

# 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](#)



---

## Four Conjectures on the *Republic*

J. Adam

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 08 / November 1896, pp 384 - 386

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204836, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00204836](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204836)

### How to cite this article:

J. Adam (1896). Four Conjectures on the *Republic*. The Classical Review, 10, pp 384-386  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204836

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

Ictinus, in which is the ivory work of Phidias, the Athena. But (I will be brief) for if I once begin to describe such a multitude of famous and well-known objects of interest as Athens has to show, I shall be prolix and not adhere to the principle of my work. For I recollect what Hegesias says... 'Hegesias is, I suppose, the Magnesians mentioned p. 648, who lived early in the third century (Müller-Donaldson, iii. 53). The quotation from him is mutilated at the end, but the point of it is that he mentions only one interesting object on the acropolis, the marks of Poseidon's trident, only two or three buildings in the city, and outside Athens only Eleusis: it ends in a rhetorical flourish about Attica being the favoured land (or something of the sort) of gods and heroes, which is substituted for any detailed description of the wonders of the land. οὗτος μὲν οὖν (Hegesias) ἐνὸς ἐμνήσθη τῶν ἐν ἀκροπόλει σημείων (the trident-marks), Πολέμων δ' ὁ περιηγητὴς τέτταρα βιβλία συνέγραψε περὶ τῶν ἀναθημάτων ἐν ἀκροπόλει, while Polemo filled four books with his description of the votive offerings on the acropolis. Strabo goes on τὸ δ' ἀνάλογον συμβαίνει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς πόλεως μερῶν καὶ τῆς χώρας. Ἐλευσινὰ τε εἰπὼν, ἓνα τῶν ἑκατὸν ἐβδομήκοντα δήμων πρὸς δὲ καὶ τεττάρων ὥς φασιν, οὐδένα τῶν ἄλλων ὠνόμακεν. Müller translates: 'Eandem vero rationem etiam de reliquis urbis partibus deque agro eius Hegesias sequitur, quumque Eleusinem dixerit unum ex pagis centum septuaginta et praeter hos etiam quattuor, ut dicunt, reliquorum nullum nominavit. Groskurd seems to take the passage in the same way 'ähnliches Verfahren beobachtet er auch bei dem übrigen Theile der Stadt und des Landes: denn nachdem er Eleusis als einen der hundert und siebenzig Landgaue (ausserdem noch vier nach Andern) erwähnt hat, nennt er weiter keinen der übrigen'; though he leaves it a little ambiguous, he certainly means, like Müller, to take Hegesias as the nominative to ὠνόμακεν. 1

submit that this is the only way in which the context allows us to take the sentence. It is only by the way that the discursive and rhetorical method of Hegesias is contrasted with the voluminous work of Polemo, and the person with whom Strabo is concerned, just at the moment when he is about to skip over Athens with a few lines and feels it necessary to apologize for this apparent neglect, is of course Hegesias. The theme was too great for details, thought Hegesias, οὐ δύναμαι καθ' ἕκαστον εἰπεῖν, and Strabo finds this sentiment a convenient one to quote, when—for reasons which we will not here discuss—he is passing over the intellectual capital of the world with so brief a mention. Who then is the authority for the one hundred and seventy-four demes? If Hegesias, according to the translations given above, the statement is considerably earlier than if it had emanated from Polemo. But I appeal to the unprejudiced reader of Strabo whether he would not rather translate thus: 'and while Hegesias spoke of Eleusis, one of one hundred and seventy demes and four besides, as the number is commonly given, he has named none of the rest.' Of course it can be taken as above 'he spoke of Eleusis as one....' but, as the context shows, Hegesias had no object in laying stress on the exact number of the demes, nor was it likely that so rhetorical a writer would indulge much in statistics; it is Strabo, who by the example of Hegesias justifies his own brevity, for Hegesias, though he might have mentioned one hundred and seventy-four demes, only mentioned one. ὥς φασιν is therefore perfectly vague, and we can only say of the number, that it was one current in Strabo's time. It has been suggested to me, that the subject of φασίν might be Hegesias and Polemo, but this seems to me very unlikely, if I understand rightly the drift of the passage.

G. C. RICHARDS.

Cardiff.

#### FOUR CONJECTURES ON THE *REPUBLIC*.

In *Republic*, iii. 396 E, where Plato is describing the style of λέξις which the good man will adopt, occur these words: οὐκοῦν διηγήσει χρήσεται οἷα ἡμεῖς ὀλίγον πρότερον διηλθομεν περὶ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ἔπη, καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῦ ἡ λέξις μετέχουσα μὲν ἀμφοτέρων, μιμήσεώς τε καὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς διηγήσεως, συμκρόν δέ

τι μέρος ἐν πολλῷ λόγῳ τῆς μιμήσεως; The words τῆς ἄλλης διηγήσεως mean either (1) 'the rest of διήγησις' or (2) 'διήγησις besides.' If (1) is meant, Plato states that the good man's style will partake in (a) imitation (b) simple διήγησις (c) the mixed style. See 392 D ἀρ' οὖν οὐχὶ ἤτοι ἀπλῆ

