SHORTER NOTES

ATHENIAN DEMES AS *POLEIS* (THUC. 2.16.2)

ἐβαρύνοντο δὲ καὶ χαλεπῶς ἔφερον οἰκίας τε καταλείποντες καὶ ἱερὰ ἃ διὰ παντὸς ἦν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον πολιτείας πάτρια δίαιτάν τε μέλλοντες μεταβάλλειν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὑτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος.

In the recently published Festschrift for Mogens Herman Hansen, his Copenhagen colleague Jens Erik Skydsgaard[1] has challenged modern scholars' habit of introducing what he calls a subjective aspect into the last part of this well-known comment on the distress of the rural Athenian evacuees in 431 B.C. Four examples are quoted: 'facing what was nothing less for each of them than forsaking his own town', from C. Forster Smith's Loeb edition; 'what he was abandoning seemed to be nothing than his own *polis*', from Whitehead;[2] 'to bid farewell to what each regarded as his native city', from Parker;[3] and 'each of them felt as if he was leaving his native city', from Hornblower.[4] More of the same could have been cited. Besides the fact that Parker was following Crawley and Hornblower Jowett, compare (for example) 'leaving behind them what each man regarded as his own city';[5] or 'as each man left behind what was, to him, nothing less than his own *polis*'.[6] In simple terms this has become the orthodox modern rendering of the passage. So is it acceptable?

Professor Skysgaard's view is that subjectivity here is '[un]necessary. The participle *ἀπολείπων* is paralleled by the two other participles (*καταλείποντες*, *μέλλοντες μεταβάλλειν*) governed by *ἐβαρύνοντο δὲ καὶ χαλεπῶς ἔφερον* and suggests that what each man left *was* precisely his own city.'[7] Needless to say, he is fully aware that in 431 the only *polis* of which Athenians, rural and urban alike, were members was Athens. Nevertheless, as far as this passage is concerned he finds significance in the fact that it comes soon after 2.15.1–2; there the Athenians of old, before Theseus' synoecism, are said to have lived *κατὰ πόλεις*.

The point was worth making, and it might have some validity in a dual sense. Within the ring-composition which shapes 2.14–17 as a whole, the middle section on early Athens might stop the resumptive material (including 2.16.2) from being a simple, unadulterated reversion to the initial story of the 431 evacuation; and if this one (albeit extraordinary) fifth-century Athenian, Thucydides, could happily employ the term *polis* with pre-classical connotations, one might imagine others—those from Attic communities which had once been *poleis* 'in a wider sense'[8]—doing the same. Yet when all was said and done, Anaphlystians or Thorikians (for example) could surely

[1] J. E. Skydsgaard, 'The meaning of *polis* in Thucydides 2.16.2. A note', in P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein (edd.), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000* (Copenhagen, 2000), 229–30—hereinafter Skydsgaard.

[2] D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca.250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study* (Princeton, 1986), 222.

[3] R. Parker, 'Festivals of the Attic demes', *Boreas* 15 (1987), 137–47, at 137.

[4] S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* I (Oxford, 1991), 269.

[5] *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War*, trans. Rex Warner, intr. and notes by M. I. Finley (Harmondsworth, 1972), 135.

[6] M. H. Crawford and D. Whitehead, *Archaic and Classical Greece: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge, 1983), 386.

[7] Skydsgaard 229. [8] Skydsgaard 230.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.2.604 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distinguish between what their home town had once been and what it was now. They would have strong feelings for it, like those of Aristophanes' Dikaiopolis; cooped up in town, he 'yearns for' his own deme (*Acharnians* 33: *τὸν δ' ἐμὸν δῆμον ποθῶν*). But they would not confuse strong feelings, even if stronger than any they felt for Athens (and themselves as Athenians), with constitutional facts; and Thucydides' words seem to me to make this adequately clear.

The problem with analysis along the lines advocated by Skydsgaard is that even if one can agree to suppress, in translation, an overt indicator of subjectivity ('what each man regarded as', and the like) there still remains that innocent-looking phrase <u>*οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὑτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος*</u>.

