

XXV.—Two Notes on Isocrates

A. E. RAUBITSCHKE

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

I

8.82: Οὕτω γὰρ ἀκριβῶς εὑρισκον ἐξ ὧν ἄνθρωποι μάλιστα ἂν μισηθεῖεν, ὥστ' ἐψηφίζαντο τὸ περιγιγνόμενον ἐκ τῶν φόρων ἀργύριον, διελόντες κατὰ τάλαντον, εἰς τὴν ὀρχήστραν τοῖς Διονυσίοις εἰσφέρειν ἐπειδὴν πλήρες ἦ τὸ θέατρον· καὶ τοῦτ' ἐποιοῦν. . . . ἐπιδεικνύοντες τοῖς μὲν συμμάχοις τὰς τιμὰς τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῶν ὑπὸ μισθωτῶν εἰσφερομένας. . . .

Thus reads, with one slight change,¹ the text as printed by G. Norlin in the second volume of his Loeb Classical Library edition.² Norlin accepted here the reading *φόρων* which is based on the text both of one group of manuscripts and of Papyrus 132 in the British Museum.³ In fact, *φόρων* was the accepted reading of all editions up to that of G. E. Benseler (Leipzig, 1851) who preferred the reading *πόρων* which he found in the then newly discovered manuscript Urbinas 111 (Γ).⁴ Benseler was followed by F. Blass and, more recently, by M. L. W. Laistner⁵ who omitted in his critical apparatus any reference to the readings either of Δ or of the London papyrus, although he accepted the papyrus in other instances as a source of independent evidence.⁶ Isocrates used the word *φόρος* frequently,⁷ and it seems that he was familiar with matters concerning the Athenian tribute,⁸ whereas there is no other evidence in Isocrates for the occurrence of the word *πόρος*. It is known,

¹ One may suggest retaining *εἰσφερομένας* instead of Lange's unnecessary emendation *εἰσφερομένης*.

² *Isoc.* 2 (London, 1929) 56–57.

³ See E. Drerup, *Leipziger Studien* 17 (1896) 148; H. I. Bell, *JPh* 30 (1907) 46, column 26, line 4; F. Blass, *Isocratis Orationes* 1 (*editio stereotypa*, Lipsiae, 1913), pref. 44.

⁴ It may be noticed, however, that I. Bekker as well as G. Baiter who based their editions mainly on Γ retained the reading *φόρων* from the vulgate tradition represented by the manuscript Vaticanus 65 (Δ).

⁵ *Cornell Stud. Class. Phil.* 22 (1927) 45.

⁶ *CQ* 15 (1921) 78–84.

⁷ S. Preuss, *Index Isocrateus* (Leipzig, 1904).

⁸ Compare B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* 1 (Cambridge, 1939) 581, T79–82; G. Schmitz-Kahlmann, *Das Beispiel der Geschichte im Politischen Denken des Isokrates* (Leipzig, 1939).

moreover, that the tribute was due at the time of the City Dionysia,⁹ and Isocrates apparently refers to the presence of delegates from the allied cities. The final proof for the reading *φόρων* comes from the statement of Isocrates which immediately follows: *ἐπιδεικνύοντες τοῖς μὲν συμμάχοις τὰς τιμὰς τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῶν*; only the tribute can properly be called the *οὐσία* of the allies. It is clear, therefore, that Isocrates refers here to an Attic decree concerning the tribute.

Benseler was not only responsible for the acceptance of the reading *πόρων* in preference to *φόρων*, he also gave an interpretation of the whole passage which seems to have found almost general approval, although it is based on an obvious misunderstanding of the text. He declared¹⁰ that the Athenians decided to use the surplus of their public revenues for the so-called *θεωρικόν*; he adds that the author of this decree was Pericles.¹¹ As a matter of fact, Isocrates does not say, or even intimate, that the money brought into the theatre was distributed among the people; had this been the intention he would undoubtedly have mentioned this fact because such a distribution rather than a mere display would have aroused the hate of the allies. Moreover, the money mentioned by Isocrates apparently amounted to more than two talents, while the funds needed for the *θεωρικόν* hardly exceeded this amount.¹²

