

presumably indicates that the authors themselves do not feel that an overwhelming case can be made for either of them. While we do not think that it is particularly likely that either leptospirosis or tularaemia is the modern equivalent of the Plague, we find these suggestions a good deal more plausible than most of those put forward in the past.

We agree with W. and S. in stressing the importance of the fact that the Plague of Athens was a disease that affected not only man but also other animals. Thucydides made it quite clear (2. 50) that this was a particular characteristic of the Plague that distinguished it from the familiar diseases. If he was wrong about a point to which he drew particular attention, then no part of his account can be trusted, and it is pointless to examine it in detail or to draw any conclusions from it. On the much more likely assumption that his account is in the main reliable, several of the diagnoses that have been widely supported in the past, such as smallpox (which affects man alone) or epidemic typhus (which affects only man and the body-louse), can be confidently ruled out. It is among the diseases known to infect not only man but also other animals that one must search for the modern equivalent of the Plague of Athens if one is determined to attach to it the name of a modern disease. But we are still inclined to think that those who wish to do so are pursuing a will-o'-the-wisp.

Trinity College, Oxford

A. J. HOLLADAY

The Sir William Dunn School of Pathology, Oxford

J. C. F. POOLE

#### A FRAGMENT OF ANAXAGORAS IN THUCYDIDES?

E. C. Kopff's suggestion that a fragment of Philistos has intruded into Thucydides 7. 42. 3 has not gone unnoticed.<sup>1</sup> A point at issue is frequency of interpolation in Thucydides. K. J. Dover states:<sup>2</sup> 'There are indeed interpolated passages in Thucydides'. He adduces only 3. 17 and 3. 84. There may be a third. At 2. 77. 4 in his narrative of the siege of Plataia, Thucydides writes of the Spartan attempt to burn the town:

καὶ ἐγένετο φλόξ τοσαύτη ὅσην οὐδεὶς πω ἔς γε ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον χειροποίητον εἶδεν. ἥδη γὰρ ἐν ὄρεσιν ὕλη τριφθεῖσα ὑπ' ἀνέμων πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου πῦρ καὶ φλόγα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνῆκεν. τοῦτο δὲ μέγα τε ἦν κτλ.

I should seclude ἥδη... ἀνῆκεν. χειροποίητον makes the gloss redundant. Its sentiment too is suspect. Shilleto well observed *ad loc.*: 'The truth of this statement may be doubted'. The narrative flows untroubled after excision. τοῦτο as before (*KG* 1. 204; 2. 36) refers to πῦρ (77. 2, 3): 'This was a large fire and came very close to destroying the Plataians'. Because the statement is untrue, I conclude that [Thucydides'] source was a document, not autopsy. Commentators aptly cite Lucretius 1. 897–900:

'At saepe in magnis fit montibus' inquis 'ut altis  
arboribus vicina cacumina summa terantur  
inter se, validis facere id cogentibus austris,  
donec flammai fulserunt flore coorto.'

No Thucydidean commentator whom I recall adds that Lucretius here summarizes Anaxagoras (Bailey on Lucret. 1. 830 cf. Anaxag. 59 T 44 D–K?). The similarity between Lucretius' Latin and [Thucydides'] Greek merits attention. Notice especially

<sup>1</sup> E. C. Kopff, *GRBS* 17 (1976), 23–30; M. W. Dickie, *GRBS* 17 (1976), 217–19; E. C. Kopff, *GRBS* 17 (1976), 220–21; K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. V, *Book VIII* (Oxford, 1981), 425 n. 1; id. *PRIA* C 8 (1981), 231–8.

<sup>2</sup> *PRIA* 81 C 8 (1981), 234.

*saepe* (ᾗδη), *montibus* (ὄρεσιν), *arboribus* (ῥῆμα), *terantur* (τριφθεῖσα), *inter se* (πρὸς αὐτήν), *austriis* (ἀνέμων), *flammai...flore* (πῦρ καὶ φλόγα). Lucretius is translating into Latin verse the Greek prose of Anaxagoras preserved in the *textus receptus* of Thucydides.

The source for the intrusion was presumably the Thucydidean commentator, Antyllos: see Julius Brozka, *RE* 1 (1894), 2643–44 *s.n.* Antyllos 2. Antyllos alleged (Marcellinus, *Vita* 22. 6–8 Luschinat) the considerable influence of Anaxagoras upon the historian. Anaxagoras at 2. 77. 2 becomes a parallel to Philistos at 7. 42. 3. Seclusion will render the context less ‘childish’ than Gomme on Thuc. 2. 77. 4 found it.

*The University of Colorado at Boulder*

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

#### ARISTOTLE, *EN* 1144a27–8

The manuscript text διὸ καὶ τοὺς φρονίμους δεινοὺς καὶ πανούργους φάμεν εἶναι gives the unsatisfactory sense ‘which is why we say that even those of practical wisdom are clever and wicked’. Some modern scholars including the Loeb and Penguin translators have rightly adopted the suggestion of J. Klein<sup>1</sup> that τοὺς should be inserted before πανούργους, giving the correct sense ‘which is why we call both prudent and wicked people “clever”’. It has not, I believe, been noticed that this suggestion was anticipated by Aquinas in his commentary on William of Moerbeke’s translation.<sup>2</sup> Moerbeke’s text reads

‘Siquidem igitur intentio sit bona, laudabilis est. Si autem prava, astutia (= πανουργία): propter quod et prudentes dinoticos (= δεινούς) et astutos (= πανούργους) aimus esse.’

This could be a translation of either text, depending on whether the first ‘et’ is read as ‘even’ or as ‘both’; that ambiguity, together with the lack of the definite article in Latin, here produces an ambiguous sentence. Aquinas’ comment, however, puts it beyond doubt that he understood that sentence in the sense required by the emendation:

‘...si quidem intentio sit bona, huiusmodi ingeniositas fit laudabilis. Si autem sit prava, vocatur astutia: quae sonat in malum, sicut prudentia sonat in bonum. Et quia dinotica (= δεινότης) communis est utrique, inde est, quod tam prudentes quam astutos dicimus esse dinoticos, idest ingeniosos sive industriosos.’

*Corpus Christi College, Oxford*

C. C. W. TAYLOR

<sup>1</sup> J. Klein, *Das Empirische in der Nikomachischen Ethik* (Brandenburg, 1875).

<sup>2</sup> *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis in Decem Libros Ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicomachum Expositio*, ed. R. M. Spiazzi, 3rd ed. (Turin, 1964).

#### A NOTE ON CATULLUS 12. 1–3

Marrucine Asini, manu sinistra  
non belle uteris: in ioco atque vino  
tollis lintea neglegentiorum.

Commentators assert that the left hand is *nata ad furta*.<sup>1</sup> As the poem proceeds this turns out to be relevant, but the impression given by the citation of parallels (or by explicit comment) is that the subject of the poem, theft, is hinted at (if not actually

<sup>1</sup> Coll. Plaut. *Pers.* 226; Ov. *M.* 13. 111; cross references are also made from Catull. 47. 1 to this passage.