

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](#)



Newman's *Politics of Aristotle* The *Politics of Aristotle* : with an Introduction, two Prefatory Essays, and Notes Critical and Explanatory. By W. L. Newman, M.A., Hon. Litt . D. Cambridge, Fellow of Balliol College, and formerly Reader in Ancient History in the University of Oxford. Vol. III Two Essays. Books III., IV., and V. Text and Notes. Pp. xlvii, 603. Vol. IV. Essay on Constitutions, Books VI.–VIII. Text and Notes. Pp. lxx., 708. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1902. Price 28s.

R. D. Hicks

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 03 / April 1903, pp 165 - 169
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207804, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207804

How to cite this article:

R. D. Hicks (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 165-169 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207804

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The most jealous lover of Aeschylus might admit, I think, that the original is worthily represented here.

On p. 89 Mr. Bevan makes a suggestion that seems right to me: 'Line 431. The description of the mourning of inanimate nature is usually connected with the reference to Atlas. It seems more naturally to follow on the description of the mourning of mankind for Prometheus. Hence Ribbeck was for *transposing* the last strophe and antistrophe. A more satisfactory method is to suppose that the part of the Chorus which sings the parenthesis referring to Atlas is not the same as that which sang the passage before and continues the theme of the mourning in *βοῶν δὲ πόντιος κλύδων κτλ.*' The Introduction is interesting, the remarks, for instance, on the conception of Oceanus (p. xxx), whose character as a trimmer, I may add, had been developed in the Orphic poems; and the geographical notes, as is natural from the historian of the Seleucid

Empire, are very well worth reading: on p. xxxvi Mr. Bevan says, 'No one can fail to see that these geographical descriptions are an object in themselves and the main purpose for which the poet introduced Io. The geographical parts of the play were perhaps *considerably* longer even than they now appear, in the original text.' Surely they were an object in themselves; a theme in which so many romantic poets have delighted, Aeschylus, Marlowe, and Milton beyond all: Clytemnestra's description of the beacons is but one example of a practice which we do not need the scholiast on *P.V.* 733 to tell us was habitual with Aeschylus, and which those to whom romantic poetry appeals have seldom failed to feel that he has fully justified. Poets, as Aristides says, love to rehearse and decorate the names of rivers and of countries; while inaccuracy and freedom of imagination are their ancient and traditionary privileges.

W. HEADLAM.

NEWMAN'S *POLITICS OF ARISTOTLE*.

The Politics of Aristotle: with an Introduction, two Prefatory Essays, and Notes Critical and Explanatory. By W. L. NEWMAN, M.A., Hon. Litt. D. Cambridge, Fellow of Balliol College, and formerly Reader in Ancient History in the University of Oxford. Vol. III. Two Essays. Books III., IV., and V. Text and Notes. Pp. xlvii, 603. Vol. IV. Essay on Constitutions, Books VI.-VIII. Text and Notes. Pp. lxx., 708. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1902. Price 28s.

THE completion of this work reflects credit upon English scholarship. It is unlikely that more will ever be done by erudition and patient labour for the interpretation and illustration of an ancient classic than has been done here. To its value for the historical student I hope to return on some other occasion.

Much of the Commentary deals with minute points of grammar, and the questions raised tend to enlarge and render more precise our acquaintance with the author's idiom. Indeed, as a reference to the copious grammatical index will shew, Mr. Newman has himself laid a solid foundation for that grammar of Aristotelian Greek, which he desiderated in the *C.R.* ten years ago.

Attention may be called to his treatment of some matters directly affecting the text, e.g. the absence or insertion of the article in clauses of the type τοῦ σκήπτρου ἐπανάστασις, vol. iii., p. 275; repetition of prepositions, vol. iii. p. 112; the awkward recurrence of prepositions, vol. iii. p. 369; the supply of words from the context, e.g., τῶν μέρων from πολυμεροῦς, 1311 a 33, ἀρχὴν from μοναρχιῶν, 1279 a 34, τὸν μισθὸν from ἀμίσθους 1320 a 18; lastly, to an interesting appendix on the use of hyperbaton, vol. iii. p. 579. The position maintained in this appendix, namely that departures from the *simplex ordo* in the *Politics* are to be explained as due to emphasis, does not appear to me to be the whole truth. I should be inclined to attribute them quite as often to considerations of euphony, a desire to avoid monotony and to escape from the commonplace by introducing into prose many of the complex rhythmical effects of verse, a mannerism which came in with Isocrates and has been traced in a more or less marked degree among many of his contemporaries, especially in Plato's later dialogues. Perhaps, however, Mr. Newman's use of emphasis may be wide enough to include this; all I would contend for, is that the mannerism is in many cases adopted for its own sake, and has little to

