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's *Ethics*, VIII. 10

J. Solomon

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 07 / July 1889, pp 294 - 295

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195381, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195381

How to cite this article:

J. Solomon (1889). Aristotle's *Ethics*, VIII. 10. The Classical Review, 3, pp 294-295
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195381

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

have ἀρχῆς—a very natural though mistaken conjecture. The *Vet. tr.* seems to omit καί. Καί is unnecessary, and may have been introduced to make the clause coherent by a scribe who read ἀρχῆς.

vii. 2, 5. 1146. a. 9. τῶν γὰρ ἐσχάτων τις. Rassow (*Forsch.* p. 127) points out that these words are parenthetical. Τίς is awkward. Ought we not to read ἐστί?

x. 4, 2. 1174. a. 21. ἡ ἐν ἅπαντι δὴ τῷ χρόνῳ ἢ τούτῳ. This is Bekker's reading. L^b and M^b have ἡ ἐν ἅπαντι δὴ τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ, which seems to be the correct reading. Instead of the second ἡ of Bekker's text, O^b and Par. 1417 have δὴ which they omit after ἅπαντι. This misplaced δὴ was probably the origin of the second ἡ. This supposition seems to be supported by K^b, which, omitting δὴ with O^b and Par. 1417 after ἅπαντι, reads ἡ not δὴ before τούτῳ.

iii. 8, 13. 1117. a. 14. οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ οἶσθαι κρείττους εἶναι καὶ μὴθὲν ἀντιπαθεῖν. Perhaps we ought to read μὴθὲν ἂν ἀντιπαθεῖν:¹ cf. *Rhet.* ii. 5. 1382. b. 31, φανερόν ὅτι οὐδεὶς φοβέεται τῶν οἰομένων μὴδὲν ἂν παθεῖν and 1383 b, 9, καὶ ὅταν ἐπιχειροῦντες ἢ μὴδὲν ἂν παθεῖν μὴδὲ πείσεσθαι ἢ κατορθωσείν οἴωνται.

v. 11, 4. 1138. a. 17. ὥστ' οὐδὲ κατὰ ταύτην

¹ I find, since writing the above, that Heylbut (*Aspasii Comm. praefatio*, p. x.) reads μὴδὲν ἂν παθεῖν after Aspasius.

ἀδικεῖ ἅμα γάρ κ.τ.λ. After ἀδικεῖ K^b inserts ἂν. Is this ἂν a corruption of αὐτόν which is required by the sense?

v. 8, 7. 1135. b, 19. ὅταν ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν αὐτῷ ἢ τῆς αἰτίας. Jackson's suggestion ἀγνοίας for αἰτίας is adopted by Susemihl. It is true that ἀρχὴ τῆς αἰτίας (= *principium causae*) is a strange phrase: and I should feel tempted to alter it, or take αἰτίας in the sense of *criminis*, were it not that I find Hippocrates (περὶ ἀρχαίης ἱητρικῆς l. Littre i. 570) using the same expression (τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς αἰτίας) in the sense of *principium causae*. The fact that the expression does elsewhere occur (though not in Aristotle), to my mind, turns the balance in favour of retaining it here. If however it be still thought that αἰτίας is wrong here, would not αἰκίας be a simpler change than ἀγνοίας? The term, well known to Athenian law, occurs in Plato, *Legg.* ix. to which this chapter is so much indebted: and in *Pol.* ii. 4, 1262a 26 αἰκίας committed by persons who are ἀγνοοῦντες are distinctly contemplated. H^a, M^b and B² with κακίας might be supposed to exhibit a divergent form, which, when compared with the αἰτίας of other MSS., would point to an original αἰκίας. On the ground however stated above I prefer to retain αἰτίας.

J. A. STEWART.

ARISTOTLE'S *ETHICS*, VIII. 10.

THE phrase κληρωτός τις βασιλεύς is clearly one of contempt, and the commentators who have gravely searched for such a monarch among the various kinds of kings enumerated in *Politics* III. 14, have naturally earned nothing by their pains. It is curious that nobody before Ramsauer seems to have noticed that the phrase is also found in *Politicus* 291a and in a context which makes its meaning clear, though we can hardly commend the learned editor for the use he made of his discovery. The passage in question confirms Coraes' suggestion (which I find in Michelet) of the origin of the expression before us, that it was primarily applied to the chief priest of Athens, the second Archon, a titular βασιλεύς appointed like his brother-Archons by lot; but the very words of Plato are specially interesting because he speaks of κληρωτοὶ βασιλεῖς generically in the plural, and with the same tinge of contempt as Aristotle, though not, I think, in precisely the same sense. These βασιλεῖς in Plato