The correct interpretation of the Isocrates passage was indicated as far back as the beginning of the last century. Adamantios Koraës the "patriarch of Greek philology"¹³ wrote in his commentary on Isocrates: ¹⁴ *Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ ἐκ τῶν φόρων περιγιγνόμενον ἀργύριον καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀποκείμενον ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίοις, ὅποτε δηλαδὴ πλείστοι ξένοι ἐπεδήμουν κατὰ θέαν Ἀθήνησι, ἐπιδεικνύμενοι τούτοις τὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν, εἰσέφερον ὡς ἐν πομπῇ εἰς τὸ θέατρον, καὶ οἱ φέροντες ἐβάσταζον αὐτὸ κατὰ τάλαντον, ἵνα καὶ οἱ ξένοι ἀριθμεῖν ἔχοιεν τὸν πλοῦτον τῶν Ἀθηναίων.*

⁹ See B. D. Meritt, *Documents on Athenian Tribute* (Cambridge, 1937) 50, note 3; compare also CAF 3.403-404, no. 32.

¹⁰ *Isokrates' Plataikos, Archidamos und Rede über den Frieden* (Leipzig, 1854) 329.

¹¹ Benseler was followed by Laistner, *op. cit.* (see note 5) 102 and W. Schwahn, *RE s.v.* "Theorikon" 2234. Even Norlin who retained the reading *φόρων* remarks (*op. cit.* [see note 2] 56, note b) that the surplus of the tribute was the theoric fund; see also Fensterbusch, *RE s.v.* "Orchestra" 884.

¹² See Schwahn, *op. cit.* (see note 11) 2234.

¹³ See J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* 3 (Cambridge, 1908) 363, note 5.

¹⁴ Repeated by I. H. Bremi, *Isocratis Orationes* 1 (Gothae et Erfordiae, 1831) 157-158.

More recently, B. B. Rogers declared ¹⁵ that "the tribute brought by the allies was spread out, talent by talent, over the theatrical orchestra, in the sight of the assembled Hellenes," and L. Pearson refers to the same passage when he writes ¹⁶ that Isocrates "deploras the *aselgeia* of their ancestors in having the tribute publicly presented at the Dionysia."

A passage of Aristophanes may be mentioned in this connection. The chorus of the Knights (line 313) accuses Cleon as ἀπὸ τῶν πέτρων ἄνωθεν τοὺς φόρους θυννοσκοπῶν. This line has commonly been interpreted as merely referring to Cleon watching from the rocks of the Pnyx the incoming boats carrying the tribute, like a fisherman who watches from the shore the schools of tuna fish coming into his nets. This interpretation seems to be supported by a passage of Plutarch (*Themistocles* 19.4) which indicates that one could view the sea from the fifth-century speaker's platform of the Pnyx.¹⁷ But the audience in the theatre of Dionysos, sitting on the rock-cut steps, might have remembered, when hearing the line of Aristophanes quoted above, that the tribute money was carried into the orchestra, each talent separately. The appearance in the orchestra of at least five hundred men each carrying one talent of money may easily have been compared by Aristophanes, and understood in this way by the audience, with a shoal of tuna fish. This interpretation seems to be favored also by the scholion which says οὐ λαθάνουσι τὸν Κλέωνα τῆς πόλεως ἐπιβαίνοντες οἱ τοὺς φόρους φέροντες. Since Cleon is accused of watching the incoming money, and since his reply (line 314) indicates that Aristophanes repeats the joke from an earlier comedy, probably the Babylonians, it may be suggested that Cleon himself was responsible for the decree to display the annually incoming tribute in public. This assumption would provide a fairly accurate date for the decree, as will be discussed below.

The interpretation may be carried further on two points. Koraës and Rogers have already indicated that the money was divided into talents when it was carried into the theatre, so that the spectators could easily estimate the total value of the display. This interpretation is fully supported by some archaeological evi-

¹⁵ *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London, 1910) 76; see also U. Kahrstedt, *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen* (Stuttgart, 1936) 314.

¹⁶ *CPh* 36 (1941) 228.

