

14

THE

# CLASSICAL REVIEW.

VOLUME X.

---

39 306  
11/6/97.

London:  
DAVID NUTT, 270 AND 271 STRAND.  
1896.

## No. 2.

	PAGE		PAGE
G. B. HUSSEY. The Incorporation of Several Dialogues in Plato's <i>Republic</i>	81	Bonhoeffer on Stoic Philosophy. R. D. HICKS . . . . .	112
A. W. VERRALL. The Calendar in the <i>Trachiniae</i> of Sophocles . . . . .	85	Thompson's Glossary of Greek Birds. W. W. MERRY . . . . .	115
W. RIDGEWAY. What led Pythagoras to the Doctrine that the World was built of Numbers . . . . .	92	Clark's Edition of the <i>Pro Milone</i> of Cicero. S. G. OWEN . . . . .	118
J. B. BURY. The Battle of Marathon .	95	W. Owen's Edition of the <i>de Oratore</i> of Cicero. J. C. ROLFE . . . . .	119
W. G. RUTHERFORD. Aristophanica .	98	Bosanquet's Companion to the Re- public. J. B. MAYOR . . . . .	120
T. G. TUCKER. Notes on the <i>Electra</i> of Euripides . . . . .	100	Nutt on the <i>Voyage of Bran</i> . F. B. JEVONS . . . . .	121
H. RICHARDS. Critical Notes on Xeno- phon's <i>Oeconomicus</i> . . . . .	101	A. SIDGWICK. Version of Browning's <i>Lyric Love</i> in Greek Hexameters .	125
J. A. JOFFE. Note on Eur. <i>Medea</i> , 340-345 . . . . .	104	Archaeology.	
J. ADAM. Note on Plato, Rep. x. 607c.	105	Reinach's Bibliothèque des Monu- ments Figurés. W. M. RAMSAY .	125
L. L. FORMAN. Ethopia in Lysias .	105	Ruggiero's Dizionario Epigrafico 43, 44. F. HAVERFIELD . . . . .	126
H. W. AUDEN. Natural History in Homer . . . . .	107	Torr's Ancient Ships (a Rejoinder). C. TORR . . . . .	127
W. H. D. ROUSE. Note on Sallust. <i>Jug.</i> 78 . . . . .	107	Bibliography . . . . .	127
Reviews.			
Jowett and Campbell's Edition of the <i>Republic</i> . J. B. MAYOR . . . . .	107		

## No. 3.

L. CAMPELL. On the Place of the <i>Par- menides</i> in the order of the Platonic Dialogues . . . . .	129	J. B. BURY. On a phrase of a Boeotian Poet . . . . .	158
J. G. C. ANDERSON. The Campaign of Basil I. against the Paulicians . . .	136	R. Y. TYRRELL. Note on Soph. <i>Trach.</i> 660 . . . . .	158
W. M. RAMSAY. Note on the Above .	140	W. RIDGEWAY. Additional Note on the name 'Bassareus.' . . . .	158
T. G. TUCKER. Notes upon the <i>Poetics</i> of Aristotle . . . . .	140	Reviews.	
H. RICHARDS. Notes upon the <i>Oecono- micus</i> of Xenophon . . . . .	144	Havet's Phaedrus. R. ELLIS . . .	159
E. POSTE. Attic Judicature . . . . .	147	Pauli on the Lemnian and Etruscan Languages. E. W. FAY . . . . .	163
C. D. CHAMBERS. On the Origin of the Construction of $\mu\eta$ . . . . .	150	Hartland's <i>Legend of Perseus</i> , Vol. II. F. B. JEVONS . . . . .	166
W. G. RUTHERFORD. Hesychiana . .	153	De Mirmont on Naval Construction in Apollonius. R. C. SEATON . .	167
J. S. REID. Note on Cic. <i>de Fin.</i> ii. 56	155	Harris's <i>Plato as a Narrator</i> . Σ . .	170
E. W. FAY. Note on Plaut. <i>Truculent.</i> 252 . . . . .	155	Hayley on Terentian Metres. J. C. ROLFE . . . . .	171
G. B. HUSSEY. Note on Plat. <i>Theaetet.</i> 171 d. . . . .	156	Archaeology.	
C. KNAPP. Note on Horace . . . . .	156	Fisher's Translation of Boissier's <i>Rome and Pompeii</i> . A. S. W. . .	171
J. STANLEY. Note on Hor. <i>Carm.</i> ii. 12, 14 . . . . .	157	Monthly Record . . . . .	172
		Summaries of Periodicals . . . . .	173
		Bibliography . . . . .	175

