

speculations seem more logical than the creation of an incorporeal Publius Lepidus.¹⁵

RICHARD D. WEIGEL
Western Kentucky University

15. Thanks are extended to the journal referees for several helpful suggestions. I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Sabine Schultz of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin for sending me enlargements of the coin.

THE MEANING OF ΠΕΛΟΠΟΝΝΗΣΟΣ IN THUCYDIDES

In volume 4 of the monumental *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, A. W. Gomme's continuators, A. Andrewes and K. J. Dover, express the following view: "whereas Πελοπόννησος in Thucydides is a geographical term, Πελοποννήσιοι means not 'the inhabitants of the Peloponnese' but 'Sparta and her allies.'" ¹ That Πελοποννήσιοι *always* means "Sparta and her allies" (i.e., the Peloponnesian League), *never* "the inhabitants of the Peloponnese," is very much open to doubt;² and it is equally doubtful that Πελοπόννησος is invariably "a geographical term." Examination of the contexts of Thucydides' 155 instances of Πελοπόννησος³ suggests that the term, though regularly geographical, is sometimes a synonym for Πελοποννήσιοι, with the result that it, too, sometimes signifies "Sparta and her allies" or "the Peloponnesian League." Sufficient for consideration here are five passages in which this meaning seems both likely and open to reasonable demonstration.

(1) 1. 71. 7. At the end of their speech to the Lacedaemonians in mid-432 B.C., the Corinthians admonish: "In light of what has been said, deliberate well and endeavor to ensure that τὴν Πελοπόννησον be not less under your leadership than it was when your fathers bequeathed it to you." In a parallel admonition to the Athenians in 1. 144. 4—again in a speech which concerns justification for war, and in the final sentence of the speech—Pericles says: "It is necessary that we not fall short of our fathers, but defend ourselves in every way from our enemies and endeavor to bequeath to our successors imperial power not lessened." It is characteristic of Thucydides' *History* generally, and perhaps of Book 1 most of all, that parallels are not only important, but very close. One is therefore justified in thinking that the parallelism of the two admonitions extends to the things which the hearers are urged to uphold; and as the Athenians are exhorted to preserve and hand on their empire, it seems beyond reasonable doubt that the Lacedaemonians are admonished to pass undiminished to their successors leadership of their nearest equivalent to the Athenian empire—the Peloponnesian League. (Conceivably this parallelism was an important factor in the decision of C. F. Smith, in

For constructive criticisms, I am indebted to Professor J. Balcer and to the journal's referees.

1. (Oxford, 1970), p. 249. The view is perhaps more Dover's than Andrewes' (cf. Dover's edition of Thucydides Book 6 [Oxford, 1965], p. 27), but Andrewes may be thought to share it (see *Comm.*, vol. 4, p. v).

2. That Πελοποννήσιοι as used by Thucydides sometimes—but "verhältnismässig selten"—means "inhabitants of the Peloponnese" is the view of J. Steup (J. Classen and J. Steup [eds.], *Thukydides*, vol. 2⁸ [Berlin, 1914], p. 296). Cf. the remarks of Gomme (*Comm.*, vol. 2 [Oxford, 1956], p. 10), which suggest his agreement. Other writers who have noted this geographical usage include J. A. O. Larsen ("The Constitution of the Peloponnesian League, II," *CP* 29 [1934]: 7, n. 80) and G. E. M. de Ste. Croix (*The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* [London, 1972], pp. 103, 188).

3. These are conveniently listed in M. H. N. von Essen, *Index Thucydidicus* (Berlin, 1887). Under Πελοπόννησον, γ 96 is a typographical error for γ 86, and ε "52 24. 29 32." (suggesting two citations) should read "52 24, 29, 32." (three citations).

the Loeb translation of the *History*, to render τὴν Πελοπόννησον in 1. 71. 7 as “the Peloponnesian League.”⁴)

(2) 1. 76. 1. In the same debate, Athenian representatives are allowed to address the Lacedaemonian assembly, and they observe: “Indeed, Lacedaemonians, in exercising leadership of states in τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ, you regulate their forms of government to your own advantage.” Compare Thucydides’ own statement of 1. 19 *init.*: “The Lacedaemonians maintained their leadership not by keeping their allies (τοὺς ξυμμάχους) tributary, but merely by taking care that they have an oligarchic form of government conformable to the interests of the Lacedaemonians themselves.” There can be no good reason to think that Thucydides and his Athenians are speaking of two different matters. Consequently, the Lacedaemonian-led states in τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ (1. 76. 1) = τοὺς ξυμμάχους (1. 19); and since some of the allies were outside the geographical Peloponnesus (e.g., Megara: 2. 9. 2), whereas some states in the geographical Peloponnesus were not allies (e.g., Argos: *ibid.*), the reference of 1. 76. 1 may be judged accurate and intelligible only if it is a reference to states in “the Peloponnesian League.”

(3) 1. 122. 3. In a later debate at Lacedaemon, the Corinthians point out to the assembled members of the League the possibility that the Athenians may be victorious over them and subjugate them, and they add: “Mention of this as even a possibility, and for so many states to suffer ill from one, is a disgrace τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ.” If this reference is taken to be to the geographical Peloponnesus, or even to states of the geographical Peloponnesus, the statement scarcely makes sense; for the logic of it would suggest that Megara, though a member of the Lacedaemonian alliance, would not be disgraced by defeat and subjection because it is not in the Peloponnesus; while Argos, though not a member of the alliance, would be disgraced because it is in the Peloponnesus. The Corinthian statement is, however, reasonable and valid if it means that the possibility of defeat by the Athenians and subjection to them is a disgrace to “[the states of] the Peloponnesian League.”