do with the meaning to be conveyed, affecting not the thing said but merely the way of saying it. Another investigation concerns the position of the adjective and noun, when the article is not used. Mr. Newman's canon is: 'When an adjective and substantive are without the article, the substantive is usually in the *Politics* placed first and the adjective second, but now and then the reverse order is adopted. When under these circumstances the adjective is placed first it is usually intended to be emphasized. Πολύς and some other adjectives are exceptions to this rule; they commonly precede the substantive with which they agree and are placed after it when they are emphatic.' (vol. iii. p. 137.) This opens out a wide field of inquiry, for if the induction be valid, it can hardly be confined to the *Politics*. The results of such an inquiry should be of considerable importance in Aristotelian studies. But it is to the textual results of the editor's labours that I must confine myself in this notice.

In editing Books I. and II. Mr. Newman appeared as an eminently conservative critic, every word in his text had manuscript authority. In the direction of emendation, he went no further than to adopt Spengel's more sensible division of the letters ἀριστ' ἀρχεῖν for the otherwise unknown ἀριστάρχεῖν 1273 b 5, and to read ἐπίσκηψιν with Scaliger and Bentley at 1274 b 7 for ἐπίσκεψιν. He indulged in no lacuna, no transposition, square brackets were sparingly employed—once or twice for a couple of words, 1263 a 13, 1266 a 18, 1270 b 22, and in the suspected chapter xii. of Book II., he was content to bracket half a dozen lines [Φαλέων... ἀχρηστον, 1274 b 9–15]. In the new volumes the rôle of conservative editor is from the nature of the case less easy; or possibly upon further study of the text, the editor has somewhat modified the rigidity of his critical principles. A sparing use is made of emendation and transposition, once or twice we find indications of words missing in the printed text. But he is still conservative and is seen at his best when defending the traditional text. Thus, to take a few examples—he refuses to alter οὔτε at 1293 a 9 for the sake of grammatical smoothness into οὐδέ, as other editors have done (cp. 1257 b 12, 1330 b 16). He does not insert πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν in the text at 1340 b 19, he prefers to understand it: 1329 a 5 πότερον ἕτερα καὶ ταῦτα θετέον ἢ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀποδοτέον ἀμφω, seems to him correct and the insertion of ἑτέροις with Coraes and Bekker² unnecessary. Take again ἡ γὰρ φύσις δέδωκε τὴν διαίρεσιν, ποιήσασα αὐτὸ τῷ γένει

ταῦτὸ τὸ μὲν νεώτερον τὸ δὲ πρεσβύτερον. Here αὐτὸ is the reading of P² 3. 4. 5. etc., omitted by P¹ and Aretinus, deserted by Bekker in favour of αὐτῷ on the authority of M¹ and the Aldine. But it makes perfectly good sense, Mr. Newman joining αὐτὸ with ταῦτὸ τῷ γένει renders 'for nature has furnished us with the distinction, having made that which is the same in kind itself of two parts, the one younger and the other older.' Again at 1307 b 32–34, where Π² are defective from homoeoteleuton he restores from M¹ P¹ λανθάνει γὰρ παραδυομένη ἡ παρανομία ὥσπερ τὰς οὐσίας τὸ μικρὸν δαπάνημα ἀναίρει πολλάκις γινόμενον, agreeing independently (as we learn from the critical note) with the last impression of the Teubner text. That this is correct, he proves from the similar language of Plato *Rep.* 424 D, and in quoting this passage to determine the text of the *Politics*, Mr. Newman has been anticipated by Susemihl.¹