Parmenides with the management of what Hegel calls the fourth person: ἔφη ὁ Ἀντιφῶν φάσαι τὸν Πυθόδωρον...τὸν Παρμενίδην φάσαι, κ.τ.λ.? The elaborate manner in which both dialogues are introduced is in accordance with the date of composition here assigned to them. For it indicates the writer's consciousness of a wide gap between the lifetime of Socrates and his own, which has to be bridged over in some way. But in the Theaetetus his way of doing this is far neater, and his comment upon it in the Preface to that dialogue betrays the consciousness of a difficulty overcome.

3. The most original and suggestive passage of the Parmenides, that in which the possibility of change (μεταβολή) is provided for through the conception of the instantaneous (ἡ τοῦ ἐξαίφνης φύσις), by removing the speculative difficulty which stood in the way of admitting the reality of γένεσις, may have cleared a path for Plato's onward thought, towards that analysis of sensation, perception, judgment, memory and opinion, as *processes*, which fills so large a space in the argument of the Theaetetus. Mr. Waddell finds that the insertion of this passage creates a want of symmetry between the two ἰποθέσεις, ἐν εἰ ἔστω and ἐν εἰ μὴ ἔστω, but to have pursued the latter into the third consequence 'neither all nor none,' would have been tedious and unmeaning.

4. That Plato himself connected the Sophist with the Theaetetus is not a conclusive argument, for the evidence of style

suggests that a gap of time must have come between, and except in the last sentence, which may have been tacked on at any time, the Theaetetus presents no trace of having been originally intended to be the first of a series.

But, once more, in looking at the Parmenides as a whole, while the style is that of Plato's maturity, the dialogue presents more the effect of a first effort in a new region,—that of pure dialectical abstractions,—than the Theaetetus with its mellow blending of ethical, psychological, logical and metaphysical elements, and its profound analysis (taken up afterwards in the Timaeus) of the nature of perception.

At the same time I am ready to admit that this particular question may be argued in a contrary sense;—that the thorny subtleties of the Parmenides, so remote from the spirit of the Republic, are only approached towards the end of the Theaetetus, that the thorough-going notion of a philosophy which despises nothing however trivial is shared by the Parmenides with the later dialogues (Soph. Phileb.), and that the ἐλεγκτικὸς ἀνὴρ of the Theaetetus (a contemporary portrait) may have led Plato back to Zeno and through Zeno to the re-examination of 'the great Parmenides.' I have far less of certitude on this point than I have in maintaining that the Theaetetus and Parmenides are sister dialogues and that they are intermediate between the Republic and the Sophistes.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

#### THE CAMPAIGN OF BASIL I. AGAINST THE PAULICIANS IN 872 A.D.

THIS campaign of Basil is of great interest and importance from a topographical point of view and will well repay a careful examination because of the mention of several geographical names which have not hitherto been definitely localized—the fortress Zapetra or Sozopetra (Zibatra in the Arab writers) which plays so important a part in frontier wars with the Saracens, the city Taranta (probably Derende), and the River Zarnouk (= Zarnūk) which is apparently not elsewhere mentioned in the Byzantine authors. When Zapetra is once fixed, it is possible to fix (from statements in the Arab geographers) the site of Adata (Al-Hadath). In his well-known *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* Professor Ramsay

makes no reference to this campaign, because, as he informs me, it was not possible at the time to localize the names mentioned. But he has very kindly directed my attention to Mr. Guy Le Strange's interesting translation (with notes) of Ibn Serapion [from *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, 1895], which has given me invaluable aid in writing this paper, as will be seen from the numerous references to the work.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Since these lines were written, I have received from the Author (through the kindness of Professor Ramsay) a copy of his book with MS. corrections and additional notes. I am glad to find that in several points Mr. Le Strange's views now agree with conclusions reached in this paper, e.g. in reference to the River Hurith (Jurith) and the identification of the River Karākis with the Sultan Su, &c.

