

would not pardon Athens for her part, and reprisals against Thebes could well be against Athens too; in which case the prosecution of the generals who had helped the murderers must have been a lame attempt to avoid Spartan vengeance.

Certainly in the first three months of 378 Athens must have been in a very nervous state. The formation of the Confederacy within the King's Peace was therefore, as indeed Diodorus (15. 28. 2) asserts, defensive, an attempt to prepare herself against Spartan attack. As long as the Peace held, Athens was in theory safe, but the prospects of the Peace holding must have seemed slight.

There were therefore two distinct phases in the evolution of the Second Athenian Confederacy, which are marked off in Diodorus' narrative by an intrusion of Oriental history (29. 1-4). The first was in the shadow of the King's Peace, the second, preluded by the affair of Sphodrias, began with the declaration that the Peace had been broken.¹

University College, Oxford

G. L. CAWKWELL

¹ A difficulty remains. In the decree of Aristotle of 377 lines 12-14 were erased, but enough remains of line 14 to show that probably there was an allusion to the Great King. Accame (*La lega*, pp. 49-52) supplemented the lines in such a way as to make them profess an intention to maintain the King's Peace, and, if he were correct, the view that Athens denounced the Peace after the acquittal of Sphodrias could not stand. However, as his description of the traces makes clear and examination of the stone and of squeezes confirms, his readings are far from secure. In particular the seventh letter of βασιλεύς is not legible, and the upright stroke immediately preceding may well have been a ρ. So the line may have

read ὑπὲρ βασιλέως κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας, and the clause have been concerned not to assert an intention to maintain the Peace, but to condemn Sparta for acting on behalf of the King under the treaty in a manner improper to the hegemonic power. With the peace of 375 and the new arrangements for shared hegemony such a clause would have seemed out of date, and since the *stèle* was to remain after 375 the place where the names of new members were to be inscribed, the clause was erased. Cf. Accame, *ibid.*, p. 150 for a similar suggestion. (It may be added that the traces of line 12 are far too uncertain to permit secure supplement, and it would be better if editors would cease reproducing Accame's text.)

BΩCECΘE

(See *C.Q.* lxx [1972], 111 f.)

NEARLY forty years ago I wrote to the editors of Liddell and Scott, pointing out that βώκεθε in Apoll. Rhod. 1. 685 was a future, not as they thought of βίωω, but of βόσκειμαι, and that it was so explained e.g. by V. Magnien, *Le futur grec* (Paris, 1912). The correction, slightly muddled, is to be found in their *Addenda*, new Supplement, s.v. βόσκω, but it seems to have escaped Dr. Giangrande and Mr. M. Campbell, not to mention Schwyzler *e tutti quanti*, and should therefore perhaps be repeated here.

University College London

O. SKUTSCH