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](#)

The Laws of Plato *The Laws of Plato*. The text, edited with Introduction, Notes, etc., by E. B. England, Litt.D. Two vols. 8vo. Pp. x + 641; 669. Manchester University Press; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1921. 10s. + 10s.

R. G. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 7-8 / November 2012, pp 173 - 175
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00017224, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00017224

How to cite this article:

R. G. Bury (1922). The Classical Review, 36, pp 173-175 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00017224

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

strictly analogous to the hypothetical process sketched upon p. 55. The failure of Cylon was more probably due to national resentment against a *coup d'état* engineered by Delphi and Megara and attempted with foreign soldiers than to the fact that Cylon was a mere aristocrat and not a merchant prince. The reason that Athens passed through the normal constitutional stages later than other Greek states is surely because Athens was a territorial state and the monarchy lasted longer there, because the political subjection of Attica, which justified its existence, took time to accomplish.

Economic changes, of course, contributed to the rise of tyrannies, but to emphasise them to the exclusion of other contributory causes is neither good history nor good sense. It is true no doubt that the concentration of capital in the hands of a single ruler enabled the material development of the Greek states in the seventh and sixth cen-

turies to be adequately financed. But Professor Ure does not always distinguish, though it is vital to his argument, between the tyrant's economic position before and after his accession. As regards the soundness of the analogies offered by the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. to modern industrial conditions, I should probably agree rather with the Oxford lecturers, who are reprimanded upon p. 3, than with Professor Ure.

The difficulties of unremunerative publication in these days are obvious, but both individual scholars and libraries with limited endowments will find it difficult to pay 35s. for a book of 374 pages. Farnell's *Hero Cults* (Oxford Press, 1921), which contains 434 pages, costs 18s. Although the half-tone figures are a valuable addition to Professor Ure's book, they are not worth, if they are responsible for it, this remarkable difference in price.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

THE LAWS OF PLATO.

The Laws of Plato. The text, edited with Introduction, Notes, etc., by E. B. ENGLAND, Litt.D. Two vols. 8vo. Pp. x + 641; 669. Manchester University Press; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1921. 10s. + 10s.

DR. ENGLAND is to be warmly congratulated on having achieved a task which has daunted the tribe of commentators for two full generations. Although much good work has been done on the text, especially by Burnet, and on the subject-matter, especially by C. Ritter, no complete commentary on the *Laws* has appeared since the 1860 edition of Stallbaum.

The first thing that strikes one about Dr. England's work is that it is a marvel of compression. His general introduction occupies but 8 pages; his full analysis of the first six books, 25 pages; about 160 pages go to the text in Vol. I., and about 440 pages to the notes. The arrangement of contents in Vol. II. is on a similar scale. The present conditions of bookmaking are, one supposes, mainly responsible for

this cult of conciseness; and if one is sometimes inclined to grumble at what seems undue brevity in the discussion of important points, this is to carp at the dictates of *ἀνάγκη* rather than at the editorial *νοῦς*.

It is also obvious at a glance that the work is marked throughout by erudition, fine scholarship, and sound judgment. Every real difficulty, whether of text or interpretation, is fairly faced and grappled with; grammatical points are very carefully dealt with; the links in the argument are sagaciously elucidated; and helpful and happy renderings abound in the notes. The reader is further assisted, we should add, in following the argument by a series of very brief analyses prefixed to the text of each book.

Dr. England's treatment of the text—a very difficult matter in the case of the *Laws*—seems to me admirably sane. Basing his text on Burnet's, he steers a middle course between Burnet and Schanz. On a rough calculation, in Book I. Schanz uses the brackets twenty times, Burnet not at all, and England five times. Moreover, I have noted over forty instances of old conjectures, and about eighteen of new conjectures admitted into the text of Books I.-IV.; while a considerable

number of other conjectural emendations are favourably mentioned in the notes. These figures suffice to show the general tendency of the editor. Space forbids the strictly 'rationed' reviewer to discuss many details: I confine myself to the briefest of comments on some of the more doubtful places.

