

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](#)



Note on Aristotle' *Politics*, 1338, a 24

T. D. S.

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 01 / February 1903, pp 22 - 23

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207166, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207166

How to cite this article:

T. D. S. (1903). Note on Aristotle' *Politics*, 1338, a 24. The Classical Review, 17, pp 22-23
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207166

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

274 D ὁλος ὁ κόσμος, ᾧ συμμιμούμενοι καὶ συνεπόμενοι . . ζῶμεν.

ᾧ συνεπόμενοι καὶ συμμιμούμενοι ?

277 E ἐν <μὲν> ταῖς βραχυτάταις.

278 D ἡ ψυχὴ . . τότε μὲν ὑπ' ἀληθείας περὶ ἐν ἑκάστον ἐν τισι συνίσταται, τότε δὲ . . . φέρεται.

The compound *συνίσταται* does not seem right. In contrast with *φέρεται* we want *ίσταται*. *συν* is perhaps a repetition of the last letters of *τισί*(*τισίν*).

He goes on καὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀμῇ γέ πη τῶν συγκράσεων ὁρθῶς δοξάζει, where the genitive is odd. Should not τὰ μὲν be τὰς μὲν, αὐτῶν agreeing with τῶν συγκράσεων and contrasting them with the στοιχεῖα ?

281 C δοκεῖν χρή . . προσποιήσασθαι.

The future *προσποιήσεσθαι* is necessary, like *ἀμφισβητήσουσιν* a few lines before.

284 B καθάπερ ἐν τῷ σοφιστῇ προσηναγκάσαμεν εἶναι τὸ μὴ ὄν, ἐπειδὴ κατὰ τοῦτο διέφυγεν ἡμᾶς ὁ λόγος.

Surely *διέφυγεν*. ὁ λόγος *διέφυγεν* ἂν, if they had failed to vindicate not-being.

293 D ἕαν τε . . καθαίρωσιν . . εἴτε καί . . ποιῶσιν ἢ . . αὐξῶσιν.

'Εάν can hardly carry on its force over the *εἴτε*, so as to make subjunctives possible. Must we not read *ποιούσιν* and *αὐξουσιν* ?

296 E τοῦτον δεῖ καὶ περὶ ταῦτα τὸν ὅρον εἶναι τὸν γε ἀληθινώτατον ὁρθῆς πόλεως διοικήσεως, ὃν ὁ σοφὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ διοικήσει τὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων ; ὥσπερ ὁ κυβερνήτης τὸ τῆς νεῶς καὶ ναυτῶν αἰεὶ συμφέρον παραφυλάττων κ.τ.λ.

So this passage is written in all the editions I have consulted. Stallbaum translates τὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων *res civium*, Campbell

the condition of his subjects, Jowett *the affairs of his subjects*. But in reality τὸ goes with the *συνφέρον* which is coming in the next clause, governed by *παραφυλάττων*. τὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων *συνφέρον* is compared to τὸ τῆς νεῶς καὶ ναυτῶν *συνφέρον*. The mark of interrogation should therefore be deferred and put after *σφίξει τοὺς συνναύτας* at the end of the ὥσπερ clause, though the sentence is really anomalous, Plato forgetting that he began with a question and after the ὥσπερ clause rambling into another which takes it up with a οὕτως.

299 A. οὐκοῦν ὁ γ' ἐθέλων καὶ ἐκὼν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀρχεῖν δικαιοτάτ' ἂν ὀτιοῦν πάσχοι καὶ ἀποτίνωι.

The distinction, if any, between ὁ ἐθέλων ἀρχεῖν and ὁ ἐθέλων ἐκὼν ἀρχεῖν is very fine and hardly to the purpose. Read ὁ γ' ἐθέλων καὶ ἐκὼν . . ἀρχων, in which the two words become, what they really are, synonyms.