The accounts of this campaign given by our authorities are somewhat confused, but by no means hopeless. Basil's first campaign (probably in 871 A.D.) had ended in disaster (Geo. Mon.<sup>1</sup> p. 841, Sym. Mag. 690, Zon. xvi. 8). Next year he took the field again (872 A.D.), advancing towards the Euphrates no doubt by the ordinary military road passing Dorylaion and Sebasteia. The enemy retired before him and left him free to lay waste their country and destroy their villages. But when he appeared before their capital Tephrikē<sup>2</sup> (Devrik), he found that it was too strongly fortified and too well garrisoned to be taken except by a protracted siege, and so he contented himself with capturing some neighbouring forts (among which are mentioned Abara,<sup>3</sup> Spathē, and Koptos), and devastating the surrounding country (Theoph. Cont., p. 267, Kedrenos, p. 207). The exact site of these forts is unknown.

In alarm the city of Taranta (*ἣν Τάραντα λέγουσι*, Cont.; *Τάρας*, Kedr., probably by mistake: *v. infra*), which lay not far off (*γειτονοῦσα ταύτῃ*, *sc. τῇ Τεφρ.*, Kedr.), sent envoys to Basil to sue for peace and permission to be 'enrolled among the Roman allies'; and their submission was 'graciously' accepted. Taranta is evidently one of the more important towns in the Paulician territory: it is called a 'Saracen' city in alliance with Tephrikē (*ἡ ἐτέρα τῶν Ἰσμηλιτῶν πόλις, . . . ὁμαιχμίαν ἔχουσα καὶ κοινοπραγίαν μετὰ τῆς Τεφρ.*, Kedr.), *i.e.* it is a Paulician stronghold. Professor Ramsay now identifies this town with Daranda (Dalanda), the modern Derende.<sup>4</sup> He points out that the position of Taranta (which is probably a neuter plural, wrongly taken by Kedr. as an accus. sing.) is fixed by two<sup>5</sup> passages of Theoph., pp. 312 and 372 (*ed. De Boor*). Heraclius returning from his second expedition into Persia in 626 A.D. hesitated whether to march by way of Taranta or by way of Samosata. The former road evidently denotes the great route across the Euphrates through Melitene,

Derende, Gurun (Gauraina), and Azizie (Ariarathia)—which indeed is most probably Herodotus' Royal Road.<sup>6</sup> It is possible that Heraclius had taken this route in starting for his second expedition in 624 A.D., and perhaps Philippicus also traversed it in 585-6 A.D.; *v. Gerland*, 'die Pers. Feldzüge des Kaisers Herakleios,' p. 24 (*Byz. Zft.* iii. p. 351). Compare Ritter, *Erdkunde von Asien*, vol. x. 798 and 844-5. This identification shows that the Paulician territory included the whole mountain country extending south from Tephrikē as far at least as the Tokhma Su, the ancient Melas; and if the Paulician Argauth<sup>7</sup> (*see infra*) is Arga-Arca, as is very probable, their territory must have extended even south of the river. The identification of Taranta with Derende suits the conditions of our campaign. The next fact with regard to Basil's movements that is certain is that we find him encamped some distance to the south-west of Melitene, and the submission of Taranta suggests that he had marched to this point by the road which was thus opened to him.