It is more open to doubt whether ἀγεῖν, the reading of M¹P¹ is equally right at 1336 a 6 οἷς ἐπιμελές ἐστιν ἀγεῖν τὴν πολεμικὴν ξέιν. Here Π² give αἰεὶ and Vetus Versio *inducere*. Mr. Newman admits that ἀγεῖν is usually rendered *ducere* and sometimes *adducere* by Vet. Int., though rendered by *inducere* in 1306 a 3. It would seem that ἀγεῖν τὴν πολεμικὴν ξέιν is a little odd for 'to create the military habit' and it is hardly borne out by the editor's quotation of ἀγεῖν χορόν from Aristot. *Fragm.* 627. 1584 a 16 τὸν δὲ ἀρξάμενον τῆς πόλεως Ἀριστοτέλης Ἀρίωνά φησιν εἶναι, ὃς πρῶτος τὸν κύκλιον ἡγάγε χορόν. Another reading of M¹P¹, which has been unreasonably suspected, I mean καὶ γυνὴ λάλος, εἰ οὕτω κοσμία εἴη κ.τ.λ., 1277 b 23, receives confirmation from Philemon *Adelphoe*, *Frag.* 2, where λαλεῖν is similarly contrasted with κόσμιος εἶναι. This is one of several instances in which the editor has illustrated the language and subject-matter of his author from the Greek comic poets.

If we now inquire in what relation this text of the *Politics* stands to that of Immanuel Bekker, in its original form, while we fully admit the immense stride which Bekker made, it is clear that we are now in a position to judge more dispassionately the text of 1831. Bekker had not all the materials before him, he did not always use them with sufficient care or judgment and he adopted (this is more often the case with Bekker²) unnecessary emendations. In some three

¹ *De Pol. Arist. Quaestiones Criticae*: 1886, p. 446. Mr. Newman is throughout so scrupulous in pointing out anticipations of his views, that this must have been overlooked by him.

hundred places where Mr. Newman diverges from Bekker's original text, he almost invariably produces evidence, which commands respect, even if it does not carry conviction at the first glance. We may set on one side proposals to transpose, to bracket words, and to mark lacunae ('chasms in the text' is Mr. Newman's phrase) which can hardly ever command universal acceptance. Nor do the editor's own emendations, few as they are, appear altogether indispensable. At 1328 b 4, he proposes to insert α before ἀναγκαῖον ὑπάρχειν where M^P¹ give διὸ, omitted by Π². The reading of Π² which is Bekker's text, will construe, and the change, though tempting, fails to account for διὸ in Π¹. At 1331 b 4, ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ πλῆθος διαιρεῖται τῆς πόλεως εἰς ἱερεῖς, εἰς ἄρχοντας, προσετός is proposed in place of πλῆθος and the sense of the passage would be improved by the change. In the apparently mutilated passage μηδὲν ἦττον τοῦ παιδοτρίβου καὶ τοῦ γυμναστικοῦ παρασκευάσαι τε καὶ ταύτην ἐστὶ τὴν δύναμιν, he is prepared to accept Bekker's οὐδὲν for μηδὲν, and to shift the place of τε to follow παιδοτρίβου. In the same book, Chapter xiv, an attempt is made to frame a text of the corrupt passage 1300 a 23—b 5, which compares favourably with the former attempts by Thurot, Spengel, and Susemihl. At 1301 b 26—28, Mr. Newman reads πανταχοῦ γὰρ διὰ τὸ ἄνισον ἢ στάσις· οὐ μὴν (εἰ)¹ τοῖς ἀνίσοις ὑπάρχει ἀνάλογον (ἀτίδιος γὰρ βασιλεία ἄνισος, ἐὰν ᾗ ἐν ἴσοις), inserting εἰ and interpreting 'Civil discord arises on account of inequality, not however if unequals receive in proportion to the inequality subsisting between them; (for a perpetual kingship is unequal [only] if it exists among equals).' Surely the insertion of εἰ is gratuitous. Assuming that Mr. Newman has rightly interpreted τοῖς ἀνίσοις ὑπάρχει ἀνάλογον, it is plain from his translation that he regards these words as describing the case in which civil strife is *not* likely to arise, and the text unaltered would give this meaning if the sentence οὐ μὴν . . . ἀνάλογον be taken to refer, like the preceding sentence, to the case where strife *is* likely to arise: if, that is, instead of completing the sentence (as I suppose the editor to do) οὐ μὴν (sc. διὰ τὸ ἄνισον ἢ στάσις), εἰ τοῖς ἀνίσοις ὑπάρχει ἀνάλογον, we complete it thus: οὐ μὴν τοῖς ἀνίσοις (sc. τοῖς στασιάζουσιν) ὑπάρχει ἀνάλογον. Two conditions are laid down, (1) the presence of inequality, (2) that it is not proportional

inequality, and both refer to the same set of circumstances.