302 C τὴν αὐτὴν τοῖνον (i.e. ἀρχὴν) φάθι τριῶν οὓσων χαλεπὴν διαφερόντως γίγνεσθαι καὶ ῥάστην.

ῥάστην I take to be a mere blunder for *ἀρίστην*, encouraged no doubt by the opposition of *χαλεπὴν*. See further on in E *μοναρχία* (which is what he means here) *ξευχθεῖσα μὲν ἐν γράμμασιν ἀγαθοῖς, οὓς νόμους λέγομεν, ἀρίστη πασῶν τῶν ἐξ ἀνομῶς δὲ χαλεπὴ καὶ βαρυτάτη συνοικήσαι*: and again 303 B ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ (ζῆν) πρώτον τε καὶ ἀριστον. The question all through is about goodness and badness: see especially 303 A.

303 C With *εἶναι* and *γίγνεσθαι* there must have gone some word now lost like *λεκτέον* or *νομιστέον*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

NOTE ON ARISTOTLE'S *POLITICS*, 1338, A 24.

THE unmetrical verse quoted here by Aristotle as Homeric, ἀλλ' οἷον μὲν ἔστι καλεῖν ἐπὶ δαῖτα θαλεῖην, is still assigned to ρ 382 f. in spite of Peppmüller's objections in the *Jahrbücher*, 1891, page 375. So the Provost of Oriel and van Leeuwen in their editions of the *Odyssey*, and Susemihl-Hicks and Newman in their editions of the *Politics*, have not hesitated to accept the line as in Aristotle's text of ρ. Mr. Newman (*Politics*, iii. 516) takes this text to have been:

ρ 382

τίς γὰρ δὴ ξεῖνον καλεῖ ἄλλοθεν αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν, ἀλλ' οἷον μόνον ἔστι καλεῖν ἐπὶ δαῖτα θαλεῖην, μάντιν ἢ ἱγῆρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δούρων, οἱ καλέουσιν αἰδοῦν, ὃ κεν τέρπῃσιν ἅπαντας.

To assume the absence from Aristotle's text of οἱ δημοεργοὶ ἔασι, which is found not only in the Homeric MSS. of 383 but also in Plato (*Republic*, 389 D), would seem unscientific, but that may pass. The text as formed, however, is obscure. What is the

antecedent of οἷ in line 4? Can it be the seer and carpenter of the preceding verse? Are they the bidders to an Homeric feast? Or, if this seems unreasonable, are they the most distinguished guests, to receive the first invitation? With all Homeric appreciation of the dignity of labour, neither of these alternatives is possible. The most serious objection to this construction of the text, however, lies in the fact that the poet is not speaking of invitations to a feast, but of bringing to the community (πόλινδε ἡγάγες) men who would be useful to it (δημοεργοί). Thus in the early settlements of New England and in the western parts of the United States, nothing was more common than to offer special inducements to a teacher, a physician, a preacher, or a skilled artisan to join the community;—a farm might be offered to such a one, or freedom from rates, or other privileges. So Eumaeus disclaims all responsibility for bringing the disguised Odysseus to Ithaca, and says at 387 πτωχὸν δ' οὐκ ἂν τις καλέοι, in which he cannot refer to an invitation to a feast but must refer to an invitation to come to the settlement to live. The fact that καλεῖ is used often of bidding to a feast seems to have led Spengel to connect the Aristotelian verse with ρ 382.

But are we obliged to accept this connexion with ρ 385, ὃ κεν τέρπῃσιν αἰδῶν? Aristotle

says ἦν γὰρ οἶονται διαγωγὴν εἶναι τῶν ἐλευθέρων, ἐν ταύτῃ (i.e. σχολῇ) τάττουσιν (sc. μουσικῇν). διόπερ Ὅμηρος οὕτως ἐποίησεν, ἀλλ' οἶον κ.τ.λ. καὶ οὕτω προειπὼν ἑτέρους τινάς, οἱ καλέουσιν, αἰδοῖν, φησὶν, ὃ κεν τέρπῃσιν ἀπαντας. In my opinion, Aristotle is making two entirely independent quotations. The οὕτω would be then a repetition of οὕτως with ἐποίησεν, and προειπὼν ἑτέρους τινάς κ.τ.λ. would be simply 'after mentioning several other kinds of men, he names a bard *who cheers all*.' The last three words are the sole reason for this second quotation: the carpenter and seer are of no importance in this connexion, since the author is speaking of the place of music in education and in life.