The submission of Taranta was the signal for the surrender of several other towns or fortresses among which was Lokana,<sup>8</sup> a fort held by Kourtikios (Kourterios, Kedr.), an Armenian, *i.e.* a Paulician leader. Basil's ulterior object is now plainly to attempt the capture of Melitene, the capital of the Saracen territory west of the Euphrates and north of Mt. Tauros. The Saracen towns in this district were the support of the Paulicians, and the conquest of these towns would isolate the rebel heretics and make their reduction an easy matter. The time was favourable: for the internal dissensions among the Abbassides and the revolutions at Baghdad had paralysed the Saracen power and prevented any aid from being sent across the Euphrates either to the Paulicians or to the Saracen towns on the west of the river. But Melitene itself was a strongly fortified place and powerfully garrisoned: and so Basil determined first of all to capture the towns in the rear which might send assistance to the capital. With this object he crossed the hill-country between the Tokhma Su (the Arabic Kubākib) and the Sultan Su (the Karākis), sending forward a flying column (*κοῦρσον*) of picked soldiers against *Zapetru* and Samosata, while he himself evidently en-

<sup>1</sup> The Bonn edition of the Byzantine authors is quoted, unless otherwise mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> Sym. Mag. (*l.c.*) calls the town Ἀφρικῆ, Ibn Serapion's 'Abrik' (Le Strange, pp. 58, 63). This form is therefore not a mere error of the MSS. but a variant (*see concluding paragraph*). [Le Strange in his additional MS. notes proves that Abrik is Tephrikē (according to his first statement on p. 58), and not Arabkir (according to Mr. Hogarth's opinion, adopted by him on p. 740).]

<sup>3</sup> Probably the Amara of Kedr. II. 154.

<sup>4</sup> On Daranda I quote from his MS. additions to his *Hist. Geogr.*

<sup>5</sup> In both passages Τάραντον is the form given.

<sup>6</sup> The pass Βουκούλιθος on this road is mentioned by Kedr. II. p. 421.

<sup>7</sup> Ἀργαοῦν Kedr. II. 154.

<sup>8</sup> Possibly identical with Gurun [R.].

camped in the country between the Karākis and the Zarnūk (see below). The column obviously took the road which leads from Melitene up the course of the Karākis (Sultan Su) and thence turns south-eastwards to Perre (Hisn Mansur, the modern Adiaman) and Samosata, joining this road of course on the west of Melitene. This road is shown in Professor Ramsay's map, (*H. G.*, p. 266). After passing through τὰ στενὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ—the description given by our authorities is too vague to admit of any definite localization of the pass referred to—the detachment captured Zapetra and released many Romans who had for long been prisoners there. They then laid waste the adjacent country and captured Samosata. It is said that they also crossed the Euphrates and ravaged the country beyond, its defenders being all concentrated against Basil. This is not impossible when we bear in mind the temporary paralysis of the Saracen power: it would mean that they crossed at Samosata for a plundering raid merely. Then they returned to the Emperor whom they found *still* encamped on the Zarnouch (= Zarnūk), ἔτι πρὸς τῷ Ζ. The ἔτι is significant: Basil had remained quiet with the main body of his army all the time the detachment was away, and they found him where they had left him, close by the Zarnūk.

The above description, taken in connexion with other statements, leaves little doubt as to the site of Zapetra. Another reference to this place belongs to the year 836 A.D., when Theophilus in his campaign against the Saracens captured *Sozopetra* (Theoph. Cont. 124, Kedr. 130, Zon. xv. 29; 'Ozopetra' in Gen. 66; 'Zapetros' in Sym. Mag. 634), the birthplace of the Caliph Al-Mo'tacim,<sup>1</sup> and Samosata. Here it is said that he advances a considerable distance into the Saracen country (πορρωτέρω τῆς Συρίας) before he reaches Sozopetra. Zapetra clearly lies on or near the road between Melitene and Samosata. This is confirmed by the Arab geographers. Abul-Fida (quoted by Weil, *Gesch. der Khal.* ii. p. 309, n. 2, and by Le Strange, *Trans. of Ibn Serapion*, p. 66), who visited the place in 1315, says, 'It lies two marches southward of Malatia and the same distance westward of Hisn Mansur [Perre—Adiaman] in a plain surrounded by hills.' This description exactly suits the site near the sources of the Sultan Su and the Geuk

<sup>1</sup> This fact seems to be unknown to the Arab historians and is probably a mere unfounded report current in Byzantine circles.

