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 Justice in Exchange

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 06 / June 1893, pp 251 - 251

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197884, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197884

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1893). Aristotle's Justice in Exchange. The Classical Review, 7, pp 251-251 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197884

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ARISTOTLE'S JUSTICE IN EXCHANGE.

IN the *Classical Review* for April Mr. Stewart appeals to the *Magna Moralia* as authorizing his view that in the *Nicomachean Ethics* 'justice in exchange' is meant to be a case of 'distributive justice.' The account of the matter given in the *M. M.* hardly warrants this contention. Mr. Stewart admits that the writer does not use the expression 'distributive justice,' but neither in reality does he describe the thing. He says that justice (in general) is an *ἀναλογία*, and he illustrates this indiscriminately by examples belonging to the distributive justice of the *Ethics* and others belonging

to justice in exchange. Surely it does not follow that he regarded the latter as only a subdivision of the former any more than *vice versa*. He is simply using a wider and vaguer formula which embraces both. He goes on to show that it embraces also the principle of punishment, called by him τὸ ἀντιπεπονθός: but he does not identify this principle of punishment with any other principle of justice except so far as it too is an *ἀναλογία*, and I take his meaning to be the same with regard to justice in exchange and distributive justice.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE *REPUBLIC* OF PLATO.

(Continued from p. 15.)

387 E. Ἡκιστ' ἄρα καὶ ὀδύρεσθαι. There is no proper or easily to be supplied construction for the infinitive. ὀδύρεσθαι <ἔοικε> is possible.

390 B. ἡ Δία...ὡς μόνος ἐργηγοῶς ἃ ἐβουλεύσατο τούτων πάντων ῥαδίως ἐπιλανθανόμενον.

To suppose with Stallbaum that this stands for ἃ ἐβουλεύσατο ὡς μόνος ἐργηγοῶς is to attribute to Plato a very awkward order and very indifferent sense. I conjecture ὅσα μόνος ἐργηγοῶς ἐβουλεύσατο and suppose ἃ to have been inserted after ὡς was written for ὅσα. τούτων πάντων rather points to ὅσα.

393 B. περὶ τε τῶν ἐν Ἰλίῳ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰθάκῃ καὶ ὅλη τῇ Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ.

Is there not a difficulty in carrying on ἐν, which with Ἰθάκῃ has a strict local meaning, to go with Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ in a semi-figurative sense? It would be a sort of zeugma in meaning. Perhaps καὶ (or καὶ ἐν) ὅλη τῇ Ὀ.

397 C. διὰ τὸ παντοδαπὰς μορφὰς <ἐκ> τῶν μεταβολῶν ἔχειν.

398 A. προσκυνούμεν ἂν αὐτὸν....εἵπομεν δὲ κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps προσκυνούμεν <μὲν> ἄν.

398 E. τίνες οὖν μαλακαὶ τε καὶ συμποτικά, τῶν ἁρμονίων; ἡ Ἰαστί, ἡ δ' ὅς, καὶ Λυδιστί, αἵτινες χαλαραὶ καλοῦνται. (I have added ἡ to Ἰαστί with one or two edd.)

Αἵτινες cannot be used in this way in good Attic prose of Plato's date, if of any date.

I conjecture that αἵτινες χαλαραὶ καλοῦνται is an adscript, giving the sort of information that such notes often contain, and written at a time when ὅς and ὅστις were confused as we often find them in scholia. It seems some confirmation of this suspicion that in 411 A (ἃς νῦν δὴ ἡμεῖς ἐλέγομεν τὰς γλυκείας τε καὶ μαλακὰς καὶ θρηνηδεις ἁρμονίας) the word χαλαρός is not used.

402 A. οὐτ' ἐν σμικρῷ οὐτ' ἐν μεγάλῳ ἡτιμάζομεν αὐτὰ, ὡς οὐ δέοι αἰσθάνεσθαι.

Read ὡς οὐ δέον.

403 B. τὰ δ' ἄλλα οὕτως ὁμιλεῖν (νομοθετήσεις) πρὸς ὃν τιν σπουδάζοι, ὅπως κ.τ.λ.

The optative σπουδάζοι is ungrammatical. Read σπουδάξει with a few MSS. Just below, if ὑφέξοντα instead of ὑπέχειν is right, we ought perhaps to read <ὡς> ψόγον..... ὑφέξοντα.

407 E. Πολιτικὸν, ἔφη, λέγεις Ἀσκληπιόν. Δῆλον, ἦν δ' ἐγώ· καὶ οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τοιοῦτος ἦν, οὐχ ὁρᾶς ὡς καὶ ἐν Τροίᾳ ἀγαθοὶ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἐφάνησαν.

By translating ὅτι 'because,' it is just possible to make poor sense of this. Some inferior MSS. add δεικνύοιεν ἂν before ὅτι. Madvig proposed δῆλον...καὶ οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοιοῦτοι· ἡ οὐχ ὁρᾶς κ.τ.λ. I would rather suggest that the words have got slightly disarranged, as elsewhere, and read δῆλον, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὅτι τοιοῦτος ἦν· καὶ οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ οὐχ ὁρᾶς ὡς κ.τ.λ. For the position of οὐχ ὁρᾶς ὡς cf. 421 A.

409 D. ἀρετὴ δὲ φύσει παιδευομένης χρόνῳ