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](#)

Kenyon's ΑΘΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεα. Edited by F. G. Kenyon. Third and revised edition. 1892. 7s. 6d.

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 07 / July 1892, pp 319 - 320
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186287, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186287

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 319-320 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186287

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

KENYON'S ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. Edited by F. G. KENYON.
Third and revised edition. 1892. 7s. 6d.

THE main questions that naturally suggest themselves as to Mr. Kenyon's third edition—the second was a mere reprint—are how far he has now presented us with a better text, what amount of new light he has got on the contents of the treatise, and, after what has been written on the subject in England and abroad, what is his present opinion as to its authorship.

Between the two texts, that of the first and that of the third edition, there can be no comparison. The first contained many obvious errors, some adopted from the papyrus without any apparent suspicion that they were errors, some consisting in unsatisfactory or impossible ways of filling up a hiatus where the MS. was worn away or had become more or less illegible. Besides these errors (which would no doubt have been removed, if the editor had been allowed more time and the authorities of the British Museum had not been in a perhaps pardonable hurry to give their MS. to the world) there were many corrupt or imperfect passages which it needed not merely a good knowledge of Greek, but some amount of real insight, ingenuity and occasionally learning to restore. From the present edition almost all the obvious errors have been removed, and many of the more deeply corrupt or incomplete sentences have now assumed a plausible and sometimes fairly certain form. Mr. Kenyon expresses quite candidly the obligations which he is under in this matter to many English and foreign scholars and especially the assistance he has derived from the Dutch and German editions recently noticed in these columns (*C.R.* Jan. 1892). He has not himself, I think, made any further contributions to the text, except those corrected readings of certain passages in the MS. which he published last year (*C.R.* June 1891); and those who have the Dutch and German editions will find little novelty in this one. But he has used his judgment in putting right the many small and occasionally even considerable errors that had been pointed out and in making a selection from the immense number of emendations that might with more reason be regarded as doubtful. Whether he has gone far enough in this latter respect is a fair subject for difference of opinion, nor can I profess to be a quite impartial judge.

The errors are not all removed, for we still find in ch. 42 διδασκάλους [οἷ]τινες... διδάσκουσιν, when Greek grammar requires οἱ διδάσκουσιν or οἷτινες διδάξουσιν; in 40 δημοκρατήσαντες, when δημοκρατεῖσθαι is the only admissible form of this verb; in 25 the suggestion that τοὺς ἀφαιρεθέντας τῆς βουλῆς means 'the persons selected for the purpose by the Areopagus,' when, if the words were right, the genitive could only be partitive; and in 11 οὐ γὰρ οἶσθαι δίκαιον εἶναι τοὺς νόμους ἐξηγεῖσθαι παρῶν, where δίκαιον εἶναι and παρῶν cannot possibly be right together. In some other places too the editor seems hardly to realise the grammatical or linguistic difficulties that have suggested an emendation. For instance, he follows Kontos (as the other editors have done) in rejecting Mr. Bywater's ἐκ γῆς οἰκείας for ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας in 7 on the ground that ἡ οἰκεία is a frequent expression. So it is, but only in the sense of a man's own country, not of his own piece of land. Of the latter sense Kontos gives in *Athena* no instance at all. In πρὶν ἢ Πανσανίαν τ' ἀφικέσθαι (38) the editor keeps τε where the MS. has it, though it is perfectly clear that it must be either omitted or placed elsewhere, thinking apparently that, if only it is put somewhere, it may be put anywhere and follow any word in a clause. But errors such as these are now rare.

A few new readings not given in the German and Dutch editions may be noticed here. For ὀμνύουσι... τῆς πόλεως ἄρχειν (ἀρξέιν) in ch. 3 we now have ὀμνύουσι... τὰ ὄρκια ποιήσεν, which Mr. Kenyon adopts partly on conjecture and would have done well to justify; in 4 we find τοὺς δ' ἔδει διεγγνᾶσθαι τοὺς πρυτάνεις; in 6 τὰ τε πράγματα νοσοῦντα μαρτυρεῖ with a hiatus after μαρτυρεῖ (this word is said to have been deciphered by Wessely and Blass, but it can hardly with any word after it make sense); in 9 ὅπως ἢ τῆς κρίσεως ὁ δῆμος κύριος; in 15 τῆς δὲ φωνῆς ἐχάλασεν μικρὸν after Kontos' conjecture, in which both ἐχάλασεν and μικρὸν seem open to objections; in 40 πρώτη μετὰ ταύτην ἔχουσα πολιτείας τάξιν; and in 42 for the original ἵνα μὴ πράγμασι συμμειγείν τι we have now ἵνα μὴ πρόφασις ἢ τοῦ ἀπίεσθαι (deciphered by Blass). A few more readings extracted from the facsimile by Blass are mentioned in the introduction, the most interesting of which is οἱ δανεισμοὶ πᾶσι for δεδεμένοι τοῖς δανείσασιν in 2, and ἦσαν οἱ δανεισμοὶ for ἦσαν δεδεμένοι at the end of 4: Mr. Kenyon does not however seem to re-