The words οἱ καλέουσιν have not been explained. Spengel's οἱ καλοῦνται gives a satisfactory sense; that these men are called to live in a town and not to take part in a feast does not disturb Aristotle's neat quotation. However the faulty verse is to be emended, οἶον must be masculine, as Mr. Newman interprets it, rather than neuter as Mr. Jowett translated it, 'how good it is to invite men to the pleasant feast,' which has no connexion with the rest of the passage.

T. D. S.

MUSONIUS AND SIMPLICIUS.

A NEW edition of the remains of Musonius is advertised; and indeed Peerlkamp's edition has long been out of date, and is little known. In two interesting fragments περὶ τροφῆς (Stob. flor. 17 n. 43 Meineke, n. 42 Hense, and 18 n. 38 M, 37 H, 10. Stob. anthol. iii. 503, 523, Weidmann 1894), Hense illustrates some details from other authors, but has missed the most comprehensive parallel, the commentary of Simplicius on Epictet. enchirid. c. 46 (of Schweighäuser's ed. c. 33 s. 7, S's Epict. iv. 427-8). Thus Stob. p. 503 19 H ὡς χρὴ καθάπερ τὴν εὐτελὴ τῆς πολυτελοῦς τροφῆς προτιμᾶν καὶ τὴν εὐπόριστον τῆς δυσπορίστου. p. 505. 4 ἡμᾶς δὲ ὁμοιοτάτην ταύτῃ προσφέρεισθαι τροφὴν ἂν εἴπεν τὴν κουφοτάτην καὶ καθαρωτάτην. Simplic. p. 269b Heins ἐν μὲν τροφαῖς καὶ πόμασι τῶν κατὰ φύσιν τρεφόντων τὸ ἀνθρωπείον σῶμα τὰ εὐπόριστα καὶ φυσικώτερα ἐκλεγομένους. ταῦτα γὰρ εὐθὺς καὶ καθαρώτερα εὐρίσκεται καὶ λιτότερα καὶ ὑγιεινότερα.

Muson. p. 505 14 ἡμεῖς δὲ τέχνας καὶ μηχανὰς ποικίλας ἐπινοοῦμεν, ὥστε τὴν ἐδωδὴν τῆς τροφῆς ἐφηνδύνειν καὶ τὴν κατάποσιν κολακεύειν μειζόνως. εἰς τοῦτο δὲ προελήλυθαμεν λιχνείας καὶ ὀψοφαγίας, ὥστε καθάπερ μουσικὰ καὶ ἱατρικὰ οὕτω καὶ μαγειρικὰ πεποιήνται τινὲς συγγράμματα, ἃ τὴν μὲν ἡδονὴν καὶ πάνν αὔξει τὴν ἐν τῷ φάρυγγι, τὴν δ' ὑγίειαν διαφθείρει. πολὺ γοῦν κάκιον διακειμένους ὄραν ἔστι τὰ σώματα τοὺς περὶ τὰ βρώματα τρυφῶντας. Simplic. ib. τραφῆναι γὰρ δέεται τὸ ζῶον, οὐ μέντοι τοιαῦδε καὶ τοιαῦδε ποικιλίαις τροφῶν. οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸς θεωρίῳ καὶ Παξάμονας ἡμᾶς ἡ φύσις ὑπέκλεισε καὶ τὴν μαγειρικὴν κακοτεχνίαν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τροφὴν τὸ ἀπορρέον ἀνυφαίνουσιν. Sen. cons. ad Helv. 12 § 5 o miserabiles quorum palatum nisi ad pretiosos cibos non excitatur! pretiosos autem non eximius sapor aut aliqua faucium dulcedo sed raritas et difficultas parandi facit. alioqui, si ad sanam illis mentem placeat reverti, quid opus est tot artibus ventri servientibus? quid mercaturis? quid vasta-