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](#)

Recent Literature on the ' Αθηναίων Πολιτεία Aristotle on the Athenian Constitution, translated, with introduction and notes, by F. G. Kenyon. London. Bell. 4s. 6d. Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, translated by E. Poste. London. Macmillan. 3s. 6d. Aristoteles Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener, verdeutscht von Georg Kaibel und Adolf Kiessling. Strassburg. 2 Mk. Aristotele la Costituzione degli Ateniesi Testo Greco, versione Italiana, introduzione e note per cura di C. Ferrini. Milano.

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 10 / December 1891, pp 465 - 468

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179624, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179624

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 465-468 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179624

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

φάγματ' for πρὸς αἶματ' in the previous line : in 938 ἐξὸν μίας μοι χειρὸς εἶ θέσθαι τάδε ; giving an interesting explanation of the genitive : while in 775, δύνασιν ἄδικον ἐφέλκων, the editor retains ἄδικον which he had previously agreed with Nauck in expunging : in 879 μανίαισιν—χορευθέντ' ἐναύλοισι the adj. is defended by a comparison with καταυλήσω φόβῳ in 869.

Only six lines are obelized : and in 1288 κληδονχοῦμενοι is marked as corrupt while in 1209 the emendation πολὺ τε δάκρυον ἐκβάλλων (for πολιόν) though introduced into the text is admitted to be unsatisfactory.

The orthography may be new to some English students in the following respects : the editor writes μέμφη, ἔρχη, etc., for the vulgar μέμφει, ἔρχει : οἰκτίρω (οἰκτεῖρω) : ἐκτεισαῖατο (ἐκτισαῖατό) : ἐκκρίμνασθε (ἐκκρήμνασθε), see n. on p. 152 : γέλον (γέλων) l. 285, see n. : ὃ for δ demonstrative : while σὲ when emphatic is not elided, e.g. ἐς σὲ ἀφιξομαι, see n. to l. 218.

The following peculiarities are less defensible : in dialogue, the παράγραφος replaces the speaker's initials, a vexatious retrogression apparently intended, like the insertion of the marks denoting correspondence in the choruses, to give the reader an idea of the appearance of the MSS. Even more confusing to the English reader is the absence of capital letters in the German except before proper names : while the German orthography, like the Greek, is obtrusively up to date.

These however are minor matters : the only serious defect from an exegetical point of view is the absence of a translation, a defect which is remedied in the recent edition of the *Hippolytus* : while the editor's broad treatment of his subject in the first volume really marks an epoch in the method of studying Greek Tragedy.

N. WEDD.

RECENT LITERATURE ON THE Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία.

I.

Aristotle on the Athenian Constitution, translated, with introduction and notes, by F. G. KENYON. London. Bell. 4s. 6d.

Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, translated by E. POSTE. London. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.

Aristoteles Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener, verdeutsch von GEORG KAIBEL und ADOLF KIESSLING. Strassburg. 2 Mk.

Aristotele la Costituzione degli Ateniesi Testo Greco, versione Italiana, introduzione e note per cura di C. FERRINI. Milano.

THE business-like and bald language of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία presents, except now and then from the state of the text, no difficulties of translation. The English and foreign versions now before us would therefore hardly call for notice, if it were not for the interest attaching directly to a new Greek book and indirectly to the first translations of it. Both the English translators address themselves primarily to the general public rather than to scholars, and for the latter the chief interest consists perhaps in observing which of the many suggestions made for the improvement of the text they have adopted and how far, when translating through thick and thin, they have been able

to extract a reasonable meaning without doing violence to Greek idiom. Though Mr. Kenyon's book did not appear till July, the introduction is dated in April last. It is therefore hard to tell which suggestions he had and which he had not before him at the time of writing. He has however adopted a great many, and his translation is very different from what it would have been if he had translated his own original text. But the work of emendation is by no means over and it may safely be predicted that any translation made in a few years' time will differ almost as much again. Meanwhile he has had one advantage over Mr. Poste : by further study of the papyrus he has been able to correct his own previous readings in several places. He tells us for instance that what he printed in ch. 16 as ὥστε δια[μπε]ρὲς ἐγεωργοῦντο is now found to be ὥστε διατρέφεσθαι γεωργοῦντας, and in ch. 15 τῷ Ἀνακίῳ becomes τῷ Θεσίῳ.

The translation of ch. 5 seems to be a fair specimen of his work.