διηγῆσαι ἢ διὰ μμήσεως γιγνομένη ἢ δι' ἀμφοτέρων περαίνουσιν; Such a statement is cumbersome and unnecessary; for if the good man's style partakes in (a) and (b), it is necessarily (c). If by τῆς ἄλλης διηγῆσεως Plato means (2) 'διήγησις besides,' it is still very awkward not to define what kind of διήγησις he means. Read τῆς ἀπλῆς διηγῆσεως, and all is plain. The good man, says Plato, will use the kind of style which we described in connexion with the verses of Homer above (392 E-394 A). Now the style of Homer, Plato expressly said, is partly μίμησις, and partly ἀπλῆ διήγησις (393 C, 394 B). Therefore, he repeats, the good man's style will partake both of μίμησις and ἀπλῆ διήγησις. The common confusion of ἀπλῆ and ἄλλη is illustrated by Bast, *Comment. Pal.* p. 730.

In *Republic*, iii. 407 B, Plato is animadverting on νοσοτροφία, which is, so he tells us, a hindrance to the prosecution of virtue. Glauco agrees: καὶ μὰ τὸν Δία, ἢ δ' ὅς, σχεδὸν γέ τι πάντων μάλιστα ἢ γε περαιτέρω γυμναστικῆς ἢ περιττῇ αὐτῇ ἐπιμέλεια τοῦ σώματος (sc. ἐμποδίζει τὸ ἀρετὴν ἀσκεῖν). In this sentence the double nominative is displeasing; and there is a further difficulty in περαιτέρω γυμναστικῆς. The editors explain these words to mean 'going beyond the limits of gymnastic,' cf. *Gorg.* 484 C, περαιτέρω τοῦ δέοντος. But in point of fact it is not the desertion of γυμναστική, but the pursuit of γυμναστική in excess, which involves νοσοτροφία. This is clear, I think, from 406 A ff. Herodicus combined γυμναστική, i.e. the regimen of diet, life, etc., with ἰατρική, and introduced all the mischief, by making the διαίτα of invalids even more subject to self-denying ordinances than that of athletes in training. Compare 406 D-E. We have, I think, no right to take γυμναστικῆς in περαιτέρω γυμναστικῆς as 'legitimate training,' which is practically what the editors do. Read γυμναστικ<ή>, ἢς for γυμναστικῆς and translate 'the exaggerated discipline, which is responsible for this excessive care of the body.' ἢς sc. ἐστίν like the Latin 'cuius est nimia haec cura corporis.'

The third passage which I now discuss is in iii. 414 D, ἦσαν δὲ τότε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ὑπὸ γῆς ἐντὸς πλαττόμενοι καὶ τρεφόμενοι καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ ὄπλα αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἄλλη σκευὴ δημιουργομένη. ἐπεὶ δὲ παντελῶς ἐξεργασμένοι ἦσαν, καὶ ἡ γῆ αὐτοὺς μήτηρ οὖσα ἀνέκε, καὶ νῦν δεῖ ὡς περὶ μητρὸς καὶ τροφῆς τῆς χώρας ἐν ἣ εἰσι βουλευέσθαι, κ.τ.λ. If the text is sound, the double καὶ printed in spaced type must be taken (with Jowett and Campbell) as 'marking the correspondence of the two

clauses.' Precise parallels are however very difficult to find. Thuc. iv. 8, 9, to which Schneider refers in his *Additamenta*, p. 27, is certainly not parallel, as Classen's explanation clearly shows. Ast expunges the second καὶ, while Hermann replaces it by ὥς. I think the corruption lies in ἐπειδὴ. Read δημιουργομένη ἔτι. ἢ δὲ δὲ κ.τ.λ. and for ἢ δὲ—καί, which is common in telling a story, compare *Symp.* 220 C, ἢ δὲ ἦν μεσημβρία, καὶ ἄνθρωποι ἡσθάνοντο. This correction appears to me also to obviate the difficulty, if such it is, which Hartman (*Notae Criticae ad Pl. de Rep. libros*, p. 100) feels about δημιουργομένη, 'quod post πλαττόμενοι abundat,' since it permits δημιουργομένη ἐτι 'still in course of manufacture' to be taken as merely a descriptive adjunct. π for τ and ε for η are among the commonest of errors.

