The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens*, Chap. 39, § 5

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 10 / December 1893, pp 448 - 449

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0019897X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0019897X

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1893). Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens*, Chap. 39, § 5. The Classical Review, 7, pp 448-449 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0019897X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

59.32 οἶον ἱκκος τε ὁ ταραντινος

34 ηρόδικος

61.6 μνείαν B μνείαν b

63.24 ἔξ

64.1 πρεσβύτερος B υ' b

64.7 εἰμαρμένους 65.12 εἰμαρμένη

69.32 μὴ ποιεῖ

74.13 δδ' B δδ' b

18 εἴν B εἴν b

77.10 ἀμηγέπη B (as in line 5 and T quoted) ἀμῆγέπη b with marginal note
ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁπωσοῦν

[The scholia on this dialogue in this MS. are so few that they are perhaps worth quoting.

On ὑποπιπλάμενος 50.5 (p. 309 a) τῆς αὐτῆς φράσεως καὶ τὸ ἄρτι χνοάζειν τὰς παρειάς· καὶ τὸ ἀρτίχρους· καὶ τὸ ἰούλους ὑποσκιαζόμενος ἤδη· καὶ τὸ πρῶτος ὑπηγήτης.

On δ 51.13 (p. 309 d) θαναμαστικόν

On παρελθούσης 51.23 (p. 310 a) ἀπτικὸν τοῦτο. τὸ γὰρ κοινὸν τὴν παρελθούσαν νύκτα ταύτην. ὑπὸ βαθὺν ὄρθρον.]

78.10 οὐκ ἔφη

78.16 ὁμολόγηκαμεν

79.19 ἐξαρχῆς, so 97.21 and καταρχὰς 66.2, 112.1

81.4 τῇ βραχυλογίᾳ given to Protagoras by the first hand: corrected

87.6 αὐτὸς breathing corrected

94.32 εἰρῶν B εὐρῶν b

95.4 αἰσχροὺν B αἰσχρόν b

103.19 ἡδονὴν B ἡδονήν b

104.25 ἀποκρινώμεθα

105.12 ἑλλέψις

106.29 ἀνάγκη (bis)

107.8 ἡττᾶσθαι

107.18 ἀμαθία

109.18 οὐκ ἔφη

110.32 τέ, so σοφία τέ 75.8, where however the words have been rewritten

111.20 ἦν

A mass of details such as the above can hardly be without error, but will at least serve to show that a future editor of any of the dialogues contained in the Bodleian Plato must recollate that manuscript for himself.

C. S. ADAMSON.

ARISTOTLE, *CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS*, CHAP. 39, § 5.

τὰς δὲ δίκας τοῦ φόνου εἶναι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια,
εἴ τις τινα αὐτόχειρ ἀπέκτεινεν ἢ
ἔτρωσεν.

The above is the reading adopted by Blass in the Teubner text, and also accepted in my own edition. Kaibel and Wilamowitz prefer to read: εἴ τις τινα αὐτοχειρὶ ἐκτείνειν ἢ ἔτρωσεν, and the former, in the valuable and interesting work he has just published, entitled *Stil und Text der πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων*, says on p. 197: *Unsere Verbesserung . . . kann gar nicht zweifelhaft sein . . . Mit Unrecht hat Blass αὐτόχειρ ἀπέκτεινεν vorgezogen: man sagt das nicht im Griechischen.*

This statement happily admits of an easy refutation. The very phrase, which is here condemned as bad Greek, is found five times in the *Laws* of Plato. Having lately had occasion to read through the whole of that work in search of further illustrations of Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, I may be allowed to cite the following examples of the phrase in question:—

(1) p. 865 B, εἰν δὲ αὐτόχειρ μὲν ἄκων δὲ ἀποκτείνειν τις ἕτερον. (2) 866 D, εἰν δ' ἄρα τις αὐτόχειρ μὲν κτείνειν ἐλεύθερον. (3) 867 C, ἂν ἄρα τις αὐτόχειρ μὲν κτείνειν ἐλεύθερον. (4) 871 A, ὅς ἂν ἐκ προνοίας τε καὶ ἀδίκως . . . αὐτόχειρ κτείνειν. (5)

872 B, ἐὰν δὲ δοῦλος ἐλεύθερον ἐκὼν, εἴτε αὐτὸς ὁ χεῖρ εἴτε βουλευσας ἀποκτείνῃ. Cf. 872 A, ἐὰν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ χεῖρ μὲν μή, βουλευσὴ δὲ θάνατον τις ἄλλος ἐτέρῳ.