are in all cases priests; and their function, we are informed with a certain sardonic humour, notwithstanding their great pretensions (their annexation of the crown itself, as in Egypt; of its titles, as at Athens)—their function is the purely ministerial one of communicating between gods and men; of course, then, they are no real kings at all. This negative significance is what Aristotle appropriates; κληρωτὸς βασιλεύς with him is 'a merely titular king.' It is probable, however, that while taking the phrase from Plato he added some associations to it while dropping others. He thought probably not of the priestly so-called kingship, but of the insignificance of offices to which election was made by lot. That lot was only applied to routine posts demanding nothing but average ability, is well known to all readers of Athenian history; the strategi and other important military officers were appointed by vote. Grant, therefore, though he correctly catches the tone of contempt in κληρωτός, is not

merely wrong but most unfortunate in his translation 'ballot-box king,' for a king elected by ballot-box or *χειροτονία* may quite well be the most powerful and most gifted man in the state, nor is his tenure of power necessarily insecure: we have but to refer to the case of Pericles. The *κληρωτός*, on the other hand, is certain not to rule for long, will be merely an average citizen, and will be trusted with no higher functions than the average citizen can discharge. This rule of practical politics was observed, as we have seen, in the Athenian constitution; an interesting confirmation of it is to be found in *Politics* VII. (VI.) 2. 1318a. 2, where it is recommended that if any ancient office survive a revolution, its power shall be taken away and the mode of election to it changed so as to make it *κληρωτός* instead of *αἰρετός*. Thus *κληρωτός* practically = insignificant.

A further confirmation of this may be supplied, and the true sense given at the

same time to a famous passage in Plato's *Laws* III. 692a, misrendered with truly ovine sequacity by commentator after commentator. The Athenian is speaking of the successive curtailments of the power of the Spartan kings, first through the action of a guardian deity, which split it in halves by the erection of two lines of kings, secondly by the introduction of the *γερονσία*: 'a third saviour seeing it still too exuberant, put on it as curb the authority of the ephors, *ἐγγὺς τῆς κληρωτῆς ἀγαγὼν δυνάμεως*, which last phrase, we cannot now doubt, means 'reducing it to insignificance,' making of its holder a *κληρωτὸς βασιλεὺς*: the reference ordinarily made of the words to the new power of the ephors, and the mode of their appointment—they were in fact elected in a way of which we know nothing except that Aristotle thought it 'childish'—is barely grammatical, and too foolish to need express refutation.

J. SOLOMON.

THE CODEX WITTIANUS OF THE *ILIAD*.

For about a century a legend has been afloat concerning a valuable lost manuscript of the *Iliad*, supposed to be, like the Venetus A, supplied with the marginal signs of Aristarchos. La Roche gives a brief account of it under No. 101, on page 474 of his *Homerische Textkritik*, and adds 'Diese Handschrift scheint gänzlich verschollen zu sein. Enthält dieselbe wirklich die Aristarchischen Zeichen, und wenn auch nur den Obelus, so wäre eine Vergleichung mit dem Venetus A wünschenswerth, ja sogar für die Stellen geboten, wo der Venetus A von zweiter Hand geschrieben ist und keine Zeichen hat.'

The legend was started by Villoison in the long note on p. xiv. of his *Prolegomena*. He gives the following history. The MSS. originally in the library of Cardinal Seripandi passed by bequest into that of the Augustinian friars of San Giovanni di Carbonara at Naples. Towards the end of the 17th century, a young Dutchman, John de Witt, destined to become otherwise famous, came to Naples, and at the price of 200 scudi persuaded the friars to part with no less than forty of their most valuable MSS. These he carried off to Holland, and they were ultimately sold with his other books in 1701. Now Fabricius says that

among the books then sold was 'Homerus MS. cum obelis Aristarchi, et scholiis MSS., quae marginibus adscripta bonam partem Porphyrium auctorem agnoscunt, adjecto Procli commentario ad sex libros priores Iliados, ex bibliotheca Antonii Seripandi, cardinalis; tum Odyssea, cum antiquis scholiis copiosis.' The former MS. Villoison identifies with one used by Bergler and Lederlin in the preparation of Wetsten's edition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Amsterdam, 1707. Bergler's words in his preface are, 'paravit sibi (Wetstenius) utriusque operis codices MSS. tos praestantissimos, scholiis nondum editis insignes, sed alterum profundae antiquitatis nomine longe excellentissimum; alter in frontispicio etiam signa Aristarchi, et *Μνοβατραχομαχίαν*, uti ibi scriptum, habet.' This, then, is what is known of the lost manuscript.

It is characteristic of La Roche that among the references which he gives to those who have discussed this subject he should not mention Heyne, whom he makes a point of ignoring when possible. But Heyne is the only man who has guessed at the truth. In his note on Vol. III. p. xcvi. he says, 'suborta quoque mihi est alia suspicio, an forte hic codex Harleianus 5674 cum altero 5693 ipsum illum codicem Wittianum cum