Su where stand the ruins called Viransheher (*i.e.* 'ruined city'), about four miles from the road,<sup>2</sup> the very spot indicated by Ibn Serapion (*Le Strange, l.c.* p. 63), when he says that the Karākis (= Sultan Su)<sup>3</sup> 'passes near the gate of Zibatra.' The statements of Ibn Khordādbēh (*flor. ca.* 864) give a further confirmation of this argument, and at the same time indicate the site of Al-Hadath (Adata) as somewhere on the road between Zibatra and Marash. The frontier towns of Mesopotamia are given (*De Goeje's Trans.*, p. 70) as Malatia, *Zibatra, Al-Hadath*, Marash (thirty miles between the latter two), &c. Again, the following route is given (pp. 70 and 165): Samosata, Hisn Mansur, Malatia—then, turning to the left (see p. 165), the fortress of *Zibatra* (in Greek power), *Al-Hadath* (frontier fortress quite close to Greek territory), and Marash (frontier fortress with only Greek territory beyond). Further (p. 193) 'the town nearest the Syrian frontiers is Marash, the next Al-Hadath: formerly *Zibatra s'élevait dans le voisinage*, but was sacked by the Romans in the time of Al-Mo'tacim,' referring to 836 (*supra*). All this proves clearly that Zibatra was at Viransheher and Al-Hadath (Adata) on the Ak Su near Inekli. As to the latter fortress, Ibn Serapion says, 'There falls into the Kubākib [= Tokhma Su] a river Hurith (Jurith): its course lies through certain lakes and it passes near the city of Al-Hadath, falling out into the Kubākib at a point in the direction of this town.' Here, as Professor Ramsay holds, Ibn Serapion is mistaken in making the Hurith fall into the Tokhma Su instead of the Jihan (Pyramus). Yakūt (*v. Le Strange, l.c.* p. 67) is undoubtedly right in saying, 'the Hurith flows out of the Lake of Al-Hadath

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sir C. Wilson in his *Handbook*: 'Viransheher, ruins of ancient city in the plain four miles to the left, *i.e.* west of the Marash—Malatia road. Cf. also Ritter, *l.c.* x. 850-1. This suggestion was made by Le Strange on Ibn Serapion, p. 65, and retracted on p. 745, in deference to Mr. Hogarth's argument. Now however he will probably recur to it again, see my first note.

<sup>3</sup> Le Strange (*v. Addenda*, p. 744) doubts this identification, which he had made on p. 65, in deference to Mr. Hogarth's argument that *ca.* 900 the whole district of Melitene was permanently occupied by the Saracens, and therefore could not be the 'Greek country' in which Ibn Serapion says the Karākis rises. But Ibn Serapion may have written as late as 930-40, and the Tauros range was by that time in Greek power, even Melitene being captured by Joannes Kourkouas in 934. [The translation formerly given 'the source of the Karākis is in a lake in the Greek country' (p. 63) is now altered to 'in the confines of . . .']

near Marash; and flowing on, it falls into the Nahr Jayhūn.<sup>1</sup> The lakes are those out of which the Ak Su flows, and Al-Hadath is on the road leading from Marash (Germaniceia) by Inekli, Pavrelu, Surgli, and Viransheher (Zibatra)<sup>2</sup> to Malatia.