It is obvious that *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ* (or variations thereof), like its Latin counterpart *nihil aliud quam*, means in itself 'nothing other than'. And straightforward uses of a phrase like 'nothing other than *x*' can imply, in context, either or both of two things: 'nothing above-and-beyond *x*: *x* alone'—sometimes with the further implication of *merely x*'—and/or 'nothing in the place of *x*: *x* is (or ought to be) *x* rather than *y* or *z*'. Classical Attic prose furnishes many instances of both. So, for instance, the putative defendant in the Second Antiphontean Tetralogy, whose task, he declares (Antiph. 2.4.3), ought to be *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ* replying to prosecution testimony (though in fact, like so many Athenian litigants, he mentions what ought to be the case only as a prelude to explaining that circumstances compel *him* to act otherwise); or Xenophon in *Anab*. 3.2.18, seeking to encourage his troops by pointing out that ten thousand enemy cavalry are *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ* ten thousand human beings; or Demosthenes in 8.73, on his opponents' jibe that from him the Assembly, in desperate need of deeds, gets *οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἤ* words.

Equally obvious, though, is that sometimes the phrase serves a third and different purpose, that of flagging up something *not* 'purely' or 'literally' so, but, at most, tantamount to being so. Here *x* is, very likely, *y* or *z*; it nevertheless resembles *x* (or is experienced as *x*) to a degree sufficient to make that resemblance (or experience) the point of emphasis, and thus to make the *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ* phrase still appropriate.[9] Plato, *Euthydemos* 277d9–e2 proffers a good example of this: *καὶ νῦν τούτω οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ χορεύετον περὶ σὲ καὶ οἷον ὀρχεῖσθον παίζοντε*. (Euthydemos and Dionysodoros are *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ* Corybantic dancers—we might nowadays say veritable whirling dervishes—as they run their argumentative rings round young Kleinias.) And there is an even better one in Andokides 1.101: *καθήμενος ἡνίκα μου κατηγορεῖ, βλέπων εἰς αὐτόν, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα συνειλημμένος ἔδοξα κρίνεσθαι*; as Andokides sat watching Epichares make his prosecutor's speech it seemed *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ*—for all the world like—being tried by the Thirty, *sc.* three or four years earlier.

What then of Thucydides' usage in this regard? Often *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ* (*vel sim.*) does, when he uses it, mean just what it says. For this see 1.122.2 (defeat by Athens will bring *οὐκ ἄλλο τι . . . ἤ* downright slavery—*douleia* in the sense of political subjection),[10] 2.49.5 (plague sufferers craved total nakedness: *μηδ' ἄλλο τι ἢ γυμνοὶ ἀνέχεσθαι*),

[9] In modern English this sort of thing seems increasingly to be encountered in television or radio interviews, where someone will say (for example) 'I was literally glued to the spot.' We know that they were not, and we sympathize with their unwillingness to say, heavy-handedly,'I was figuratively glued to the spot'; but when a metaphor has exploded there is no saving it by pretending it is not there.

[10] The passage would only be classifiable with those in the next paragraph if it were to be argued that political subjection is, precisely, not true *douleia*; but such an argument would miss the point of the metaphor. The Corinthians do mean to say that defeat will bring what they say it will, not a mere approximation to it.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.2.604 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.89.2 (according to Phormio, about to fight a sea-battle, Peloponnesian confidence is based *οὐ δι' ἄλλο τι . . . ἤ* their success in fighting on land), 3.11.3 (some of Athens' allies were left autonomous *οὐ δι' ἄλλο τι ἤ* a clever means of oppressing the rest), 3.30.4 (current circumstances are *οὐκ ἄλλο τι . . . ἤ* an instance of The Unknown in war), 3.56.7 (shrewd hegemonic policy-making should recognize *μὴ ἄλλο τι . . . ἤ* rewarding the loyalty of one's allies), 3.85.3 (the returning Corcyrean oligarchs burned their boats, so as to have no option but—*ὅπως ἀπόγνοια ᾖ τοῦ ἄλλο τι ἤ*—to press on and win), 4.126.2 (Peloponnesians gain power *οὐκ ἄλλῳ τινὶ . . . ἤ* by fighting for it), 6.11.6 (the Spartans have no other thought than, *μηδὲ . . . ἄλλο τι ἡγήσασθαι ἤ*, the overthrow of Athens), 6.17.7 (the Athenian empire was founded on *οὐκ ἄλλῳ τινὶ ἤ* naval superiority), 6.80.4 (if the Athenians prevail in Sicily the prize of their victory will be *οὐκ ἄλλον τινὰ . . . ἤ* its provider, *sc.* Syracuse), 7.77.5 (the troops *in extremis* at Syracuse must each concentrate exclusively, *μὴ ἄλλο τι ἡγησάμενος ἕκαστος ἤ*, on standing firm), and 8.5.1 (in winter 413/12 both sides were no less intent on preparing for war than they had been at the outset: *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ὥσπερ ἀρχομένων ἐν κατασκευῇ τοῦ πολέμου*).

