by H. Muhlius;⁷ now, three years later, the latter may well have abandoned his project. Fritsch in 1696 published Kühn's Pausanias and Spanheim's Julian, both of which are mentioned in connection with Bentley's Philostratus in a letter from Graevius to Bentley of 25th December, 1694.

This letter from Graevius, written half a year after Bentley's threat, confirms that Bentley had not given up his plans—at least as far as Graevius knew; he reports how the editions of Julian and Pausanias advance, and then adds: '*In tuo Philostrato quo usque progressi sint [i.e., the printers in Leipzig] ex te cognoscemus.*'⁸

The real reason for abandoning the project was surely less capricious, and far more trivial. Upside down, on the *verso* of the rejected specimen leaf, we find in Bentley's handwriting his disposition for the project, with detailed titles of ten different texts, all to be edited by R. B. himself. The edition is to contain not only the whole Corpus Philostrateum: *Vita Apollonii, Epistulae, Heroicus*, both collections of *Imagines, Vitae Sophistarum*; but also the other works that were traditionally connected with it: Eusebius' *Hierocles*, the *Epistulae* of Apollonius, and works of Callistratus and Eunapius. The gigantic enterprise—from which Bentley is obviously not deterred by the ugly printing of the

⁵ Quoted from *The Correspondence of Richard Bentley* i (London 1842) 87.

⁶ Dr Fogelmark calls attention to the similarity of the Greek fount used on p. 1–2 of the second specimen with that used for the edition of Dionysius of Halicarnassus which appeared with Chr. Günther in Leipzig in 1691.

⁷ Eloquently introduced in W. E. Tentzel's *Monatliche Unterredungen*, June 1691, 521–6. On Heinrich Muhlius (1666–1733) and his mainly theological career, *cf.* *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* xxii (Leipzig 1885) 481 f.

⁸ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 89.

recto—is to end with ‘Indices Graeci et Latini Accuratisissimi et Locupletissimi’! It is true that Bentley’s MS notes in the complete copy cover all the texts contained in Morel’s edition, but from the incomplete one we now know that the actual work on the huge project never exceeded the first two books of *Vita Apollonii* . . .

There is also, as far as I have been able to find out, nothing in Bentley’s published correspondence to support Monk’s statement that the editions of Philostratus and Manilius were in 1694 ‘in a state of readiness for the printer’. In 1690, Bentley first mentions ‘an Edition of Philostratus, which I shall set out this next year’,⁹ in 1692 Graevius expresses his delight that Bentley is now fully engaged in the work on the new edition,¹⁰ and in December 1694, as we have seen, Graevius just asks about its progress.

For the same period there is also some—unfortunately rather confusing—information to be had from other sources. With reference to Bentley’s Philostratus, Fabricius states in his *Bibliotheca Graeca*: ‘Hujus primum folium Lipsiae excusum vidi Anno 1691’.¹¹ He must be mistaken. The statement cannot be reconciled with the evidence of the letters, and the reference he gives in this connection, to Tentzel’s *Monatliche Unterredungen* 1691, p. 521, is also wrong: it refers to the announcement of Muhlius’ edition (above n. 7). When, some lines further down, he really wants to refer to Muhlius, his reference (1693, 882 f.) is to Bentley! And at this place Tentzel only says that Bentley’s edition, printed in Leipzig, will be welcome when it appears.¹² Thus, Fabricius cannot be adduced as a support for Monk’s timetable, and Tentzel’s *Monatliche Unterredungen* unfortunately do not mention Bentley’s Philostratus again.

The project thus seems to have been abandoned simply because it had not advanced very far at all when, in the later part of the 1690s, other well-known activities increasingly absorbed Bentley’s time.¹³ It thus shared the fate of many other similar enterprises. There seems to have been a definite decision at some time between December 1694, and the beginning of 1698. Graevius, who constantly tries to push Bentley on, continues in letters of February and June 1698 to ask for the editions of Hesychius and Manilius, but Philostratus he mentions no more.¹⁴ Already in his letter of 6th February, 1697, when quoting Spanheim’s laudatory reference to Bentley’s projected Philostratus (in his Julian of 1696), Graevius abstains from any remark of his own on this (delicate?) topic—he just wants to elicit from Bentley his comments on a certain locus in *Imagines*, which he also receives in Bentley’s reply of 26th March.¹⁵

⁹ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 11. The earlier edition of Bentley’s letters, *Richardi Bentleii et doctorum virorum epistolae partim mutuae* (Leipzig 1825) 127, reads ‘which I shall send out this next year’, which may have misled Monk.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 46.

