chapter the author tries to prove that the 'Αθήνα is a dialogue, as suggested already by Cobet. But although he has demonstrated convincingly that the 'Αθήνα contains dialogical elements, this does not allow us to declare this small treatise a dialogue. We can only say with sufficient certainty that the author discusses some objections to his ideas that were made or might be made by fellow-oligarchs; cp. also 3, 7: φήσει τις.

Canfora shows a thorough knowledge of the sources and of modern scholarship, and has a balanced and independent judgment. Sometimes, however, his argument is not convincing. He oversteps for instance the mark in concluding from the fact that no persons are mentioned by name in the 'Αθήνα that it was not written in a period of great leaders, but "in un'epoca di politici trascinati dal demo, indotti per demagogia ad assecondarne i voleri e gli instinti" (p. 6). It is no more than an ingenious hypothesis that the 'Αθήνα was taken into exile by Xenophon, from whose literary remains it was edited later as one of his works, the pendant of his Constitution of the Lacedaemonians (p. 8; 80; 89). That the criticism of oligarchs who have chosen to function politically in a democracy (2, 20) would be especially aimed at Alcibiades (p. 30 ff.; 82), who before 424 can hardly have been a prominent politician, seems a rather fragile supposition. To sum up: a valuable contribution to the continuing discussion of a vexing problem, but not the final verdict.
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1) Annales littéraires de l'université de Besançon, Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne 22, Paris 1976. Cp. e.g. 35, where she says regarding the problem of the date of the 'Αθήνα: "Or il y en a une (possibilité) qui n'a pas été utilisée: c'est la référence à l'histoire des idées".

2) E.g. the 'Αθήνα belongs to the literary genre of the Πολιτεία (see also M. Treu, RE IX A, 2, col. 1936 ff.) and has been written between 421 and 418 B.C.

3) Cp. Hdt. 3, 80: ἐν γὰρ τῷ πολλῷ ἐν τὰ πάντα; Thuc. 6, 39, 1; see Lampas 6 (1973), 7 (in Dutch).


In 1945 the late A. W. Gomme published the first volume of his historical commentary on Thucydides. In 1956 the volumes II and

III followed. After Gomme’s death in 1959 Professor Andrewes and Professor Dover undertook the task of revising and supplementing Gomme’s provisional draft of the remaining part of the commentary and of his scattered notes. In 1970 vol. IV appeared and now also the last volume has been completed. For book VIII, treated in this final volume, Andrewes and Dover had only a number of scattered notes by Gomme at their disposal. The commentary on book VIII is primarily the work of Andrewes, but it has been written in close cooperation with Dover. It contains also a large excursus on the revolution of the Four Hundred, including a commentary on Aristotle’s ’Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία 29-33, and a briefer excursus about the number of ships available to both parties in 412 and 411 B.C.

Having finished the commentary in which so much information about various pieces of evidence and many problems in accordance to their relevance for the interpretation of the text of Thucydides has been scattered over five volumes, Andrewes and Dover felt that this should be organized by indexing; by adding a general index, an index of authors and passages discussed and a Greek index they have made the wealth of information contained in this work easily available. Moreover, after having finished their commentary they apparently wanted to add a summing up about the problems concerning the composition of Thucydides’ History. Consequently two appendices have been added, one by Andrewes about the indications of incompleteness, and one by Dover about the strata of composition. This was all the more appropriate because in many respects book VIII differs from the other books, especially because of the partial character of the information available to Thucydides at the moment of writing, of the many inconsistencies, and of the absence of speeches (cp. p. 114ff.), which are taken as indications of the unfinished state in which the author left his book.

The quality of Gomme’s commentary was very high and he deservedly enjoyed a great reputation as a Thucydidean scholar. His successors kept up the same high standard of scholarship. Gomme was rather generous in treating in his historical commentary problems of textual criticism and linguistic interpretation, and although I have the impression that Andrewes and Dover display somewhat more restraint in this respect, they do by no means avoid discussion of textual and philological problems when this may be useful for the elucidation of the contents. Most scholars will have recourse to this work whenever they are confronted with the text of the eighth book of Thucydides or with the intricate problems of