But when these slight deductions are made, it will, I think, be admitted that we have here a more faithful presentment of the whole tradition than has ever appeared before. It is conceivable, though not, I think, probable, that the editor's verdict in favour of Π² against Π¹ may hereafter be challenged, but the greater number of his divergencies from Bekker, who himself chiefly followed Π², will not be affected if this happens. The advance upon Bekker is in most cases due to critical insight, a prolonged study of the MSS. of that family and irrefragable inferences as to their comparative merits. No subsequent editor would dream of imitating Bekker in his occasional lapses, as when for instance he prefers the reading of Π³, i.e. inferior MSS. of the second family, or some of them, to that of its better representatives.² Now and then Bekker's text rests merely on one or two of these inferior MSS. (1298 b 7 μὲν added after ἀριστοκρατία Q^bV^b; 1321 a 14 δημοκρατική L^a, Ald.; 1290 a 21; τὴν before Φρυγισί Q⁶; 1321 a 5 βάνανσον with R^b; 1320 b 38 δύναται with Ald.). So at 1325 a 39, Bekker reads ὑπολογεῖν, a doubtful word with S^b alone, where Mr. H. Richards, doubting if ὑπολογίζεῖν is any better attested than ὑπολογεῖν, would suggest ὑπόλογον ἔχειν in place of ὑπολογεῖν, the reading of all other authorities and of Mr. Newman. But errors of this kind are trivial in comparison with Bekker's fatal confidence in that very corrupt MS. P⁵, which misled him in more than a dozen passages, notably 1307 b 32—34 noticed above. That Bekker should have collated P⁵ throughout and omitted to collate P¹ seems nowadays inexplicable. So much for the still prevalent idea that Bekker's text, because founded on Π² remains our sole trustworthy guide.³

On the other hand there are many passages in which the reading of Π¹ is preferred and a fair sprinkling where the editor has adopted the conjectures of his predecessors. It is just possible that owing to these innovations the editor may fail to please some critics. To deal with the last named matter first, it should be remembered

² e.g. 1275 b 32 καὶ γὰρ οὐ with P⁴ Q^b T^b L^a. I have noted thirty-two similar instances in the last six books. To these should be added 1252 a 15 τοὺς om. Π³ Bk. and fourteen other instances in Books I and II.

³ An eminent scholar has declared that he deliberately prefers to quote from it, in order to escape the 'bad tradition' of inferior authorities. In view of the facts this seems very like 'out of the frying pan into the fire.'

¹ Mr. Newman employs curved brackets for words conjecturally inserted in the text as well as for marks of punctuation.

that conjectures which Bekker adopted in one or other of his editions, have not fared particularly well, most of them are now ejected from the text. Who for instance at 1275 a 13 with an intelligible *ῶστε* before him would dream of resorting to the conjecture *διό*? Who would omit the idiomatic *καὶ* after *ὥστερ* introducing an illustration at 1255 a 36, or arbitrarily change the traditional order of the words *εἰ σώματα διακείμενα* to *σώματα εἰ διακείμενα*, 1320 b 33?¹ Whether the emendations which the editor has admitted will stand the test of time any better than those which he has excluded it is not for me to say; I fear there is little chance of their being verified by fresh discoveries in the same way in which the Vatican Palimpsest has confirmed Perizonius' *ἀστῶν*, 1278 a 34. But to return to the fascinating problem of the two recensions Π^1 and Π^2 . In considering their comparative merits, Mr. Newman makes an interesting attempt to determine the sources of error in some or all of the MSS. vol. iii. p. vii. *sqq.* Apart from the common faults of dittography, lipography and insertion of marginal glosses, these are found to be more particularly (1) mechanical omissions of short words, initial or final syllables, occasionally of letters in the middle of a word; (2) misinterpretation of contractions in the archetype, similar to those employed in the papyrus of the 'Aθ. Παλ.; here the scribe of that otherwise badly copied MS, M^s, becomes an invaluable detective, reproducing the contractions which he failed to decipher, as shown in the critical notes of Susemihl's editions *e.g.* 1337 a 28, 1283 b 9, 1335 a 27. All this is familiar, but Mr. Newman calls special attention to an additional cause of error, (3) the tendency, of Π^1 more especially, 'to introduce a word into the text which they repeat from a neighbouring line, often the preceding or following line, the word thus repeated sometimes extruding another word from the text and sometimes not doing so.' Thus in 1255 a 24 *ἄμα* is displaced by *ὅλως*, probably repeated from a 21;