'Now seeing that such was the organization of the constitution, and that the many were in slavery to the few, the people rose against the upper class. The strife was

keen, and for a long time the two parties were face to face with one another, till at last, by common consent, they appointed Solon to be mediator and Archon, and committed the whole constitution to his hands. The immediate cause of his appointment was his poem, which begins with the words :—

I see, and within my heart deep sadness has
claimed its place,
As I look on the oldest home of the ancient
Ionian race :

and so he continues fighting and disputing on behalf of each party in turn against the other, and finally he advises them to come to terms and put an end to the quarrel existing between them. By birth and reputation Solon was one of the foremost men of the day, but in wealth and position he was of the middle class, as is manifest from many circumstances, and especially from his own evidence in these poems, where he exhorts the wealthy not to be grasping :—

But ye who have store of good, who are
sated and overflow,
Restrain your swelling soul, and still it and
keep it low :
Let the heart that is great within you be
trained a lowlier way ;
Ye shall not have all at your will, and we
will not for ever obey.

Indeed, he constantly ascribes the origin of the conflict to the rich ; and accordingly at the beginning of the poem he says that he fears “the love of wealth and an overweening mind,” evidently meaning that it was through these that the quarrel arose.’

‘Poem’ here is hardly exact enough for *ἐλεγεία*, and *αἰτίαν ἀνάπτει* means perhaps rather ‘imputes the blame’ ‘than ascribes the origin.’ It is surely an error to translate *ὡς ἔκ τε τῶν ἄλλων ὁμολογεῖται* ‘as is manifest from many circumstances.’ If the meaning were doubtful it would still be determined by the parallel expressions *οἱ ἄλλοι συνομολογοῦσι πάντες* and *οἱ τ’ ἄλλοι συμφωνοῦσι πάντες* at the end of ch. 6 and beginning of ch. 12, in each of which places Solon’s own verses and the witness of other people are coupled together. There are some other places in which the meaning seems to me to be missed. I mention a few of them. P. 101, l. 2, *ἐὰν δέ τινες τῶν ἀπιόντων οἰκίαν λαμβάνωσιν* ‘Ελευσίνι, *συμπείθειν τὸν κεκτημένον* does not mean ‘the people would help them to obtain the consent of the owner’ ; *τινες* gives the subject of *συμπείθειν*, a verb which

is used in the same sense in at least two other passages of this treatise. In ch. 56, ‘at the Dionysia there is a chorus for each tribe,’ &c., Mr. Kenyon has understood of the choruses what the writer says of the choregi, with the result of throwing the expense of the chorus on the tribe instead of the choregus. In Solon’s lines (p. 32, l. 5) *ἀλκὴν πάντοθεν ποιέσθαι* cannot, I think, mean ‘took me strength from every side’ but ‘showed prowess on all sides,’ like Mezentius when he ‘partes cunctatur in omnes,’ for Solon compares himself to a wolf at bay, as Virgil compares Mezentius to a wild boar. The rendering of *ἐποίησαν διαψημισμὸν* (p. 35, l. 10) by ‘a resolution was passed’ seems to be doubly wrong, for it confuses *ποιεῖν* with *ποιέσθαι* and *διαψημισμός* with *ψήφισμα*. The expression means literally ‘caused a distinguishing vote to be taken,’ unless indeed we ought to read the middle voice. In p. 80, l. 3, *τῇ πόλει πάσῃ πατρικῶς χρωμένους* surely does not mean ‘that they acted in all their public life in a manner worthy of their ancestry’ but that they behaved like fathers (not to this or that class, but) to the whole state. Mr. Kenyon still takes *θυρῶν* in ch. 50 to mean doors, though in a note he adds ‘or possibly windows.’ There is no reason whatever to suppose that the word can be used as doors. It is true that Liddell and Scott recognize that meaning but any one who verifies their references for it will see that they are not justified. In p. 140, l. 11, *ἔπειτα χορηγοὺς τραγῳδοῖς καθίστησι τρεῖς ἐξ ἀπάντων Ἀθηναίων τοὺς πλουσιωτάτους*, I have suggested that *τοὺς πλουσιωτάτους* should be omitted as a gloss on the ground that this liturgy was not the most costly. This view is strengthened by the necessity Mr. Kenyon finds himself under of writing ‘three of the richest persons’ instead of ‘the three richest,’ for the Greek can only mean ‘the three richest’ and, if genuine, would imply that the three richest were appointed over and over again. When Theramenes is said (p. 80, l. 8) *πάσας προάγειν* (*τὰς πολιτείας*), Mr. Kenyon translates this by the word ‘supporting,’ which, no doubt, if right, it would have to mean. But can the Greek word mean that? *προάγειν πολιτείαν* means in general what *προάγειν δημοκρατίαν*, *ὀλιγαρχίαν*, &c., would mean in particular, and this must be, I think, to make a democracy more democratic, an oligarchy more oligarchical, and so on. It would be almost a synonym for Aristotle’s *ἐπιτείνειν* as opposed to *ἀνιέναι*. Although the conjecture is a bold one, I still think that, as I have before