I. 630E¹: Badham's *θείου ἀνδρός* is adopted, rightly, and well defended.

643E²: *σοφίαν* for *σφόδρα* is unconvincing; I still prefer my own cure.

645B⁶: ought we to have *ἄνου* (= *ἀνθρώπου*) here?

647B¹: read, perhaps, *κάκης* for *κακῆς*.

648E¹: for *διαφορᾷ* cp. 672B⁴.

649D⁵: is *ἀδειλία* a vice? I had, long ago, thought of *ἀδεια* (cp. 701A⁷).

II. 653D⁴: I still have doubts about Burnet's pointing.

654D¹: I had, independently, corrected to *ἡ διανοεῖται*, and am glad to find this adopted.

656E²: I too had noted *ομοιώματα* as a possibility; but I now think we should rather write *ομοί' ἄττα* (making *ομοῖα* = *ομοιώματα*).

663C²: the note on this is good, but doubt still remains as to the text.

666B⁷: Burges preceded Burnet in correcting to *λήθη*.

668A²: I wish that the *τῷ* after *χαίρει* had been expunged or altered.

668A³: a helpful note; but I think we must allow *μίμημα* = *μιμητόν*.

668C²: I think *βουλῆσεως* (as if *βολ-*) = *ἐφέσεως*, 'aim.'

672D²: *τούτων* for *θεῶν* is difficult; I suggest *συναϊτίους*.

III. 677C⁷ ff.: this deserves a longer note: I much doubt *δρωτ'* in D⁷.

679D⁷: Burnet's text here is unsatisfactory.

681C¹: possibly *δύναμιν* is right, after all.

697C⁷: Apelt's conjecture is ingenious, but not quite convincing.

699C⁶: *δείλδς* . . . *δέος* seems strange if E.'s view is right—also the sing. *συνελθών*.

IV. 706A¹: I am inclined to side with Ritter.

706C⁸: a good note; read, perhaps, *ληρήματα*.

708D⁴: *καθ' ἑνα εἰς* is ingenious; but do horses pipe to 'any 'tune'?

713D⁶: Burges had already suggested *δρᾷ* for *δρα*.

714A⁵: I still favour Heindorf's view; cp. *Eumen.* 976.

715C⁴: I should prefer even *θείων* to *θεῶν*.

719D⁸: *ἐν τῷ ποιήματι* is rightly defended, but the comma after it seems superfluous: below, for *τὸν αὐτὸν* I would guess *τὸν αὐτοῦ*.

722C¹: the conjecture *διδαχὴν* for *μάχην* is not mentioned, but deserves consideration.

V. 727A²: I am interested to see that E. makes *τίμιον* active, as I argued long ago (C.R. XXIX. p. 171) that both *τιμή* and *τίμιον* must imply 'honorific' action; but *Elh. Nic.* 1123b 35 rather supports Stallb.

732C⁴ ff.: this 'hard passage' can hardly be left as it stands: at least let us shift the comma after *ἐκδαστου* and place it after *ἀνυχίας*, and mark off *οἶον* . . . *πράξεις* as a parenthesis.

733D⁷ ff.: I am not satisfied with 'Burnet's sagacious ἀθέτησις of ἐκούσιον . . . καί,' but Badham's *ἰδιὸν τινα* (or *τ' ἀεί*) deserves the approval given to it.

736A²: E. makes the best of *ἀπαλλαγὴν*, but *ἀπαλλαγείσιν* might be easier.

737A¹: I am glad to see of *τῆς μεταβάσεως* bracketed—the most logical course.

738A⁴: here a full list of the 59 divisors of 5040 might well have been supplied.

739B⁴: ? *ἄλλη ποτε* rather than *ἀεί ποτε*.

