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](#)

Plato, *Republic* 440b.

John I. Beare

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 08 / December 1909, pp 250 - 250

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00004121, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00004121

How to cite this article:

John I. Beare (1909). Plato, *Republic* 440b.. The Classical Review, 23, pp 250-250
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00004121

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

PLATO, *REPUBLIC* 440 B.

οὐκοῦν καὶ ἄλλοι, ἔφη, πολλαχοῦ αἰσθανόμεθα, ὅταν βιάζωνται τινα παρὰ τὸν λογισμὸν ἐπιθυμίαι, λοιδοροῦντά τε αὐτὸν καὶ θυμούμενον τῷ βιαζομένῳ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὥσπερ δυοῖν στασιαζόντων ξύμμαχον τῷ λόγῳ γιγνόμενον τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ τοιούτου; ταῖς δ' ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτὸν κοινωνήσαντα, αἰρουῦντος λόγου μὴ δεῖν ἀντιπράττειν, οἶμαι σε οὐκ ἂν φάναι γενομένου ποτὲ ἐν παντὶ τοῦ τοιούτου αἰσθέσθαι, οἶμαι δ' οὐδ' ἐν ἄλλῳ. The sense is: 'We often perceive θυμός allying itself with and fighting for λόγος against the ἐπιθυμία, when these forcibly oppose λόγος. You never perceive, through such a thing having occurred in yourself or another, θυμός making common cause with the ἐπιθυμία, when reason decides that it (θυμός) ought to oppose them.'

Adam, p. 271, says Richter 'evades the anacoluthon by defending the more than dubious construction αἰσθέσθαι αὐτὸν κοινωνήσαντα'; but it is scarcely 'dubious' here, for the participial acc. after αἰσθάνεσθαι (not rare or unnatural *per se*) is employed in the first part of this very sentence, and the balancing principle would lead one to expect it also in the last. What Adam probably dislikes is the order of words implied in Richter's translation, but the order so implied is justified by the additional force it gives to the expression of the thought. There is no real difficulty in Richter's construction, and there is no anacoluthon in the sentence. γενομένου . . . τοιούτου is, like αἰρουῦντος above, gen. absolute, not gen. after αἰσθέσθαι, which governs αὐτὸν κοινωνήσαντα.

The real difficulty lies in the clause αἰρουῦντος . . . ἀντιπράττειν. None of the suggestions mentioned in Adam's note or appendix seems to get rid of this. Schneider's interpretation implies αὐτῷ (sc. τῷ λόγῳ) after ἀντιπράττειν, but one* would naturally expect αὐταῖς (sc. ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις). Instead of making common cause with the ἐπιθυμία, 'θυμός should oppose them.' This, and not that 'θυμός should not oppose reason itself,' was to have been expected. The vice of Schneider's explanation would be plainer if we supposed αὐτῷ actually given in the text; for this might as well—indeed it would more naturally—refer to θυμός, which would destroy the sense.

Two ways out of the difficulty seem open, or at least conceivable. If μὴ were not in the clause at all, there would be no question about the construction or the meaning. Can it have been a correction for οὐ, the latter having been dittographic at some early period after λόγου? This is one way. The other is to suppose that ἄλλ' was lost after δεῖν, also of course at a very early period. The sense would then be 'when reason decides that it (θυμός) should not (sc. κοινωνεῖν), but should oppose.' A tradition of some strange disturbance in this very part of the text seems proved by the reading of *q* ἂν τι πρᾶττειν for ἀντιπράττειν. The original may have been ΔΕΙΝΑΛΛΑΝΤΙΠΡΑΤΤΕΙΝ.

JOHN I. BEARE.

Trinity College, Dublin.

THE ADVERBS OYXI AND NAXI IN GREEK.

In modern Greek, especially in popular speech, it is considered poor form to reply curtly in short words such as ναι, yes (which still fully survives from ancient times) and όχι no (from ancient οὐχι), corresponding to ancient οὐ: the form όχι made its appearance in Roman antiquity,

as *Bull. Corr. Hell.* xvi. 9 (no. 9, 2, 10): 'τὴν οὖν ἀπόφασιν ὀρώμεν αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ ἡλίου) ἀλλ' ὅχι αὐτόν.' This ὅχι then, for the sake of politeness (not of emphasis!) is often amplified to ὅχι κα (i.e. ὅχι καλέ), ὅχεσκε, ὅγεσκε (whence οἶσκε ὄσκε). In the same way and for the same reason ναι is