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](#)

Textual Notes on Plato's *Republic*

R. G. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 06 / July 1903, pp 295 - 296

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208305, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208305

How to cite this article:

R. G. Bury (1903). Textual Notes on Plato's *Republic*. The Classical Review, 17, pp 295-296
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208305

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

general mass of Greek which comes to the surface later was used like the future indicative) is in effect a future perfect; and always refers, more or less, to future time: just as *ὅταν τοῦτο ποιήσης* is *hoc cum feceris*, so *μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσης* is *hoc ne feceris* (like *ὅπως μὴ ποιήσεις*) 'see that you do not do this' at whatever future time, next moment or a hundred years hence. Whereas *μὴ τοῦτο ποίει* is 'do not do as you are doing', 'do not continue doing so', 'cease to do so'.¹ Thus *μὴ σπεῦδε* in Theocr. v. 31 elicits the rejoinder *ἀλλ' οὔτι σπεύδω*, and *μή μ' ἐκδίδασκε* in Soph. *El.* 395 elicits the retort *ἀλλ' οὐ διδάσκω*, because it implies *οὕτως ὥσπερ διδάσκεις*, but this would not

¹ This I had from Dr. Henry Jackson years ago, who had it as he told me from Shilleto, who derived it probably from Heimmann; see the quotation from him in *Greg. Cor.* p. 864.—In Latin Comedy, translating Greek, *ne* with the present imperative is not uncommon, *ne fle*, *ne plora* for *μὴ κλαίε* but I fancy Latin normally preferred to say *noli flere*.—In Herodas iv. 52 our choice is therefore limited to *καρδίη βάλλει* or *καρδιβόλλει* (W. R. Paton) or *καρδιηβολεῖ*.

have been implied by *μή μ' ἐκδιδάξῃς*: in the famous fragment (136) of Euripides, *σὺ δ' ὦ ... Ἐρως, ἣ μὴ δίδασκε τὰ καλὰ φαίνεσθαι κακά*, the substitution of *διδάξῃς* would destroy the sense. *ἃ μὴ μέγα λέγε* in Plat. *Hipp. Maj.* 295 A is 'O don't boast so!' as in Theocr. x. 20 *μηδὲν μέγα μυθεῖ*, with the rejoinder *οὐ μέγα μυθεῖμαι*: but *μηδὲν μέγ' εἶπες* and *μηδὲν μέγ' αὖσης* *El.* 830 are interruptions in anticipation. By the same rule I would punctuate *O.T.* 325: *TE. ὁρῶ γὰρ οὐδὲ σοὶ τὸ σὺν φώνῃ' ἰὸν πρὸς καιρόν' ὥς οὖν μηδ' ἐγὼ ταῦτόν πάθω*,—(*I will depart without speaking*) *OI. μὴ πρὸς θεῶν φρονῶν γ' ἀποστραφῇς*,... *Lucian i.* 655 *ὥς οὖν τό γε ἡμέτερον ἀναίτιον ἢ μηδὲ ἔχῃς λέγειν ὥς...* ὅπως μὴ ταῦτα λέγῃς, ἀκουσον ἐξ ἀρχῆς. Perhaps *Cho.* 771 should be punctuated *ἀλλ' εἰ τροπαίαν Ζεὺς κακῶν θήσει ποτέ*,—'Well, if Zeus ever means to end our troubles', (now is the moment): cf. *Electra's* exclamation in Soph. *El.* 411 on hearing of her mother's ominous dream, *ὦ θεοὶ πατρώοι, συγγένεσθέ γ' ἀλλὰ νῦν*.

W. HEADLAM.

TEXTUAL NOTES ON PLATO'S *REPUBLIC*.

I. 335 A *κελεύεις δὴ ἡμᾶς προσθεῖναι τῷ δικαίῳ ἢ ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ἐλέγομεν . . . νῦν πρὸς τούτῳ ὧδε λέγειν ὅτι ἔστιν δίκαιον κ.τ.λ.*

Obviously ἢ is out of place here; and Madvig and others have done well to eject it. As the words *πρὸς τούτῳ ὧδε λέγειν* serve to resume *προσθεῖναι*, I suggest that, in place of ἢ, we should insert the words *καὶ ὅτι*, which the *ὅτι* following *λέγειν* will then serve to resume. After *δικαίῳ, καὶ ὅτι* might easily have been lost.