No one doubts that αὐτοχειρία ἔκτεινεν is good Greek. I only insist that αὐτόχειρ ἀπέκτεινεν is equally good.

J. E. SANDYS.

SOPH. OED. COL. 527.

In the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xiii. p. 152, I proposed to write here ἡ πατρόθεν, ὡς ἀκούω, δυσώνυμα λέκτρ' ἐπάσω; and I added *i.e. didst thou wed thy father's widow?* No. xix. of *Hermathena* contains an article by Prof. Tyrrell, full of his usual kindness and generosity, in which the following remarks occur (p. 307):

But what is most puzzling to me is to guess why . . . Prof. Housman thinks that he has improved the sense by reading πατρόθεν for ματρόθεν, and how he has persuaded himself that πατρόθεν λέκτρα could mean 'his father's widow,' unless πατρόθεν can take

the place of πατρός; and if it can, then ματρόθεν = ματρός, and ματρόθεν λέκτρα means 'thy mother's bed,' and there is no difficulty in the passage.

I take πατρόθεν with the verb: ἡ πατρόθεν λέκτρ' ἐπάσω; means *came thy bride unto thee from thy father's arms?* My paraphrase *didst thou wed thy father's widow?* is in sense the exact equivalent of this; but since its form has misled Prof. Tyrrell, and may therefore mislead others, into thinking that I took πατρόθεν λέκτρα to mean *thy father's widow*, I desire to make this explanation.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

PERSIUS, SAT. VI. 79.

I am glad to see that Dr. Reid has proposed *bulgam* for *rugam* in the disputed phrase *iam decies redit in rugam*. I have the same suggestion now for many years down in the margin of my Conington; but I never ventured to publish it. Palaeographically, the conjecture is perfect; for B and R are habitually confounded, and the omission of *l* or its equivalent *i* is very common. The only objection is the anti-

quity of the word, for Persius seldom goes as far back as Lucilius for his vocabulary. Dr. Reid rightly rejects the meaning 'purse' for *rugam*, and the explanation of 'frowning' based on Juvenal xiv. 326. The only possible explanation of *rugam* is that of the scholiast: 'ἀλληγορικῶς αὐτὸς vestibis dixit, quod in rugam plicantur.' But I believe *bulgam* is right.

A. PALMER.

NOTES ON SOPHOCLES TRACHINIAE.

V. 1.

λόγος μὲν ἔστ' ἀρχαῖος ἀνθρώπων φανείς.

Mr. Margoliouth's remark that 'ἀνθρώπων is hardly tolerable with βροτῶν in the same place in the following line' appears to me, in view of the context, eminently just. However, I am not inclined to accept his ἀνθρώπων, or to regard ἀνθρώπων as a gloss on βροτῶν. The original reading was, I believe (quite independently of Mr. Blaydes), ἀρχαῖος ἐκ τινος φανείς. The partitive ἀνθρώπων was added to τινος and finally sup-

planted ἐκ τινος in the text. Mr. Blaydes, although he quotes *Ant.* 621 (σοφαῖα γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται) in support of ἐκ τινος, does not seem to have appreciated the intrinsic probability of his conjecture; for he offers also λόγος παλαιὸς ἔστ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις φανείς.

V. 55.

ἀνδρὸς κατὰ ζήτησιν οὐ πέμπεις τινά.

Neither Mr. Blaydes nor Professor Jebb notices what I believe to be the most