¹ The following is a list of emendations introduced by Bekker² in Books III—V: 1282 a 11 *οἱ τοι* Coraes; 1286 a 32 <γὰρ> Bk²; 1330 b 5 *εὐρήσθαι* Lambinus; b 7 *ἐπιλείπειν* Coraes; 1333 b 31 *τῷ* Scaliger; 1333 b 38 [*ταῦτα*] Bk²; 1334 b 1 *γίνεσθαι* Schneider; b 11 [*καὶ*] Coraes; 1335 a 38 *συνουσίαν* Zwinger; 1336 b 4 *ἐπερ* Lambinus; b 17 *τούτους* Reizius; 1340 a 27 *αὐτοῦ* Ar. Lambinus, Scaliger; *ἰδ.* *ἐκείνου* Lambinus, Scaliger; 1340 b 8 [*τὰ*] Bk². In all of these Mr. Newman following Susemihl returns to the text of the MSS. and of Bekker.¹ Space forbids me to quote thirty similar instances in the last three books. To these must be added four instances in Books I and II.

in 1266 a 37 *ἀναγκαῖον* is added after *εἶναι*, being repeated from *ἀναγκαῖον* in the preceding line. With this weapon the editor attacks twelve out of sixty-two variations of reading of a less minute kind, tabulated in vol. iii. p. xiii. *sqq.* Obviously this consideration must be applied with all due caution, although no one will find fault with the suggestion that this may be the the source of error in three difficult passages, 1267 a 8 *ἐπιθυμοῖεν* (? *ἀδικοῖεν*); 1268 b 1 *γεωργήσῃ*; 1329 a 14 *πολιτεῖαν* (? *λειτουργίαν*). His conclusion is that these sources of error affect both recensions alike, but that Π^1 are more likely to err than Π^2 ,² and the cumulative effect of the evidence is strengthened by comparison of the two recensions when they present the same words in a different order, vol. iii. p. 581 *sqq.* The peculiar inversions which are sometimes classed with hyperbaton are found more frequently in Π^2 , the inference being that the variations, which return to the *simplex ordo*, are due to arbitrary change. And this agrees with other traces of variations due to grammarian revisers exhibited in vol. iii. p. xix. *sq.* Thus while a firm but temperate champion of Π^2 , the editor is not precluded from admitting the superior claims of numerous readings of Π^1 .

If these volumes had been published in the life time of the late Professor Susemihl, to whose memory Mr. Newman pays a graceful tribute in the preface of vol. iii., I have reason to believe that he would have been gratified by what seems to be the closer approximation of the results of divergent critical methods, especially in the later books.³ He would have been glad to see

² It seems to me that a re-arrangement of MSS. is desirable. The agreement of Π^2 and Π^3 should be indicated by a special symbol—say Π^4 . It would immensely simplify matters if Π^3 were consigned to the rubbish heap, and if, while Π^1 , Π^2 , Π^3 , M^s and the Vatican Palimpsest, which have been carefully collated, were retained in the *apparatus criticus*, occasional variants of the inferior MSS. and renderings of Moerbeke and Aretinus, were cited only when they are really helpful.