739E⁴: I learn from E. that my conjecture *τιμή* for *ἡ μία* was anticipated by Apelt: I wish E. had had the courage to print it in his text, for I am convinced that it is certainly right (cp. 630C-D, 728D, 841B).

746D² ff.: I agree in the main with the view taken of 'this very difficult passage,' but am doubtful about *τῆς δοξάσης* . . . *αὖ*, and inclined to put a colon after *τρόπον*.

747D³: I still think that the redundant *οὐκ* should be replaced by *φύσει*.

VI. 753E⁴: I cannot follow E.'s retention of *πρός*: could P. have written *πάρος*? Also *ιδεῖν* may have fallen out before *δεῖ*.

774C⁵: I cannot believe that *γῆράσκειν* is right, though E. retains it.

777C⁶: here too Burges preceded Burnet in writing *κλωπῶν*.

778C⁷: I find *δικαστήρια* for *-ίων* among my marginal jottings.

782A²: E. gives us no help here: the jingle *μήκος* . . . *ἀμήχανον* looks intentional.

782A⁶: here I should rather mark *καὶ ποιμάτων* . . . *βρωμάτων* as parenthetic.

783A⁴: I prefer the plur. to *τρέποντα*, and incline to read *σβεννύναι* < *αὐτῶν* >.

784C¹: E. adopts Burnet's text and interpretation, about which I have doubts.

VII. 790E²: *ἰδσεῖ* is attractive, but should we also read *καθαπερεῖ*?

808D³: *πῶν* for *πῶ* is ingenious, but is it *ἄλλο* (ἢ *πρόβατα*)?

819D³: why not *ταύτη*? At 820C⁸ I incline to follow Fic. and Ast.

VIII. 834A⁵: E.'s conjecture *σφενδόνης* is surely right; I conjecture also *λίθῳ γ' ἐκ*.

834B⁷: *ἀγωνίας* for *-ιστάς*, which E. suggests, is also one of my *marginalia*.

838A¹: it is surprising that E. here retains *τὴν μὲν* . . . *τὴν δέ*.

IX. 853A⁶: E. is right in rejecting *ρήθην*, unless we might alter it to *ρήχθην*.

854B³ ff.: the Greek is inaccurately cited in the N., and the variant in A unnoticed.

856E⁵: E. suggests *τις* for *εἰς*; I should prefer *κελσθω* for *εἰς ἔστω*.

864A²: I suggest *ἐφέσθαι* *τούτου* here, keeping *ἔφεσις* at B⁷ (where I prefer Ritter's *μὴ ἀληθοῦς* to E.'s *ἀμαθοῦς*).

X. 890D⁴: though *παλαῖω* must go with *λόγῳ*, *νόμῳ* is defensible as dat. of instrument; perhaps it ought to be *νόμοις*. In D⁶ I am glad to see the neat conjecture *ἦττον* adopted. There is a good long N. at 894A¹ on a big subject—soul and motion—of which still more might be said.

897B²: E. prints Burnet's text, with an inconclusive N.; I suggest *οἶον ὁρθῶς θεός*.

899A⁷: E.'s explanation of *αὐτοῦ* *δὴ* *ἄμεινον*, as a gloss, is ingenious but hypothetical; *αὐτὸ δὴ* *ἄμ.* would, I think, make possible sense.

XI. 925B²: an interesting N. on *πολλὰ πολλῶν* as a truncated proverb, 'many needs, many deeds': should we read it *πολλὰ ἀπὸ πολλῶν*, 'many causes, many effects,' or take it as a play on *πολλὰ* 'Ἀπόλλων'?

932A⁵: *κωφόν* (for *-ή*) and 933C¹ *δαιματούντας* are both good corrections.

XII. 943E¹: for *παρθένος* = 'virgin daughter,' cp. I Cor. vii. 36.

944C⁶: E. accepts *κακῆς* for *τάχους*, but I now think *τάχους* right, cp. 706C.

945C⁴: I can hardly believe in *ζῶου*, which E. retains: possibly *πλῆμιον* for *ἡ ζ*.