¹⁷ See K. Kourouniotes and H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia* 1 (1932) 134-135.

dence which comes in part incidentally from one of the decrees concerning the collection of the Athenian tribute.¹⁸ The stele of this decree was crowned by a relief, a fragment of which is still preserved. This relief shows several receptacles (two hydriae and several money bags) which presumably contained the tribute brought to Athens by the allies.¹⁹ A. Hess has shown²⁰ that coined money was commonly kept and transported in terracotta vessels. A stamnos which contained one talent in Attic tetradrachmas (1500 pieces) had the weight of approximately 54 pounds, its height would have to be at least about 11 inches, and its greatest diameter about 8 inches;²¹ the vessels were probably larger. It is clear, therefore, that the talents shown in the orchestra at the time of the Dionysia were carried in terracotta vessels or in money bags, each of which contained just one talent. An illustration of the manner in which the vessels were carried may be recognized in one of the scenes of the Parthenon frieze which shows "young men carrying on their shoulders heavy vases."²² These vases are strikingly similar to the one on the relief above the tribute document (see note 18), and a comparison of their profiles with those of preserved Athenian vases suggests that they were hydriae.²³

The other point on which further comment may be made concerns the phrase τὸ περιγυγνόμενον ἐκ τῶν φόρων ἀργύριον.²⁴ Benseler who read τὸ περιγυγνόμενον τῶν πόρων ἀργύριον correctly translated this as "the surplus of the revenues." If the reading φόρων is accepted and the preposition ἐκ is omitted, the phrase would have to be translated "the surplus of the tribute." Norlin, however,

¹⁸ Meritt, *op. cit.* (see note 8) 123, fig. 178.

¹⁹ See A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* (1909) 53-54.

²⁰ *Kl* 26 (1935) 23-45 and especially 27; see also *CAF* 1.410, no. 71. To these references add F. Durrbach, *Inscriptions de Délos*, note on no. 399, page 63; G. M. A. Richter and M. J. Milne, *Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases* (New York, 1935) 8. A good example showing how silver coins were packed into a terracotta pitcher comes from the excavations of Olynthos; see D. M. Robinson and P. A. Clement, *Excavations at Olynthus* 9 (1938) 179 and pl. 24. Compare also P. Wernicke, *RE s.v.* "Amphora" 1972, lines 59-61.

²¹ These figures are taken from Hess's article, *loc. cit.* (see note 20) 41-42.

²² See G. Rodenwaldt, *The Acropolis* (Oxford, 1930) 42 and plate 47.

²³ See Richter and Milne, *op. cit.* (see note 20) figures 83-85. The earlier hydria illustrated in figures 83 and 84 shows a close resemblance to the hydriae of the Parthenon frieze, while the later hydria (fig. 85) is more similar to the vases on the tribute relief.

²⁴ The word ἐκ is preserved in the vulgate tradition which has also φόρων, while the Urbinas manuscript (I') omits ἐκ and writes πόρων instead of φόρων. The papyrus, however, has φόρων without the preceding ἐκ.

who retained the word *ἐκ* in his edition translates the phrase "the surplus of the funds derived from the tributes." But his text allows also the translation "the money which comes in every year as a result of the tribute payments," or simply "the annually incoming tribute money."²⁵ It is significant that the Attic decree to which Isocrates refers apparently used the present tense *περιγιγνόμενον* and not *περιγενόμενον* as would be expected if the word were to mean "the surplus."²⁶ This interpretation obviates the difficulties resulting from the assumption that the decree dealt with provisions concerning the surplus of the tribute.²⁷ If, moreover, the suggestion is accepted that Aristophanes (*Knights*, line 313) refers to the display of the tribute in the theatre, this would supply additional evidence for the assumption that the decree quoted by Isocrates concerned the whole annual tribute and not only the surplus.

A few words may be added regarding the date of the decree under discussion. Fragments of two decrees are preserved which deal with the collection of the tribute, and it may be assumed that the decree quoted by Isocrates was of a similar nature. One of these documents,²⁸ which was crowned by the relief mentioned above, is dated in the second prytany of the year 426/5 B.C., that is, in the summer of the year 426. This decree provided that collectors of the tribute be appointed by the individual cities, and that these collectors should bring the tribute to Athens.²⁹ It is quite possible that this decree, the main part of which is lost, contained also the provision that the tribute should be carried into the orchestra at the time of the City Dionysia; for we know that this was the time when it was paid by the great majority of the cities. But it is also possible that this provision was older than the decree

²⁵ The meaning of *περιγίγνεται* with and without *ἐκ* can be determined on the basis of Liddell and Scott's *A Greek-English Lexicon*² s.v. *περιγίγνομαι* 2.2 and 3. For the phrase *περιγίγνεται* without *ἐκ*, see also *IG*, 1².338 in the new publication of B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 5 (1936) 367-368.