(4) 6. 37. 1. During the Syracusan debate over the rumored expedition from Athens, Athenagoras says: “But if, indeed, the Athenians should come, as some say, I consider Sicily better able than the Πελοποννήσου to carry the war through.” Immediately before, in 6. 36. 4, Athenagoras has said of the Athenians: “It is not likely that they would leave the Peloponnesians (Πελοποννησίων) behind, not yet for certain having ended the war there, and willingly come here for another war no less great.” Clearly, Πελοποννησίων in 6. 36. 4 = Πελοποννήσου of 6. 37. 1; and since the former here, as commonly, may be thought to mean “Sparta and her allies,” the latter may scarcely be thought to mean anything different.

(5) 7. 28. 3. Thucydides observes: “It was almost beyond belief that, besieged by the Peloponnesians (Πελοποννησίων) on account of the fortress in their land, the Athenians should not withdraw from Sicily but should remain and continue besieging in the same manner Syracuse, a city in itself not inferior to Athens; and that they should have given rise among the Greeks to such a miscalculation of their power and daring that—whereas at the beginning of the war some expected them to hold out for one year, some for two years, and some even for three, but

4. This is the single instance in which Smith so renders the term, but it is sufficient to set him apart from other translators. Neither here nor anywhere else in the *History* is Πελοπόννησος rendered “Peloponnesian League” by J. de Romilly–R. Weil–L. Bodin (Budé), B. Jowett, R. Crawley, H. Dale, S. Bloomfield, T. Hobbes, D. Roussel, G. Landmann, or A. Wähmund.

no one for a longer time, if the Peloponnesians (οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι) should invade their land—in the seventeenth year after the initial invasion they should have gone to Sicily, when already in every respect worn down by war, and have committed themselves to a war no less great than the one already existing with the Πελοποννήσου.” In the first place, the sense of Πελοποννήσου cannot be set apart from that of Πελοποννησίων and Πελοποννήσιοι: it appears unreasonable to think that, having twice spoken of warfare with “Sparta and her allies,” Thucydides should conclude by referring to war with no more than “[peoples of] the geographical Peloponnesus.” Second, to take Πελοποννήσου in a narrow, geographical sense detracts from the significance of the very point which Thucydides here is concerned to make: that, contrary to all expectation, Athens was able to undertake and sustain a major war in the west at a time when she was still engaged in the homeland in an already prolonged war with a powerful enemy. His point is served by emphasizing the strength of the enemy in Greece itself—but that strength is minimized, not emphasized, if Πελοποννήσου is taken to signify anything less than “Sparta and her allies,” i.e., “the Peloponnesian League.”

On the basis of such passages, Πελοπόννησος in Thucydides seems to be more than just a geographical term.

T. WICK
University of Wisconsin,
Stevens Point

†DUNTIA (CICERO LUCULLUS 135)

Sed quaero quando ista fuerint Academia vetere †duntia, ut animum sapientis com-moveri et conturbari negarent: mediocritates illi probabant et in omni permotione naturalem volebant esse quandam modum. [Cicero *Lucullus* 135]

decreta *F*² dicta *N* dictata *Ha*.

So Otto Plasberg's edition.¹ The fuller apparatus in his 1907 edition merely spells out the MSS readings in greater detail, and adds J. S. Reid's suggestion *declarata*,² in the main text of that edition, Plasberg still read *decreta*, as did Reid and most other previous editors except Karl Halm.

Halm was justified in his conjecture *dictata* for the *dicta* of the majority of MSS known to him in 1861, or even to Reid in 1885.³ Only after the establishment by Plasberg of a proper stemma based on ABV could one treat the majority of MSS

1. "*Academicorum*" reliquiae cum "*Lucullo*" (Leipzig, 1932), p. 96 (= fasc. 42 of *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia*). I accept Plasberg's explanation (in the apparatus ad loc. of his *editio maior*, *M. Tulli Ciceronis "Paradoxa Stoicorum," "Academicorum" reliquiae cum "Lucullo"* e.q.s., vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1907], p. 147) of the MSS reading *Academia vetere*. K. Halm's *ab Academia vetere* (*M. Tullii Ciceronis "Lucullus"* in I. G. Baiter-K. Halm [eds.], *M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol. 4 [Zurich, 1861]) would only do (and is only required) with a verb like *dicta*, *dictata*, or *decreta*.

2. This is only offered in the apparatus ad loc. in Reid's great edition (*M. Tulli Ciceronis "Academica"* [London, 1885], pp. 336–37) as *fort. leg.* In his main text, Reid adopts *decreta* of *F*² (which he still ascribed to E [= Erlang. 847], included now by Plasberg among the *deteriores*).

3. Reid's apparatus ad loc.: "*dicta* codd. (cf. § 103) exc. B (*durata*) et A (*dunt tia*).” If Reid's B (described by him, p. 66, simply as “another Leyden MS; XIIth cent.”) is the same as Plasberg's B (= Vossianus 86), then, on the evidence of Plasberg's 1907 edition, it reads *duntli aut.* A (Vossianus 84) does not appear to me to separate *dunttia* into two words, as reported by Reid and Plasberg; see the photocopy published by Plasberg (*Cicero: Operum philosophicorum Codex Leidensis Vossianus Lat. Pol. 84* [Leyden, 1915], fol. 103r.). But this is a minor point.