suggested, we should for *προάγειν* read *στέργειν*, which fits in admirably with the context. In ch. 24 '600 jurymen' is only a misprint for '6000 jurymen'; but M. Gennadius' conjecture of *ὀπλίται* for *δικασταί* seems for more reasons than one extremely probable, and it may perhaps go along with my own conjecture of *ὀπλιτῶν* in p. 150, l. 2, where Mr. Kenyon prints *δ[ημο]τῶν* and where the MS. may by the same error really have had *δικαστῶν*. In the last mentioned place Mr. Kenyon writes 'the citizens': does he think *δημοτῶν* can mean that, or is he suggesting *πολιτῶν*? This however is hardly the occasion to raise questions about readings, and I will only remark on that matter that, though Mr. Kenyon usually states in a note where he is translating something different from the text of his second edition, he sometimes omits to do so. For instance, he appears to adopt the suggestion of *συμφορὰν* for *διαφορὰν* in p. 80, l. 14, and that of *ἐγκάουσι* for *ἀνάγουσι* in p. 122, l. 20, but there is nothing to show his readers that he is not translating his own printed text.

Mr. Poste's rendering of ch. 5 will also give a fair idea of his work in comparison with Mr. Kenyon's.

'The narrowness of the constitution and the oppression of the many by the few ended in an outbreak of war between the nobles and commons. As the disruption proved persistent, after they had been long divided into hostile camps, they concurred in a joint election of Solon to act as mediator and dictator and reconstructor plenipotentiary of the state, a work for which he had shown some fitness in the elegiac poem which begins "my eyes are opened, and I see with anguish the plight of this old Ionian land," in which poem he endeavours to calm their resentments, champions each party in turn against the other, appeals to the reason of both, and finally urges them to join in uprooting the causes of dissension. Though illustrious by birth and ancestry, in fortune and occupation Solon belonged to the middle class according to all authorities and his own testimony in the verses where he tells the wealthy not to be overgrasping—"Still, ye great, the mighty pantings within your bosom. Feed not so high the over-dieted and riotous steed, your overweening spirit: for neither my compeers nor the humblest ranks will tolerate the present yoke." He continually throws the blame of the schism on the rich, fearing, as he says in the beginning of the poem, their greed and pride as the sources

of the hatred that ranged class against class.'

It may be doubted whether 'ancestry' and 'occupations' are good words for *δόξη* and *πράγμασι*, and whether Solon had any notion of a steed and its pantings in his mind, nor does he say anything about uprooting causes. The concluding words are so translated (or punctuated) as to make *ὡς διὰ ταῦτα τῆς ἔχθρας ἐνεστώσης* a sort of quotation from Solon, which they are not. In the last line of Solon Mr. Poste is presumably translating some new reading which is unknown to me. 'He endeavours to calm their resentments' no doubt represents his own conjecture of *ἐπράνεν* for the corrupt *ἐπήλανε*; but, though *ἐπράνεν* is one of the first words that would occur here to the emender, it can hardly be right. In the first place we want a present tense, not an imperfect, to go with the present tenses following. In the second the word would be out of place in this part of the sentence. Solon is described as adopting first a combative and afterwards a conciliatory attitude. It is not at first that he *παρανεί καταπαύειν τὴν ἐνεστώσαν φιλονικίαν*, but only *μετὰ ταῦτα*.