¹¹ Vol. iv. 2 (Hamburg 1711) 53. The whole passage is reprinted, without corrections, in the 3rd edn, vol. v (Hamburg 1796) 555 f.

¹² November 1693, 882: ‘Dannhero ist kein Zweifel, der *Philostratus*, so jetzt in Leipzig mit seiner neuen Lateinischen *Version* und *Annotationibus* in Druck kommet, werde bey der gelehrten Welt angenehm und willkommen seyn.’

¹³ *Cf. op. cit.* (n. 5) 18 (Feb. 1691?), 164 (15 Feb. 1698), 194 (20 Aug. 1702: ‘scias me toto hoc biennio vix unum et alterum diem vacavisse humanioribus literis’).

¹⁴ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 158, 175.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 138–43.

On the other hand, this decision, whenever it was made before 1698, does not seem to be connected with another one; namely, to let Olearius take over the job and use Bentley’s collations. The young Olearius—‘iste egregius juvenis’—is not mentioned in the correspondence until June 1698, when he is about to set out for London and is introduced to the great man by Graevius: ‘Cognosces juvenem integerrimae vitae, et nostrarum artium cupidissimum . . .’¹⁶ There is no mention of Philostratus here; possibly Olearius’ visit to London was the very occasion when the idea to let him take over was formed. Eleven years later Olearius’ edition appeared, in Leipzig, with Fritsch.

Anyway, the German printers are not the ones to blame for the fact that Bentley gave up and the learned world had to wait another 150 years for a decent edition of Philostratus.

TOMAS HÄGG

University of Bergen, Norway

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 175 f.

A Thucydidean Scholium on the ‘Lelantine War’

The purpose of this note is to bring to light a piece of evidence on the ‘Lelantine War’ which has hitherto been neglected, and briefly to review the Thucydidean and some of the other evidence in the light of it. The neglected evidence is a scholium on Thuc. i 15:

οὐ γὰρ ξυνειστήκεσαν πρὸς τὰς μεγίστας πόλεις ὑπήκοοι, οὐδ’ αὖ αὐτοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἴσης κοινὰς στρατείας ἐποιούοντο, κατ’ ἀλλήλους δὲ μάλλον ὡς ἕκαστοι οἱ ἀστυγείτονες ἐπολέμουν. μάλιστα δὲ ἐς τὸν πάλαι ποτὲ γενόμενον πόλεμον Χαλκιδέων καὶ Ἐρετριῶν καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἐκατέρων διέστη.

The gloss is on the word διέστη:

διεσπάσθη, ἀνεχώρησεν, οὐ συνεμάχησεν· οὐ γὰρ λέγει ὅτι ἐμερίσθη, ἀλλὰ μόνοι Χαλκιδεῖς μόνοις Ἐρετριεῦσιν ἐμάχοντο. ABMC₂f.

1. *Thucydides* i 15.3

In his introductory chapters¹ Thucydides gives a brief survey of earlier Greek history, the purpose of which is to show that τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν (i.e. Greek history before the Peloponnesian war) were οὐ μεγάλα . . . οὔτε κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους οὔτε ἐς τὰ ἄλλα,² to explain why this was the case and thus to support his view that the Peloponnesian war was ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων.

In our passage he is saying that land-wars in general were not on a large scale as there were no combinations of resources either on the basis of inequality or ἀπὸ τῆς ἴσης; but rather wars tended to be purely local affairs between neighbouring πόλεις. Does the next sentence, μάλιστα δὲ . . . διέστη, illustrate or modify this? The orthodox and, I think, clearly correct view is that it modifies: ‘The best exception is that long-ago war between Chalcis and Eretria in which the rest of the Greek world was divided in alliance with either side.’

(a) διυστάναι in Thucydides always means ‘divide’,

¹ i 1–23.

² i 1.3.