III. 410 E *τί δέ; τὸ ἡμέρον οὐχ ἢ φιλόσοφος ἂν ἔχοι φύσις; καὶ μᾶλλον μὲν ἀνεθέντος αὐτοῦ μαλακώτερον εἴη τοῦ δέναντος, καλῶς δὲ τραφέντος ἡμέρον τε καὶ κόσμιον.*

Does *αὐτοῦ* mean *τοῦ φιλοσόφου*, or *τοῦ ἡμέρον*? Either alternative is difficult (see Adam's n. *ad loc.*), and emendation seems required. I venture to suggest *μᾶλλον μὲν ἀνεθέν τοσούτῳ μαλακώτερον . . . καλῶς δὲ τραφέν <ὄντως> ἡμέρον κ.τ.λ.*

IV. 439 A *τὸ δὲ δὴ δίψος . . . οὐ τούτων θήσεις τῶν τινὸς εἶναι τοῦτο ὅπερ ἐστίν, ἐστι δὲ δήπου δίψος;*

If the text is correct we seem compelled to make *εἶναι* do double duty: 'Will you not state, as to thirst, that it is one of these relative objects, (and that it is) that which it is.' Accordingly, Adam proposes to

insert *καὶ τινὸς* after *τῶν τινὸς*. To my mind a more attractive correction would be *οὐ τοιοῦτον θήσεις τι οἷον τινὸς εἶναι κ.τ.λ.*

IV. 440 C *ὅταν ἀδικεῖσθαι τις ἡγῇται, οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ ζεῖ τε καὶ χαλεπαίνει . . . καὶ διὰ τὸ πεινῆν . . . καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα πάσχειν ὑπομένων καὶ νικᾷ καὶ οὐ λήγει τῶν γενναίων πρὶν ἂν ἢ διαπράξῃται ἢ τελευτήσῃ κ.τ.λ.*

Many suggestions for emending this difficult passage will be found in Adam's Appendix *ad loc.* I cite two: (1) 'If the best MSS. are right in placing *καί* after *ὑπομένων*, it is possible that *ὑπομένων* is corrupt, and conceals ὑπό with a genitive (cf. *πάσχειν ὑπ' ἐκείνου* in the parallel passage just before)' (Adam). (2) 'Τῶν γενναίων is most feeble. Plainly Plato wrote *οὐ λήγει ἀγανακτῶν*' (Richards). Somewhat on these lines, with the conviction, further, that *νικᾷ* is quite incompatible with its context, I propose to emend the passage thus: *πάσχειν ὑπὸ ἀνόμων καὶ ἀδικίᾳ καὶ οὐ λήγει τῶν γε μανίων πρὶν ἂν κ.τ.λ.* For *ζεῖ . . . μανίων*, cp. *μανόμενος . . . ζεῖ* *Laws* 773 D.

V. 452 E *καὶ καλοῦ αὐτὸ σπουδάζει πρὸς ἄλλον τινὰ σκοπὸν στησάμενος ἢ τὸν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.*

στησάμενος can hardly be construed (with Jebb) 'having set himself to some other

aim'; and it is awkward to supply (with Adam) αὐτόν, i.e. τὸν σκοπόν. It is obvious to conjecture στοχασάμενος, but I suspect rather that Plato wrote συστησάμενος, 'in his compositions.'

V. 473 C εἰ καὶ μέλλει γέλῳτι τε ἀτεχνῶς ὥσπερ κύμα ἐκγελῶν καὶ ἀδοξία κατακλύσειν.

The simile is bad. It is not the 'wave that will laugh—if the 'wave' here is the same as that already mentioned, viz. the coming statement of Socrates—but some hostile spectator. Hence Adam proposed to eject the words ἀτεχνῶς . . . ἐκγελῶν. A less drastic remedy would be to insert τις after γέλῳτι τε: 'although someone is sure to drown me in laughter, roaring just like a breaker, and in disgrace.' Cp. Eurip. fr. 981 ἀλλ' ἔστι, καὶ τις ἐγγελαῖ . . . λόγῳ.

VI. 488 D ὅπως δὲ κυβερνήσει ἐάν τέ τινες βούλωνται ἐάν τε μή, μήτε τέχνην τούτου μήτε μελέτην οἰόμενοι δυνατόν εἶναι λαβεῖν ἅμα καὶ τὴν κυβερνητικήν.