gard this as certain. (Here again he does not seem alive to the objection that *δεδεμένος* is used in no such way.) He has of course incorporated in his text Wilamowitz-Möllerndorf's restoration of a portion of the fourth roll of the papyrus. He has further introduced into the new edition a series of critical notes, giving the MS. reading where he departs from it, the readings of the foreign editors, and some of the emendations which he has not adopted. It may be added that he gives reason for adhering to his view that the MS. is in four different hands (held by the German editors, who worked from the facsimile and not from the MS., to be only two), and that he too expresses the wish not long ago expressed in this *Review* that the MS. should be studied anew by some 'scholar of recognised palaeographical experience.' One or two of the new readings above mentioned show how much to be desired this is. If Mr. Kenyon and the foreign editors have thought the MS. (or the facsimile) had *ἵνα μὴ πράγμασι συμμυγέέν τι* and Blass has now discovered the real reading (so Mr. Kenyon seems to admit) to be *ἵνα μὴ πρόφασις ἢ τοῦ ἀπείναι*, what other discoveries may not be made in doubtful places?

The notes on the contents of the book have been revised and a certain amount of fresh matter incorporated in them, derived from or suggested by the work of various critics. The editor is inclined to defend the account of the Draconian constitution against those who have called it in question, and thinks that a 'sober historical judgment will probably in the end find its statements not so startling as they at first appear.' He suggests that Plutarch's apparent unfamiliarity with this part of the treatise and with the story about Themistocles aiding Ephialtes in his attack on the Areopagus may be accounted for by the theory 'that in actually writing his lives he used the notes and extracts he had previously made, without having the complete work before him.' But this only removes the difficulty a step backwards. Why should Plutarch in making notes and extracts, if he did make them, pass over this very remarkable information about Draco and the characteristic and chronologically important story of Themistocles? When scholars argue that it is strange Plutarch takes no notice of these things, it is surely no answer to say 'that is because he took no notice of them when he was collecting his materials.' And, if he was using the materials of some one else or an abbreviated copy of the treatise, there is still the difficulty how such things came to

be omitted. But, it must be confessed, the theory of interpolation also presents great difficulties. On many other smaller points, on which criticism or information has been forthcoming, the notes have been enlarged or modified, but the greater part of them remain as they were.

On the question of authorship Mr. Kenyon naturally remains true to his original faith, but perhaps he does not hold it with quite as much confidence as before. He maintains indeed still that there is evidence enough to show, not only that the treatise was written in the lifetime of Aristotle, but that 'he was content to publish it under his name and with the stamp of his authority.' But what precisely is meant by 'Aristotelian authorship,' he says, is another question, and he admits the possibility of its having been prepared by pupils under the supervision of the master. This is a view to which many scholars have seemed to incline and which at present is perhaps the best working hypothesis we have to go upon, though it is far from clearing away all difficulties. It should however be realised that such a hypothesis, to whatever extent we adopt it, considerably impairs the literary interest and historical importance of the work. Granting that Aristotle might have drawn 'outlines' and even carried out some 'revision,' we should still be far from having the materials of Athenian constitutional history sifted and used by the mind of the philosopher himself. It would not be his judgment as to the facts of history and their interpretation. At any rate we should have no assurance that it was. It might only be the work of some pupil, whom he thought competent to do the thing fairly well. When we look at the list of Aristotle's reputed writings and see how many of them, as far as we can judge, were mere compilations or little more, which it did not at all need one of the greatest of Greek intellects to execute, it is surely a probable conjecture that Aristotle confined himself to works worthy of him, works that only a great writer could worthily perform, and left compilations and catalogues to smaller men. It is likely enough that they were composed in his school, but very unlikely that he wasted his time in composing them himself. We may say now, I think, that this inherent improbability is supported by the internal evidence found in the language and contents of the newly discovered treatise. The contents are mediocre and the language is at least doubtful.

HERBERT RICHARDS.