The difficulties of iv. 421 B are well known: εἰ μὲν οὖν ἡμεῖς μὲν φύλακας ὡς ἀληθῶς ποιούμεν ἡκιστα κακούργους τῆς πόλεως, ὁ δ' ἐκείνο λέγων γεωργοὺς τινὰς καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν πανηγύρει ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πόλει ἐστιάτορας εἰδαίμονας, ἄλλο ἂν τι ἢ πόλιν λέγοι. The sentence has been practically rewritten by Madvig and others, whose emendations are duly chronicled by Hartman. Unless I am mistaken, the text is sound, except in the one word γεωργούς. The meaning, roughly speaking, is: if we are making true guardians, and the author of the other proposal is making something different, he cannot, like us, be speaking of a city. Compare 422 E, εἰδαίμων εἰ—ὅτι οἷε ἀξίον εἶναι ἄλλην τινὰ προσεπεῖν πὸ λιν ἢ τὴν τοιαύτην οἶαν ἡμεῖς κατεσκευάζομεν. It is obvious that the point of this rejoinder depends on the contrast between what we propose, and what is proposed by our rival. But 'farmers' does not furnish a proper antithesis to 'true guardians,' even if we assume that Plato is thinking of iii. 417 B and iv. 419 A. Mr. Richards suggests ἀργούς (and (with hesitation) κακούργους. I once thought of θεωρούς to suit ἐν πανηγύρει, but now prefer to change a single letter and write λεωργοὺς for γεωργούς. The contrast is with ἡκιστα κακούργους. λεωργός occurs in the *Memorabilia* if not in Plato; and so expressive a word seems to me very apposite here. There is no harsh transition from it to the ἐστιάτορας εἰδαίμονας, for εἰδαίμονας is bitterly scornful: such 'happy feasters' prey upon the city and are scoundrels of the worst kind. They are the πόλεως ἀμολγοί described by Cratinus (*Meineke Fr. Com. Gr.* ii. 1, p. 140), by Solon (ap. Arist. *Pol. Ath.* c. 12 ad fin.) and by Plato himself in *Theaet.* 174 D,

συβάτην ἢ ποιμένα ἢ τινα βουκόλον—πολυ βδάλλοντα: compare also Book i. 343 A, which suggests that ὁ δ' ἐκείνο λέγων is Thrasymachus; nor, indeed, is the objection of Adimantus anything but the dying echo of Thrasymachus' idea that the ruler is like a shepherd who feeds his sheep for his own

profit. They are those false rulers described by Milton who

“for their bellies' sake  
Creep, and intrude, and climb into the fold;”

they care nothing for their flock, but only for the “shearers' feast.” J. ADAM.

### MACAN'S *HERODOTUS*.

*Herodotus, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books.*

With Introduction, Notes, Appendices, Indices, Maps, by R. W. MACAN. Vol. I. Introduction, Text with Notes, pp. i—cxx, 1—396; Vol. II. Appendices, Indices, Maps, pp. 1—341. Macmillan and Co., London and New York. 1895. 32s.

IN these two volumes Mr. Macan has furnished a noteworthy contribution to the study of Herodotus, and has produced a book which will be found indispensable to the student of earlier Greek history. For the text of Herodotus much has been done of recent years, and the question of the dialect if not finally solved, seems at least to be on a fair way towards solution. But there is another and a not less important side to the work. For a long period of Greek history Herodotus must remain our chief authority. Hence it is a matter of the utmost moment to investigate as far as possible the historical method of Herodotus, to trace the probable sources of his materials, to mark the various disturbing and distorting influences to which those materials have been exposed, with a view to determining how far the statements of the ‘Father of History’ can be used by the critical historian of to-day. Such are the problems to the solution of which Mr. Macan has applied himself, and we imagine that few will dissent from the general principles laid down by him, however much disagreement there may be in the application of them. The exposition of these principles occupies a great part of the introduction. Nowhere have we met with so full and so clear a statement of the case. In passing by it may be noted that the editor argues ingeniously from the symmetry of the work that the History is complete as it stands. There are some very sensible remarks on the travels of Herodotus, so far as they concern the three middle books.

The principles set forth in the Introduction are applied in the notes, in which will

be found many a shrewd observation on the probable sources of the narrative and the influences that have moulded the story. If the perchance and peradventure abound here, that is inherent in the nature of the case. Sometimes the editor seems to go too far. Thus in iv. 184. 12 it is surely better with Kallenberg to omit τὴν λίμνην than to make Herodotus contradict himself within a few sentences. The notes also contain a wealth of illustrations of the text drawn from ancient and from modern sources.

A number of the larger historical problems involved in these three books are treated in a series of appendices. In these many fresh points are urged which will have to be reckoned with by the Greek historian. The best is perhaps that on the battle of Marathon, where the whole material is passed in exhaustive review and a theory is formulated which at least has the merit of being intelligible and in fair accordance with tradition. We may refer also to the discussion on the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* which raises more questions than it settles, and to that on the chronology of the feud between Athens and Aegina. The least satisfactory is the disquisition on the Scythians.

Unfortunately there are some things in the book that call for mention of another sort. What reader is supposed to be in need of such information as that *διαπάσας* comes from *διαπάσσω*, or that *γενέσθαι* governs the genitive case, or that Peithagoras must not be confounded with Pythagoras? Any one who needs instruction on such elementary points will want much more information than he will not find here. On vi. 61. 6, it is remarked that *ποιεύμενος* is the middle, but what voice except the middle could have been used here? In v. 108 it seems to be supposed that *νηυσὶ* and *τῇσι νηυσὶ* could refer to separate fleets and that *νῆες* might be applied to transports. In v. 93 *ἐπεμαρτυροῦντο* is treated as a possible variant of *ἐπεμαρτύροντο*, which was suggested by