Interspersed between passages of this kind, however, are others where something more subtle is going on: (*a*) **4.14.3**, *οἵ τε γὰρ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ὑπὸ προθυμίας καὶ ἐκπλήξεως ὡς εἰπεῖν ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἢ ἐκ γῆς ἐναυμάχουν* (the Spartans at Pylos were *ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἤ* fighting a sea-battle from land); (*b*) **4.120.3**, *τῆς Παλλήνης ἐν τῷ ἰσθμῷ ἀπειλημμένης ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων Ποτείδαιαν ἐχόντων καὶ ὄντες οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ νησιῶται αὐτεπάγγελτοι ἐχώρησαν πρὸς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν* (Brasidas tells the men of Skione that the Athenian occupation of Poteidaia has made them *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ* islanders); and (*c*) **7.75.5**, *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ἢ πόλει ἐκπεπολιορκημένῃ ἐῴκεσαν ὑποφευγούσῃ* (the retreating invasion-forces in Syracuse were like *οὐδὲν . . . ἄλλο ἤ* a *polis* that has been taken by siege and is in flight).

In all three of these cases *ἄλλο οὐδὲν* (or in [*a*] *οὐδὲν ἄλλο*) *ἤ* serves a rhetorical function. In (*a*)—part of a prominent Thucydidean paradox identified and discussed by Flory[11]—*ὡς εἰπεῖν* ('so to speak') alerts us in itself to the imminent arrival of a fanciful, non-literal statement; and in (*c*), by the same token, 'were *like*' (*ἐῴκεσαν*) falls some way short of unvarnished *were*.[12] But (*b*) eschews any such circumspection. With the neck of the Pallene/Pellene isthmus impassable, the Skionaians *are* (*ὄντες*) 'nothing other than' islanders. Centuries later, Arrian, it seems, could misunderstand this as the literal truth.[13] No modern reader has followed him, though, when it is so obvious what Thucydides meant. 'They were thus practically in the position of islanders' was Warner's version, and it is this or some variant on it—exactly like, nothing short of, tantamount to—that is required.

Let 2.16.2, then, be approached in the same light. The words *οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὑτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος* need not be translated (as Skydsgaard fairly points out) as if they included an explicit, focalized comment upon what each Athenian evacuee *felt* about his home town or village in the Attic countryside. But the alternative need not be to embrace the possibility adumbrated earlier—that the interposition, in

[11] S. Flory, 'The death of Thucydides and the motif of "land on sea" ', in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (edd.), *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, 1993), 113–23, esp. 116–22.