³ Susemihl made some 945 innovations in Bekker's original text. Of these Mr. Newman has adopted some 304, if my calculations are correct. Taking the books as numbered by Mr. Newman, the figures are: Book I., Susemihl 70, Newman, 14; Book II., Susemihl 162, Newman 33; Book III., Susemihl 137, Newman 35; Book IV., Susemihl 184, Newman 62; Book V., Susemihl 72, Newman 27; Book VI., Susemihl 124, Newman 53; Book VII., Susemihl 128, Newman 56; Book VIII., Susemihl 68, Newman 24. It will be noticed that the proportion is highest in the last three Books, and lowest in Books I and II. I have included proposals for transposition and the bracketing of words amongst the innovations I have counted, but not changes of punctuation generally.

that at 1287 a 29, the reading τὸν νοῦν μόνους is adopted with the Vossian MS. of Julian where all our other authorities and all other MSS. of Julian give τοὺς νόμους; a correction which, if right, is calculated to arouse misgivings as to many other passages where the traditional text runs with at least equal smoothness. With his fondness for transposition, he would have welcomed the occasional adoption by Mr. Newman of this device; 1335 a 29 ἡ μικρόν transferred to the previous line a 28, at 1292 b 32 διὰ πᾶσι τοῖς κτησαμένοις ἐξέσται μετέχειν to follow δημοκρατικόν b 32, and at 1317 b 30 ἡ τῶν μεγίστων to the preceding line as suggested by Götting, Rasso, and the third Basel edition respectively; and still more readily would he have welcomed the shifting of 1303 b 3-7 στασιάζουσι . . . ὄντες and of 1312 a 17 μάλιστα . . . ἐπιθέσεις from their position in the text, although the place to which Mr. Newman transfers the two passages is not precisely that which he himself assigned to them. He would have approved the adoption of a few conjectures

at 1325 b 7, 1333 b 37, 1299 b 14, 1290 b 15, 1302 a 14 of Thurot and Bojesen, whose critical studies he was one of the first to appreciate. Of the many longer passages condemned by him as spurious just one is enclosed in square brackets in the present volumes, but here there is not as much difference as at first sight appears, for no one has presented the case against the suspected chapters more skilfully or fully than Mr. Newman; only when it comes to execution he stays his hand, and for my part I fail to see why he should have summed up courage to condemn on internal grounds the single passage in question, 1315 b 11-39, when so many worse offenders escape. On the whole I venture to believe that the more valuable and enduring results of Susemihl's pioneer labours are enshrined in these volumes. Mr. Newman may be congratulated on having achieved a work which will long be a landmark for students of the *Politics*.

R. D. HICKS.

ADAM'S REPUBLIC OF PLATO.

The Republic of Plato. Edited with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Appendices, by JAMES ADAM, M.A., Hon. LL.D. of Aberdeen University. 2 vols. Pp. xvi, 364; 532. Cambridge University Press. 1902. 33s. net.

THE present edition, full as it is, is so far incomplete that the editor looks forward to the publication of 'an introductory volume, to which occasional reference is made throughout the notes.' This volume, we are told, 'will deal *inter alia* with the MSS. and date of composition of the dialogue, and will also include an essay on the style of Plato, together with essays on various subjects connected with the doctrine of *The Republic*.' In judging the work before us we have then to remember that a good many points are reserved. But the most cursory acquaintance with these two volumes is sufficient to convince the reader of the great stride towards the better understanding and appreciation of *The Republic* which they represent. Dr. Adam shows his qualifications for the work he has undertaken by the admission in his Preface that 'in one sense of the term there can never be a definitive or final interpretation of *The Republic*.' It

is partly by his apprehension of this truth that he has produced what must be regarded as the characteristic and adequate interpretation of the work for at least the present generation. One source of strength in the edition is the definiteness and strict limitation of its scope. It is not, in its attitude to the doctrines conveyed, either largely critical or historical, but in the main purely expository. 'Any systematic attempt,' we are told in the Preface, 'to trace the connexion between Platonism and modern political, religious, or philosophical theory is foreign to the scope of this edition.' But it would be a great mistake to infer from this that the editor's attitude is a dry scholastic one. The spirit and secret of the book is that the editor looks at Plato's work *from the inside*; he speaks as a disciple, not to say a prophet, of Plato. 'We can only rejoice,' we read, 'that Platonism is still a living force in both philosophy and in religion; ἐτι ἥλιος ἐπὶ τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ οὐκ ὄψω δέδωκεν.' Thus the commentary not only exhibits a rich acquaintance with modern thought and literature, but may be said to be permeated with the modern spirit, in that at every turn it brings Platonism into touch