

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 *Republic* 597 E

B. Bosanquet

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 04 / May 1896, pp 193 - 193

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203831, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203831

How to cite this article:

B. Bosanquet (1896). Note on *Republic* 597 E. The Classical Review, 10, pp 193-193
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203831

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the morrow, in the company of the most abandoned ruffians: the ruffians, I presume, assist him in these brutish excesses. This nonsense was emended, twenty years before C. F. W. Mueller or Hauschild, by Badham; but for fear the editors of Cicero should get wind of the emendation he stowed it away, where no one would think of looking for it, in the index to a recension of Plato's Euthydemus and Laches, and for further security muffled it up in a joke. On the

last page of the book, under the promising heading 'ὕγιενόν et εἰπείν οἶον confusa,' is this note:

'In Cic. Phil. ii 34 absurde legitur: *non solum de die, sed etiam in diem vivere*. Quam lectionem miror tamdiu τῶν κριτικῶν πονηρίᾳ bixisse.'

That is to say, Cicero wrote '*non solum de die sed etiam in diem bibere*.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

NOTE ON *REPUBLIC* 597 E.

MR. MAYOR's interpretation of the words *τρίτος τις ἀπὸ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας πεφυκώς* seems to me untenable. He takes the king to be the idea of the king as contrasted with the actual king and the stage king. But all through the context Plato exhausts the powers of language in distinguishing the real object, or 'idea,' from the other products which bear the same name. If no such distinction is here marked, the reasonable inference is that *this object*, unlike the 'bed,' carried its rank in itself. It is bad interpretation, I submit, to supply the essential point of a contrast, when it can easily be shown to be expressed. And the king, taken as the royal character, the type of truth and reality from whom all degrees of inferiority are measured (see 587 B-E), carries his rank, that of perfect ἀλήθεια, in himself. The absence of additional words indicating reality is thus natural. The conjunction of royalty and truth is so harped upon in the passage cited, and the process of counting removes from these attributes taken as practically the same, becomes in it so familiar, that in the total absence of other allusions to royalty, and of any slightest indication that the ideal king as opposed to the stage king is in question, I think the force of context alone compels us to suppose that the allusion is to the king as the true or real man. The whole scheme of books 8 and 9 is built upon this idea, and therefore there is nothing surprising in its cropping up even in an isolated expression early in book 10.

The dramatic poet, it should be remem-

bered, is accused in so many words, lower down, of setting up a bad government in the soul, just as when in a city the worthless obtain power and the decent people are ruined (605 B). This is the very process described in books 8 and 9; and the fact that it was in Plato's mind when he wrote book 10 removes the only difficulty attaching to the interpretation which I have suggested, viz. that in 587 the question is not of reality in general, but of reality of pleasures. Plato distinguishes but little between pleasures and desires, and in 597 E he is already connecting the tragic poet with the morbid appetites and emotions of which a little later he brands him as the instigator. I may add, though I do not insist very strongly upon it, that the sentence runs much better when a meaning is given to 'king,' by which πάντες οἱ ἄλλοι μιμηταί, and not only the tragic poet, may be estimated. All of them alike are 'third' or more from the royal character which is one with the standard of reality.

The view taken in Jowett and Campbell's commentary recognizes the reference to the language of book 9, but applies it in another way than that which I have suggested. I cannot see any reason for departing from the scheme which Plato so definitely indicates in 587 B-E compared with 445 D and the whole structure of books 8 and 9. The king is nowhere suggested to be God; he is the complete man, by whom all other men are measured in regard to their hold upon reality.

B. BOSANQUET.