²⁶ The original text of the decree may have been: τοὺς ἑλληνοταμίαις (?) τὸ περιγιγνόμενον ἐκ τῶν φόρων ἀργύριον διελόντας κατὰ τάλαττον εἰς τὴν ὀρχήστραν τοῖς Διονυσίοις εἰσφέρειν ἐπειδὴν πλήρης ἦ τὸ θέατρον. The reading *διελόντας* which is given by one group of manuscripts may originally have stood in the text of the decree.

²⁷ A passage in the so-called Callias decrees has long been thought to refer to the surplus of the tribute. But this passage, too, is of far less importance than was originally thought, and it actually does not deal at all with the surplus of the tribute, as B. D. Meritt, *AJPh* 55 (1934) 273 and A. B. West, *AJA* 38 (1934) 405-406 have conclusively shown.

²⁸ Meritt, *op. cit.* (see note 8) 213 (D 8).

²⁹ Compare A. E. Raubitschek, *AJPh* 61 (1940) 475-477.

of 426/5 B.C. In the winter of the same year, the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes was played, and it is safe to assume that any references in this play to the tribute reflects the situation before the decree of 426/5 B.C. went into effect.³⁰ This is certainly true, moreover, for the *Babylonians* of Aristophanes which was played in the spring of 426 (427/6 B.C.) at the City Dionysia. There is good reason to assume that the delivery of the tribute and the celebration of the City Dionysia were closely connected even before 426/5 B.C.³¹ Aristophanes says in the *Acharnians* (lines 505–506), which was played at the Lenaea, that he may speak frankly on matters concerning Athenian politics because “no foreigners are present; for the tribute does not come, nor the allies from the cities.” But the opposite condition prevailed at the City Dionysia of 427/6 B.C. when the *Babylonians* was on the stage.³² This comedy not only criticized in general the oppression of the allies, but it may even have contained a pointed allusion to the display of the tribute in the orchestra, if a line in Aristophanes’ *Knights* (314) is correctly interpreted as referring to this older play. The words οὔτε γὰρ φόροι ἤκουσι have been understood by the ancient scholiast³³ as well as by modern commentators as meaning that the tribute was paid at the time of the City Dionysia and that the delegates of the allied cities took the occasion to attend the whole festival. But it is quite possible that this passage refers directly to the fact that the tribute was brought into the theatre. It is more likely, therefore, that the decree quoted by Isocrates belongs to 427/6 B.C. or to the year before. The other decree concerning the collection of tribute³⁴ has been dated shortly after the middle of the fifth century,³⁵ and its early date makes it virtually impossible that it contained the phrase quoted by Isocrates. It may be assumed, therefore, that between the death of Pericles and the performance of the Baby-

³⁰ Compare H. B. Mayor, *JHS* 59 (1939) 57–64; but see W. K. Pritchett, *AJPh* 61 (1940) 473. W. Schwahn misinterprets the literary and epigraphical evidence when he declares (*RE* s.v. “Phoroi” 632–633) that the tribute was not paid at the time of the Dionysia. Characteristic for his treatment of this as well as of other problems concerning the tribute is his assertion that the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes was played at the Dionysia (*sic*).

³¹ Compare Meritt, *op. cit.* (see note 9) 50–51.

³² See the reconstruction of the play by M. Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens* (London, 1909) 42.

³³ See Meritt, *op. cit.* (see note 8) 574, T25–27.

³⁴ Meritt, *op. cit.* (see note 8) 164–165 and 212–213 (D 7).

³⁵ Raubitschek, *loc. cit.* (see note 29) 477–479.

Ionians a decree was passed, proposed perhaps by Cleon himself, which ordered the annual display of the tribute at the time of the City Dionysia.

II

8.86 : Καίτοι πλείοσι καὶ μείζοσι περιέπεσον ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ταύτης τῶν ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ χρόνῳ τῇ πόλει γεγεννημένων. εἰς Αἴγυπτον μὲν γε διακόσμαι πλεύσασαί τριήρεις αὐτοῖς τοῖς πληρώμασι διεφθάρσαν, περὶ δὲ Κύπρον πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν· ἐν Δάτῳ δὲ μυρίους ὀπλίτας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἀπώλεσαν, ἐν Σικελίᾳ δὲ τέτταρας μυριάδας καὶ τριήρεις τετταράκοντα καὶ διακοσίας, τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ διακοσίας.