To return to Basil's march: the detachment found him encamped *πρὸς τῷ Ζαρνούχ ποταμῷ, ἔνθα τὸ Κεραμίσιον ἐστί.* This river, named more correctly by Kedrenos 'Ατζαρνούκ, is the River Az-Zarnūk (*i.e.* 'the rivulet') which, according to Ibn Serapion, 'has its source in a mountain lying between Malatia and Hisn Mansur [Perre-Adiamān], and falls into the Kubākib [Tokhma Su] below the mouth of the Karākis [Sultan Su]'; and 'from the River Az-Zarnūk is carried a stream called Nahr Malatia which . . . falls into the Kubākib below the mouth of the river Az-Zarnūk; from the Nahr Malatia are brought the water-courses of Malatia,' &c. The whole campaign therefore has been confined to the west of the Euphrates. Basil had marched southwards, keeping on the west of Melitene, to a position on the Zarnuk. Professor Ramsay has suggested to me that τὸ Κεραμίσιον may be an error for τὸ Κερακίσιον, *i.e.* the country about the Karākis; and, if so, this also shows that Basil's camp lay between the two streams. Then, just as we should expect, 'he breaks up his camp and marches with his whole army against Melitene' (Cont. p. 269). Constantine, however, (= Theoph. Cont. 269), imagines that he is on the east of the Euphrates and gives a grandiose description of Basil's prowess during the construction of a bridge over the flooding river, when like the Homeric heroes he carried as much as three or more ordinary men! [Cf. his energy in the campaign of 880, p. 280.] Then after crossing the river he captures a fortress, Rhapsakion (perhaps really an outlying fort of Melitene), and despatches the Khaldian and Koloniate troops to ravage the country between the Euphrates and the Arsines (= the Arsanās of Arab writers, Pliny and

Tacitus' Arsanias), while he marches himself against Melitene.

This account cannot be accepted. He is first on the east of the river, then crosses to the west, and then sends a division of his army over again! Probably the movement is misplaced and refers to a crossing<sup>3</sup> above Kamacha later on. Basil would never have divided his force in this way when he was going to attack a fortified city like Melitene, and the fact that it is the Khaldian and Koloniate troops that are sent indicates that their operations took place in the country adjacent to these Themes. It is clear then that Basil proceeded straight against Melitene. The Emir's forces came out to meet him and a battle was fought before the town; but the Saracens were defeated and shut up within their walls. Seeing the strength of the place, however, the Emperor gave up the siege as hopeless, and withdrew again into the Paulician territory (τῇ Μανιχαίων γῆ) which he laid waste with fire and sword, capturing and burning the fortresses called Argauth (probably Arga-Ara), φρούριον Κουτακίον, φρούριον Στεφάνου, and Rachat (Ararach in Kedr., and hence no doubt the same as Arauraca). It was probably at this point that the troops of the Khaldian and Koloniate Themes were sent across the Euphrates. They devastated the country between that river and the Arsines (Arsanās) and sacked the forts of Kourtikion (Karkinion, Kedr.), Chachon (Glaschon, Kedr.), Amer (Aman, Kedr.), Mourinix (Mourēx, Kedr.), and Abdēla (or -ēla, Kedr.). The site of these forts I have found no means of determining. Basil in the meantime returned home, probably by the Sivas-Dorylaion route, to receive the crown of victory at the hands of the Patriarch (Cont. 271).

With regard to the names 'Ατζαρνούκ (Ζαρνούχ), Κερακίσιον (?), and 'Αφρικῆ (for Τεφρικῆ), it is interesting to see how the Arabic names are already displacing the Greek, even in the Greek historians. Τεφρικῆ becomes Abrik in Arabic, and then again 'Αφρικῆ in Greek. Sosopetra becomes Zibatra in Arabic, and then Zabetros in Greek. Compare the way in which, in the later centuries, Turkish names displace Greek names in the Byzantine writers, *e.g.* Τάξαρα (= τὸ \*Ακσεραι) for Ak Serai, Πέγισαρη for Bey Sheher, &c. (cf. Ramsay, *Hist. Geogr.*,

<sup>1</sup> I am pleased to see that Le Strange now adds a marginal note: 'probably the true description after all.'

<sup>2</sup> The following additional references may be given. Edrisi (Weil, *l.c.*) says that Zibatra lay fifteen miles from Hisn Mansur (which is thirty miles from Malatia and twenty-two from Samosata—Arab miles, presumably). But Abu-l-Fida's authority is better, since he visited the place. Kudāma (Le Strange, *l.c.*, p. 66) states that 'from Malatia to Zibatra was five leagues.' The lake of Al-Hadath (cp. Weil III. p. 15) is probably the southern of the three on the course of the river.

<sup>3</sup> Of course Constantine (Theoph. Cont.) may have mistaken one of the large tributaries (*e.g.* Tokhma Su) for the Euphrates itself.



pp. 290 *n.*, 209 *n.*, and *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, pp. 19 *n.*, 21 *n.*).