[12] Note, though, that the shortfall is reduced by Nikias in 7.77.4: *λογίζεσθε δὲ ὅτι αὐτοί τε πόλις εὐθύς ἐστε ὅποι ἂν καθέζησθε κτλ.*

[13] See Arrian, *Anab.* 1.9.5, with A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* I (Oxford, 1980), 88; cf. S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* II (Oxford, 1996), 379.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.2.604 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the middle of 2.14–17, of the material on Thesean Athens might have given the language in 2.16.2 a pre-classical colouring. (If such a thing were to be seriously argued, it would call for better evidence than this.) There is a middle ground, and I note that the most reliable translation of Book II in current use—that of Rhodes, for Aris and Phillips—duly occupies it: 'each man was virtually abandoning his own city'.[14]

The Queen's University of Belfast DAVID WHITEHEAD
d.whitehead@qub.ac.uk

[14] *Thucydides, History II*, ed. with trans. and comment. by P. J. Rhodes (Warminster, 1988), 61. Cf. e.g. T. K. Arnold, *The Second Book of Thucydides, with English Notes and Grammatical References* (London, 1854), 75, citing Dale: 'construe, "and in fact as good as leaving their several cities," or "and each of them doing what was equivalent to leaving his native city" '. J. S. Rusten, *Thucydides Book ii* (Cambridge, 1989) passes over the issue.

I am grateful to two (successive) *CQ* referees for their comments on earlier drafts of this note.

A NOTE ON THE EURIPUS IN EURIPIDES' *IPHIGENIA AT AULIS*

In his *Poetics*, Aristotle levels against Euripides the charge of inconsistency (τοῦ ἀνωμάλου) in *I.A.* on the grounds that 'the girl who beseeches is in no way like her later self' (*Poetics* 1454a).

The play is set by the Euripus, the strait which separates the island of Euboea from Boeotia in mainland Greece. We are first informed of this location at 11[1] and the name Euripus recurs four times (166, 804, 813, 1323). The chorus have come across this strait from Chalcis on Euboea.[2] The Greek navy is becalmed there and it is from there that it will set out after the play is over.

Strabo (1.3.12) tells us that in the Euripus the currents changed seven times a day; and they were notorious for their unpredictability.[3] And LSJ inform us that the name was used proverbially of an unstable man.[4] Among other citations,[5] they give Pollux, *Onomasticon* 6.121, a passage which sets the word in a clear semantic context:

> Κοῦφος, ῥᾴδιος, εὐμετάβολος, εὔτρεπτος, εὐτράπελος ὀξύρροπος, μεταπίπτων μεταρρέων μετατρεπόμενος, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς δόξης μένων, ὄρνις, ἄνεμος, εἰκαῖος, συρφετός, αὔρα, πνεῦμα, ἀκατάστατος, ῥᾴων τῶν κωμάτων τὴν τροπήν, πορθμός, εὔριπος, ἀπαγής, ἀβέβαιος, ἀνερμάτιστος, σαλεύων, τοῦ φέροντος ἀεὶ πνεύματος, ὀξύτερος πτεροῦ τὴν ῥοπήν.

It is against this background, both geographical and semantic, that we must surely

[1] *I.A.*, of course, has two prologues and thus there is a question mark over the authenticity of these lines. There can be no argument, however, about the setting of the play.

[2] Although not across the new bridge built in 411 (Diodorus Siculus 13.47). The dramatist places his tragedy securely in the heroic age.

[3] Ed. P. G. Walsh, Cicero: *The Nature of the Gods* (Oxford, 1997), 196, n. on 3.24.

[4] To 'unstable', LSJ add the word 'weak-minded'. Readers can base their judgement about how far this meaning applies in the citations. In my view the emphasis is very decidedly on the lack of stability.

[5] Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 90: of Callias of Chalcis: καταλιπὼν δὲ κἀκείνους, καὶ πλείους τραπόμενος τροπὰς τοῦ Εὐρίπου, παρ' ὃν ᾤκει . . .; Aristotle, *E.N.* 1167b7: τῶν τοιούτων (i.e. good men) γὰρ μένει τὰ βουλήματα καὶ οὐ μεταρρεῖ ὥσπερ εὔριπος . . .; Hipparchus (quoted in Stobaeus 4.44.81): πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα (the chances and changes of life), ἄστατά τε καὶ ἀβέβαια Εὐρίπου τρόπον . . . καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῶν μένον οὐδὲ ἀκίνητον οὐδὲ ἀναφαίρετον.; and Libanius, *Letter* 907: μετὰ ταῦτ' Εὔριποι γενόμενοι . . . (i.e. changing their views of things).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.2.604 Published online by Cambridge University Press