Thus reads the text as printed by F. Blass in the first volume of his stereotyped edition (Teubner) of 1913; for the critical apparatus, see page 44 of the preface. Blass did not yet take into account the papyrus in the British Museum (Pap. 132), which was discussed in detail by E. Drerup,³⁶ published in its entirety by H. I. Bell,³⁷ and extensively used by both M. L. W. Laistner³⁸ and G. Norlin³⁹ in their editions of Isocrates.

Besides smaller differences between the text based on the extant manuscripts and that of the papyrus, there is one passage which deserves comment because Laistner claimed⁴⁰ that the reading of the papyrus ἐν δὲ τῷ Δεκελεικῷ πολέμῳ (instead of ἐν Δάτῳ δέ) is "the papyrus' most important contribution to the text of the *De Pace*."

The reading of the papyrus is not beyond doubt,⁴¹ but its meaning has been made sufficiently clear by Laistner who referred to other occurrences of the phrase Δεκελεικὸς πόλεμος in both Isocrates and Demosthenes. It may be admitted that Laistner was justified, from the viewpoint of a pure textual criticism, in preferring the reading of the papyrus, but the historical interpretation seems to reject his reading.

Isocrates mentions first the losses of the Athenian expeditions

³⁶ *Loc. cit.* (see note 3) 94–118.

³⁷ *Loc. cit.* (see note 3) 1–83.

³⁸ *Loc. cit.* (see note 5).

³⁹ *Op. cit.* (see note 2) 2.2–97.

⁴⁰ *CQ* 15 (1921) 81–82. Laistner maintained this view in his edition of Isocrates (see note 5), and he was followed by G. Ammon, *PhW* 49 (1929) 1239, Norlin (see note 2), and G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Firenze, 1934–XII) 302, note 1. Laistner did not care to reply to E. Drerup's charges (*loc. cit.* [see note 3] 116, repeated in *Isocratis Opera Omnia* 1 [Lipsiae, 1906] pref. 99) that this passage *papyrus impudenter interpolatum ostendit*.

⁴¹ Compare Bell, *loc. cit.* (see note 3) 49, note 6.

to Egypt ⁴² and Cyprus.⁴³ He then continues: ἐν Δάτῳ δὲ ⁴⁴ μυρίους ὀπλίτας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἀπώλεσαν.⁴⁵ H. Koch had already remarked ⁴⁶ "fere eadem verba Thuc. I, 100, 3," and, indeed, the Isocrates passage has frequently been quoted in accounts of the Athenian defeat at Drabescus.⁴⁷ It may be useful, however, to rehearse in full the passages which deal with the same event.

Herodotus 9.75: αὐτὸν δὲ Σωφάνεα χρόνῳ ὕστερον τούτων κατέλαβε ἄνδρα γεγόμενον ἀγαθόν, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγέοντα ἅμα Λεάγρῳ τῷ Γλαύκωνος, ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Ἑδωνῶν ἐν Δάτῳ περὶ τῶν μετάλλων τῶν χρυσέων μαχόμενον.

Thucydides 1.100.3: ἐπὶ δὲ Στῆρύμονα πέμψαντες μυρίους οἰκήτορας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων. . . . 4.102.2: ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔτεσι δύο καὶ τριάκοντα ὕστερον, ἐποίκουσ μυρίους σφῶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τὸν βουλούμενον πέμψαντες, οἱ διεφθάρησαν ἐν Δραβησκῷ ὑπὸ Θρακῶν.

Diodorus Siculus 11.70.5: ἅμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις Ἀθηναῖοι θαλαττοκρατοῦντες εἰς Ἀμφίπολιν ἐξέπεμψαν οἰκήτορας μυρίους, οὓς μὲν ἐκ τῶν πολιτῶν, οὓς δ' ἐκ τῶν συμμάχων καταλέξαντες. . . .