949b³: E. keeps *ταρῆν* but inclines to Ast's *τασιν*: I still think my conjecture (C.R. l.c.) (*τάττειν* . . . *τὰς ῥημῆας*) the best remedy, cp. 876c.

960c⁷ ff.: E. 'in desperation' makes some interesting suggestions, but his account of previous guesses is incomplete, and the passage still remains obscure (cp. C.R. l.c.).

It should be added that the *notes* are enriched by private contributions from a number of other modern authorities—Professors J. Burnet, H. Jackson, and J. B. Mayor, Mrs. Adam and Mr. F. H. Dale. Although broader questions—such as Plato's debt to previous legislation, and his relation to other political

thinkers—receive but cursory treatment, and there is rather a dearth of illustrative matter in the commentary, on the purely philological side the work is thorough and adequate, and deserving of the highest praise. Dr. England has indeed put all students of Plato and of Greek deeply in his debt; he has 'plowed a lonely furrow' *τλάμονι ψυχῇ*; but we can assure him *ὅτι ὁ κόπος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν κενός*, since the fruit of his labour is an English *Laws* well worthy to stand beside Adam's *Republic*.

R. G. BURY.

DEMOSTHENIS ORATIONES.

Demosthenis Orationes. Recognovit W. RENNIE. Crown 8vo. Tomi II. Pars II. Orationes xxvii–xl. Oxford University Press, 1921. Paper cover, 3s. 6d.; cloth, 4s. 6d.

MR. RENNIE—and British classical scholars—may be congratulated on the appearance, so long delayed by unfortunate circumstances, of the first instalment of the only modern English text of the Private Orationes. Of late years, indeed, it has not been always easy in this country to procure any text at all, save of the speeches contained in Paley and Sandys' *Selections*. The final volume, which is to contain a detailed discussion of the MSS., is promised shortly; meanwhile the author provisionally accepts the late Professor Butcher's judgments, expressed in the preface to Vol. I. (1903).

The text of these speeches is, in one respect, in a very satisfactory state. There is hardly a passage in them where the sense is uncertain, or where any important question of fact or interpretation depends on the reading: the vast majority of variants are questions of order, or of the preference of *ἔδωκε* to *δέδωκε*, *ἐλέγχειν* to *ἐξελέγχειν*, and the like. Mr. Rennie, for the most part, is nearer to the MSS. than Blass, whose revision of Dindorf has hitherto been current in England. He rarely makes those changes of the tradition which are intended solely to avoid hiatus or sequences of short syllables, being evidently convinced that such phenomena are undoubted in Demosthenes, and

that it is hazardous to eject some where others must remain. Nor is he so inclined as was the German editor to alter passages, or adopt a less well-attested reading, in order to make them verbally agree with parallel passages elsewhere: he makes no attempt (e.g.) to assimilate the famous commonplace on torture in I *Onet.* § 37, to the corresponding words in Isaeus. (In a few instances, however, such as I *Onet.* § 32, *τούτου*, or *Zenoth.* § 3 *προσέχειν*, he adopts the principle of parallelism against the witnesses whom he usually follows.) A well-attested parallel can always prove that a word or phrase is possible for Demosthenes; but twenty parallels do not necessarily prove that Demosthenes *must* have used a particular phrase, and that only. Nor does Mr. Rennie pay overmuch heed to Blass' principles of rhythm, or to the evidence of ancient citations, which (unless the reading in question is the very point of the citation) are often careless enough.

He is thoroughly justified in his distinct preference for the *Parisinus* (S) over the *Augustanus* (A), which latter is a plausible and clever, but by no means unsophisticated, witness. He has himself inspected A, and in one or two places, e.g.—p. *Phorm.* § 15, has been able to record small points wherein previous testimony to its reading has been mistaken; he has also discovered a few readings in S (apparently from the phototype reproduction) which had been overlooked before; from this