

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](#)



**Immisch's Aristotelis Politica Aristotelis Politica post
Fr. Susemihlium recognovit Otto Immisch. Leipzig: B.
G. Teubner. 1909. 8vo. Pp. xxxix + 354. Price M. 3.**

R. G. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 24 / Issue 02 / March 1910, pp 67 - 67
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00044528, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00044528

How to cite this article:

R. G. Bury (1910). The Classical Review, 24, pp 67-67 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00044528

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the fact that the Tiber was in ancient times a Tigris, the Wolf and Twins being a restoration of the sixteenth century. Dealing with the figure of a bull on coins commemorating Empedocles' sanitation of the city of Selinus, he prefers, to the idea that it represents the sacrifice offered on the occasion, the explanation that it represents the fury of the now conquered streams. That is nearly but not quite all the true explanation; the fact that the bull stands on a pedestal shows that it is a monument erected at the time, presumably as an atonement for the summary method which Empedocles employed to get rid of the divine nuisance. Did space permit we might discuss many other points in this interesting article.

G. F. HILL.

British Museum, London.

IMMISCH'S ARISTOTELIS POLITICA.

Aristotelis Politica post Fr. Susemihlium recognovit Otto Immisch. Leipzig: B. G. TEUBNER. 1909. 8vo. Pp. xxxix + 354. Price M. 3.

THE texts of the *Politics* produced by that great Aristotelian Fr. Susemihl tended to ignore the needs and the convenience of the average student, and the average student should be correspondingly grateful to M. Immisch for having un-Susemihlised the text again so thoroughly as is here done. Speaking broadly, the text here presented is the plain undoctored tradition of the MSS., complicated by no theories of transposition and interpolation; and what is more, it is presented in the traditional order of the books, Γ followed by Δ not Η. Such reversions may displease the unco pedantic, but a Teubner editor has to consult the convenience of a wider world. Another interesting point: M. Immisch is not straight-laced in the matter of orthography; he allows, for instance, οὐθείς to stand side by side with οὐδέίς, αἰεί with ἀεί: which policy, as he observes, 'secutus est nuper Hicksius in egregia Psychologiae editione.'

In his views regarding the various fami-

lies of MSS. and their inter-relations—a matter to which a good deal of the 'prae-fatio' is naturally devoted—M. Immisch differs at some points from Susemihl; but it would seem that the rather obscure problems raised have not yet received a final solution. With regard to textual details, the editor makes a fair number of new conjectures, e.g. 1253^a6 <κρείττων δ'> ἂ τε περ; 1285^a9 ἐν τινι ἐλάσει (for βασιλείᾳ); 1294^a15 εἶδος καλλωπίζεται (for καλείται); 1298^b1 πρόκριτοι for αἰρετοί; 1330^a26 προσάντην for πρὸς αὐτήν. He also admits into his text, or mentions in his footnotes, a judicious selection of emendations by others. Thus it will interest English readers to observe that the names of Congreve, Well-don, Newman, occur not infrequently. Newman's προσετός (for πλήθος) at 1331^b4 is adopted; Jackson's δοκεῖ πον (for δοκίμουν) is printed at 1277^a26; the punctuation suggested by Wyse at 1326^b39, and that suggested by Postgate at 1328^a25, are followed. Amongst places where the traditional text is left to stand, although some change seems needed and various conjectures are recorded, are the following: 1253^a35 φρονήσῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, where it may be worth while to suggest, for ἀρετῇ, ἀνδρεία, assuming that the corruption occurred from the loss of the first two letters; 1257^a37 εὐμεταχείριστον πρὸς τὸ ζῆν, where it is not easy to propose a substitute for ζῆν (? possibly ἰστάναι, 'for weighing'); 1259^a31 τὸ μέντοι ὄραμα θάλω, where the original may have been σόφισμα; 1299^b12 οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον μὲν δεῖ δ' ὑπάρχειν, where λύει may be suggested as an easy and appropriate correction of δεῖ; 1301^a6 οἱ τρόποι . . . τοῖς εἰρηνέοις, where I should be inclined to fill the gap with <ἰσόρροποι>; 1327^b16 περὶ . . . λιμένων καὶ πόλεων, where τείχεων for πόλεων would not be, in uncials, a violent change (cf. ^a25); 1342^a17, τοῖς τοιούτοις μέλεσι θετέον τοὺς . . . ἀγωνιστάς, where ἐθιστέον may be proposed as a suitable correction of θετέον. These are specimens of places where M. Immisch does not appear to have said quite the last word; but none the less he has given us here a very sound and judicious piece of editing.

R. G. BURY.

Trumpington, Cambridge.