Pausanias 1.29.4: πρῶτοι δὲ ἐτάφησαν οὓς ἐν Θράκῃ ποτὲ ἐπικρατοῦντας μέχρι Δραβησκῷ τῆς χώρας Ἑδωνοὶ φονεύουσιν ἀνέλπιστοι ἐπιθέμενοι. . . .

Scholium on Aeschines 2.34: δεύτερον οἱ μετὰ Λεάγρου κληροῦχοι ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους.

A comparison of these passages with the one under discussion clearly indicates that Isocrates refers to the same event: the defeat of the Athenians at Datus or Drabescus. The definite proof is provided by the fact that both Thucydides and Isocrates (Diodorus depends on Thucydides) speak of ten thousand casualties among the Athenians and their allies. It may be noticed, however, that this event took place before the expeditions to Egypt and Cyprus, since the date given by the Scholium on Aeschines 2.34 can hardly be accepted.

⁴² For a recent discussion of the Athenian losses in Egypt, A. W. Gomme, *CQ* 21 (1927) 148, note 2; W. Wallace, *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 252–260; according to Wallace the Athenian losses would fall far short of the figure given by Isocrates.

⁴³ For a recent discussion of the Athenian losses off Cyprus, see Sir George Hill, *A History of Cyprus* 1 (Cambridge, 1940).124, note 2; compare also W. Peek, *HSPH*, Suppl. vol. 1 (1940) 101–108.

⁴⁴ For the position of δέ, see J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1934) 185

⁴⁵ For earlier discussions of this passage, see G. E. Benseler, *op. cit.* (see note 10) 333.

⁴⁶ *Quomodo Isocrates saeculi quinti res enarraverit* (Giessen, 1914) 32, note 12.

⁴⁷ B. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* 3.203, note 1; P. Perdrizet, *Kl* 10 (1910) 12, note 3; K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* 2².2.148, note 2; W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* 2² (Oxford, 1928) 319; compare S. Casson, *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria* (Oxford, 1926) 45–46 and 68; J. Papastavru, *Amphipolis* (Leipzig, 1936) 10; W. Kolbe, *H* 72 (1937) 249–250.

Laistner himself makes an important objection to his own reading when he writes ⁴⁸ that Athens was on the defensive after the Sicilian expedition and "that a reference to the Deceleian War is not altogether appropriate side by side with references to great foreign expeditions." To this may be added that Isocrates mentions in the other instances military events which were limited both locally and in time, while a reference to the Deceleian War would imply the inclusion of widely scattered fighting which extended over a great number of years.⁴⁹ Yet Isocrates himself says in the passage immediately following: τὰς δὲ κατὰ δέκα καὶ κατὰ ⁵⁰ πέντε καὶ πλείους τούτων ἀπολλυμένας καὶ τοὺς κατὰ χιλίους καὶ δισχιλίους ἀποθνήσκοντας τίς ἂν ἐξαριθμήσειεν;

In discussing the reading ἐν Δάτῳ δέ, Laistner admitted that "the corruption (in codices ΓΕ) cannot be fully explained." Since it is now proved that ἐν Δάτῳ δέ is the correct reading, it is necessary to explain the corruption in the text of the papyrus or its exemplar (ἐν δὲ τῷ Δεκελειῳ πολέμῳ). Laistner already called to our attention "the reference to τοῦ τείχους τοῦ ἐν Δεκελειᾷσιν" ⁵¹ in the preceding paragraph 84, but while he thought that this passage possibly "helped to bring about the omission of a second reference to the same place," it may rather be assumed that it caused the insertion of a reference to Deceleia in the phrase ἐν Δάτῳ δέ which would have been unintelligible to anyone who had not read Herodotus. Leaving aside the always tempting possibilities of explanations based on palaeographical observations, it may be stated that ἐν Δάτῳ δέ is preferable also as the *lectio difficilior* which could hardly be due to a corruption of the text.

⁴⁸ CQ 15 (1921) 82.

⁴⁹ Compare also G. Smith, CPh 14 (1919) 361, note 1; A. W. Gomme, CQ 21 (1927) 149.

⁵⁰ For this reading, compare Laistner's commentary (see note 5).

⁵¹ This reading cannot be found either in any of the manuscripts or in the papyrus, and Laistner himself has the correct phrase τοῦ τείχους τοῦ Δεκελειᾷσιν in his edition of Isocrates.