This passage is carefully discussed by Adam, Append. I *ad loc.* He adopts Schneider's view and leaves the text unaltered. One difficulty is the ambiguity of ἡ κυβερνητική in the sentence: it may be either 'navigation' in the sailors' sense, i.e. 'the art of making themselves master of the ship' (cp. κυβερνητικόν above), or 'navigation' in the proper scientific sense of the term. If we take the former of these meanings, we might, I think, simplify the passage by either inserting εἰ μή before ἅμα or changing ἅμα καὶ to ἄλλην ἢ. But I am strongly of opinion that ἡ κυβερνητική is here used in its correct sense, 'navigation' as a technical science; and I suspect that in the words following λαβεῖν we should look for a reason why the sailors hold this opinion. Accordingly, I propose to restore, for ΑΜΑΚΑΙ τὴν κ., ΑΜΑΘΙΑΙ τῆς κυβερνητικῆς.

VI. 507 B καὶ αὐτὸ δὴ καλὸν καὶ αὐτὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ οὕτω περὶ πάντων ἃ τότε ὡς πολλὰ ἐτίθεμεν, πάλιν αὖ κατ' ἰδέαν μίαν ἐκάστου, ὡς μιᾶς οὐσης, τιθέντες, ὃ ἔστιν ἕκαστον προσαγορευόμενον.

Adam pertinently asks 'if κατ' ἰδέαν is genuine, what is the grammatical object of τιθέντες?' Plainly we require an expressed

antithesis to πολλά; and the simplest mode of obtaining it is to insert ἐν after ἐτίθμεν. 'With regard to the various things, in themselves which we formerly posited as pluralities,—now, conversely, positing a unity, according to the unitary idea of each, assuming that such a unitary idea exists, we entitle each "essential being."' This seems to be the manner in which Schneider takes the passage; though he is content, apparently, to supply ἐν.

VII. 515 B εἰ οὖν διαλέγεσθαι οἰοίτ' εἶναι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οὐ ταῦτα ἡγεῖ ἂν τὰ παρόντα αὐτοὺς νομίζειν ὀνομάζειν, ἅπερ ὁρῶμεν;

A large variety of explanations and corrections is recorded by Adam in his Append. IV. The interpretation I venture to propose is, I believe, new. The prisoners are supposed to be conversing with one another; but inasmuch as they know nothing of one another beyond their shadows, each one of them fancies that his neighbour's voice proceeds from one of these shadows. The translation then will be: 'do you not suppose that they imagine that it is these present objects, just those which they see, which address them by name?' Plato has spoken above of two kinds of shadows, viz. (1) ἐαυτῶν τε καὶ ἀλλήλων . . . τὰς σκιὰς, and (2) τῶν παραφερομένων. In the sentence following (τί δ'; εἰ καὶ ἡχὼ κ.τ.λ.) he deals with sounds connected with the latter, whence it is natural to suppose that it is sounds connected with the former class of shadows of which mention is made in the present sentence. This is confirmed by the choice of the words διαλέγεσθαι—ἀλλήλους.

VIII. 562 A φέρε δὴ, τίς τρόπος τυραννίδος, ὃ φίλε ἐταῖρε, γίγνεται; ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ἐκ δημοκρατίας μεταβάλλει, σχεδὸν δὴλον.

Stallbaum's suggestion τίς τρόπος τυραννίδος φ, ὃ φ. ἐτ., γίγνεται; is, I believe, on the right lines; but it strikes me as more like Plato to write τίς τρ. τυραννίδος <φ φίλει>, ὃ φίλε ἐταῖρε, γίγνεσθαι; Cp. Phil. 37 B τῷ τρόπῳ δόξα . . . φιλεῖ γίγνεσθαι; and for the corruption of infin. ending, 407 C (ἀσκεῖται for ἀσκεῖσθαι).

R. G. BURY.

ADVERBIAL FORMS IN PLAUTUS.

I.—NOUNS AND ADVERBS.

(1) Accusatives:—

hoc commodum, Trin. 1136.
usque ad fatim, Poen. 534, and probably Men. 91; *adfatis* alone, 6(8?) instances.
nunc ipsum, B. 940.

(2) Ablatives singular:—

forte fortuna, B. 916, Mil. 287.
immerito meo, As. 608, Cas. 919; *immerito tuo*, Men. 371; *immerito*, alone, as adverb, S. 16, 28. Similarly, *merito*, clearly a noun, 10 instances; indeterminate, 23; *merito*