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

NOTE.—Mr. Anderson's acute and suggestive paper clears away many difficulties. The discussion of Adata in my *Hist. Geogr.* p. 278 showed that it was situated on a pass that leads from Marash across Taurus; but the words of Theophanes, p. 313, seemed to show that the pass in question led to Arabissos. Probably in that passage, which obviously shows topographical confusion, Theophanes is trying unsuccessfully to report the meaning of an authority, and a slight

transposition would express the real facts, *περάσας τὴν Ἄδατα, εἰς Γερμανίειαν ἀφίκετο, καὶ πάλιν τὸν Ταῦρον ὑπερβὰς ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν Σάρον* (on the correction Ἄδατα, *Hist. Geogr.* p. 311). I would add here the correction on *Hist. Geogr.* p. 291, *lines* 32 ff. The three days journey there mentioned is measured apparently from Boukoulithos, a pass near the Euphrates, and not from Caesareia; and the city Lykandos is to be identified with the Paulician Lokana, at or near Gurun on the 'Royal Road,' between Tsamandos and Taranta-Derende.

W. M. RAMSAY.

#### ADVERSARIA UPON THE *POETICS* OF ARISTOTLE.

No one who renews his studies of Aristotle's *Poetics* with a perusal of Prof. Butcher's stimulating work can help feeling that there is still much demand for conjectural emendation based upon sound principles. Nowhere could the inseparability of interpretation from textual criticism be more conclusively demonstrated. Not to criticize the existing texts is not to be in earnest with the study of the meaning. The well-chosen critical matter given by Prof. Butcher affords many gratifying proofs of the success which may still attend logical acumen combined with palaeographical knowledge.

On the other hand I venture to think that there are a large number of instances in which the incorporated or suggested emendation, however apt in sense, must necessarily be regarded as a *pis aller*.

It is, for instance, undoubtedly necessary to insert words (or groups of words) with rather a free hand. But to interpolate words is to assume that those words have actually fallen out, and that they have fallen out for a reason which will readily appear when the words are reinstated. For example, they may begin with the same, or much the same, shapes and sounds as words later on (*homoeokataktōn*), or they may end with the same, or much the same, shapes and sounds as words preceding (*homoeoteleuton*). There may be other considerations. The present contention is simply that some such explanation should spring to the eye as soon as the correction is made. Theoretically,

no doubt, every critic acts upon this principle, and Prof. Butcher has for the most part dealt wisely with conjectural material. I do not, indeed, see why in *Cap. vi.* ἅπαντες should have disappeared in αὐτῶν <ἅπαντες> ὡς εἰπεῖν, nor how ἄλλων fell away in *Cap. xxii.* τὴν τῶν <ἄλλων> ὀνομάτων σύνθεσιν. But ἄλογα like these are rare, and it is in no captious spirit that I draw attention to them.

The following suggestions may occasionally fall short of my own ideal, but I venture to hope that one or two among them may be of distinct use.

C. i. 1447a 26.

αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ ῥυθμῷ μιμοῦνται τοῖ (al. ἡ) τῶν ὀρχηστῶν.

Read οἱ <α'> τῶν ὀρχηστῶν, i.e. οἱ πρῶτοι.

*Ibid.* 29.

ἡ δὲ ἔποποιία μόνον τοῖς λόγοις ψιλοῖς ἢ τοῖς μέτροις.....(ἀνώνυμος) τυγχάνει οἶσα.

For ΗΔΕΠΟΠΟΙΙΑ read ΗΔΕΤΙΠΟΙΟΥΥΣΑ, i.e. for ἡ δ' ἐποποιία read ἡ δέ τι ποιῶσα (τι = π as often). 'The art which ποιεῖ τι by means of prose or verse without music....' This art is immediately discussed in connection with the verb ποιεῖν, the noun ποιητής, and the compounds in -ποιός. ποιῶσα is therefore the right word. The mistake is due partly to similar letters, partly to mis-conception of the copyist as to sense.