In the sketch of the Draconian constitution Mr. Poste adopts an ingenious but not, I think, a legitimate way of escaping from a difficulty, when he translates *ἀπεδέδοτο ἡ πολιτεία τοῖς ὅπλοι παρεχομένοις* 'sovereign power was already wielded by the class of persons capable of providing its (their?) own equipment in war,' and adds in a note 'this agrees with the statement of Aristotle, *Pol.* ii. 12, that Drakon made no change in the constitution. The revolution had already taken place. Drakon's task was to adjust the laws to the changed centre of political power.' But the pluperfect is used here, not because the change had taken place before Drakon, but because he had made the change before the system here described in some detail got into working order. The imperfects that follow depict its working, not its first establishment. At the time when they *ἤρουντο* κ.τ.λ. Drakon had given power to the *ὅπλα παρεχόμενοι*. In some other places Mr. Poste's renderings seem to me still more indefensible. Such are 'dispassionate judges' for *οἱ μὴ παρέργως ἀποφαίνόμενοι* (p. 80, l. 6): 'rule by consent of the governed' for *τῶν ἀρχομένων ἡττων ἀρχή* (p. 96, l. 6): 'within the precincts of the metropolis' for *ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς* (p. 125, l. 6). *καρηφορέειν* (p. 47, l. 5) ought not to be translated 'carry the sacred basket,' as though there was only one. 'A beautiful

woman named Phue' omits the *μεγάλη*, which is as essential as the *καλή* in the account of Athena's representative (p. 40, l. 5). 'The corrupt practices of modern law courts' does not at all express τὰ νῦν γινόμενα in p. 27, l. 4, which only means the great power of the courts, not their corruption.

Those who are familiar with Mr. Poste's translation of the *Posterior Analytics* will be prepared to find his English at some distance from the Greek. In the translation before us this is noticeable in the modern and not unfrequently stilted language which he employs. Solon is 'interviewed': men become 'millionaires': Cleon makes speeches 'in the garb of a working-man' (*διαζωσάμενος* or *διεζωσμένος*); οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον is 'he would have dissolved society': τῆς πολιτείας μεταδίδοναι is 'to give them a share in shaping the destinies of the nation': παραστρατηγηθῆναι is to be 'made the unwitting accomplice of a fraudulent scheme,' and we have already seen that ὁδοί are 'the precincts of the metropolis.' ἀριστίνδην is more than adequately translated by 'in accordance with the qualifications characteristic of an aristocratic constitution': something simpler would do. The following sentence offends in another way and requires the hand of the emender as much as any passage in the original Greek: 'what is the likelihood that a man, so just and so superior to personal interests that, when he might by bribing the support of either faction have continued (?) tyrant, he dared to offend them both, preferring to personal aggrandisement the glory of saving the state, it is credible that such a man should be tempted to cover himself with dishonour for a paltry pecuniary gain?' Another questionable practice is the habit of introducing explanatory matter into the text instead of putting it, if at all, into notes. κύρβεις, for instance, is translated 'three-faced pyramids revolving on pivots': Μαρωνεία is 'Maroneia or Laurion': κομίσασθαι τὰ χρήματα is 'call in the capital and dispose of it at their

pleasure.' 'Geraestus' becomes 'Geraistos, the south point of Euboia,' and 'Scyllaeum' appears as 'Skullaion, the east point of Argolis.' Into ch. 43 about eight lines of astronomical matter are interpolated, of which there is not a word in the original text.

By way of comparing the two books, it may be said shortly that Mr. Kenyon keeps closer to the words of the Greek and will give perhaps a better idea of the style of the original, while Mr. Poste strays further from it and perhaps gains less often than he loses: that Mr. Poste avails himself more freely of emendations or has brought his work more thoroughly up to date, while Mr. Kenyon can tell us with authority the last readings of the MS.: that Mr. Kenyon states what readings he is translating while Mr. Poste does not: and that Mr. Kenyon furnishes in a well-written introduction and in numerous notes an amount of explanation and comment much greater than is supplied by Mr. Poste's few notes and the explanations introduced without notice into his text.

The German translation referred to above appeared very speedily after the publication of the papyrus and, though the translators used considerable freedom in dealing with the Greek and in some places would appear to have anticipated conjectures since made, it represents a text now so discredited that it must be rewritten before it calls for particular notice. For the time at which it was published it appears to be accurately and skilfully done. The value to foreigners of the Italian translation, which also seems to be accurate, consists chiefly in the greatly improved Greek text which accompanies it, embodying a large number of English and foreign emendations, and furnishing us with something far better than the Museum's second edition. But the Dutch and German editions that have since appeared render this text of comparatively little use.

H. RICHARDS.

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS AND STUDIES. VOL. I. PART I.

Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, edited by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Vol. i. No. I. *The Apology of Aristides*, edited and translated by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1891. 5s.

AN English series of publications analogous to *Texte und Untersuchungen* is very welcome, and this first instalment augurs well for its quality. It gives English students full opportunity of judging for themselves of the value of the document which was published in 1878 (*S. Aristidis, philosophi atheniensis, Sermones duo*, St. Lazare) by the