

# 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](#)



---

## Welldon's *Nicomachean Ethics*

J. A. Stewart

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 08 / October 1893, pp 363 - 364

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00198567, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00198567](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00198567)

### How to cite this article:

J. A. Stewart (1893). Welldon's *Nicomachean Ethics*. The Classical Review, 7, pp 363-364  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00198567

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

Another original interpretation is given for 882, ζοικε νύν αὖ τῆς (so for αὐτῆς) ἐπὶ ξυροῦ πέλας αὐχὴν πεσεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ., where τῆς ἐπὶ ξυροῦ is declared to mean *the female barber*. In 574, ποδώκει περιβαλὼν χαλκέυματι, the editor refuses to accept ποδώκει as equivalent to ταχεῖ, but '*swift as the sound of the syllable ποδ*.' The modern reader will doubtless think this detestable: so would Euripides, and so would Sophocles. Other men, as great as these or greater, have thought otherwise.'

A discussion of the novelties of this edition would occupy much space. A few details may be added. The gist of the discussion of the *Recognition* is that the descendants of Pelops could be distinguished from the ordinary Greek by the shape of the foot and by the quality of the hair, just as a lock of an African's woolly hair and the print of his flat foot can be distinguished from the European's straight hair and the print of his foot with high instep. 'In comparison with the Achaeans around them Orestes and Electra were octoroons.' The tragedy is divided into three acts: 'the first act takes place in the early morning; the second at nightfall; and the third on the next day.' The first act takes place at the grave of Agamemnon; the rest of the play at the castle. A secondary chorus is assumed, who 'sing the *entr'acte* between Acts I. and II., and are afterwards absorbed into the train of Orestes.' The editor does not approve of the conjectural repetition of the *epithymia* after 795 etc. He perhaps fails to appreciate the simplicity of life in the heroic age when he thinks that Orestes, expecting 'to be received into a royal castle on terms which will bring him into personal intercourse with the lord and lady,' must have come as 'a substantial merchant conveying a rich caravan,' rather than as 'a

pedlar who carries his own pack'; and in his criticism of the old nurse as *aide de camp*. In his comment on the Homeric reference to Clytaemnestra's death, he pays no regard to Robert's attractive conjecture that, according to the epic poet's form of the story, the false queen was not killed by her son but hung herself. Κλυταιμῆστρα is read in the text, according to the best authorities, but *Clytaemnestra* is retained as the English form of the name; and this will probably continue to be English usage. *Clytaemnestra*, *Iason* and *Iocasta* are not likely to make their way in English literature. No metrical schemes are given for the lyric passages, although most users of the book would find such schemes convenient at times and for certain purposes, if not for the elementary purpose of fixing the ictus-syllables.

The form of the work compels comparison with Professor Jebb's *Sophocles*, and the reviewer is obliged to consider the edition of Sophocles far superior in literary spirit. Mr. Verrall adduces far fewer parallel passages for the illustration of poetic expressions, and his interest seems to lie in a colder kind of interpretation. The ordinary student certainly will read the commentary to the *Choephoroi* with little zest. But we must remember that in many passages of our play the text is in a desperate condition, and that no two scholars can be expected to agree in all the details of the interpretation of some of these odes. The effort to make the Greek intelligible is laudable. But in spite of all the editor's learning and ingenuity, a student who should begin his careful study of Aeschylus in the use of this book, and should trust in its methods, would be philologically lost.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

#### WELLDON'S NICOMACHEAN ETHICS.

THIS is a very serviceable translation, in which the student will find his difficulties, if not always removed, at least fully recognized and directly met. Mr. Welldon's method is to be very literal in difficult passages, with the result that, although the English is sometimes pretty hard—sometimes nearly as hard as the Greek—no doubt is left in the reader's mind as to what a very competent scholar takes the grammatical construction to be. This—and it is no small matter—is

the special merit, it seems to me, of Mr. Welldon's translation. On the other hand, what may be called the philosophical ring of Aristotle's thought is better caught, I think, by Mr. Peters, with whose scholarly translation Mr. Welldon's translation may be naturally compared. A narrow comparison however between two translations, each so good in its different way, in order to show that in this or that respect one is superior to the other, would not be instructive, and

might be unfair; so, I will merely say that, while Mr. Peters appears to advantage in passages of great philosophical importance—passages in which the subtlety and manifold ramifications of the Aristotelian technique have to be carefully taken into account—Mr. Welldon is at his best in passages of less technical and more general and descriptive character—as in passages which might be pointed out in the fourth, eighth, and ninth books, and elsewhere, *e.g.* in v. 8, 1135 b 11—1136 a 5 (pp. 163—4 Welldon).

A few separate points on which I venture, with all respect, to differ from Mr. Welldon may be mentioned in conclusion:—

P. 174, v. 11, 1138 a 14. 'Again, in the sense in which a man is said to be unjust, if he merely commits injustice and is not entirely vicious [*i.e.* when his action, but not his moral purpose, is unjust: *footnote*] it is impossible for him to act unjustly to himself.' The distinction, I take it, here is between the *ἀνίος* and the *παράνομος*.

P. 212, vii. 3, 1147 a 5. 'Thus, *the major premiss may be*, "Dry things are good for every man," and *the minor premiss* "So and so is a man," or "Such a thing is dry."' I understand *ξηρὸν τὸ τοιόνδε* to be, not a minor, but a major premiss.

P. 216, vii. 4, 1148 a 2. 'While incon-

tinence is censured not as a mistake only, but as a vice, whether a vice of an absolute or of some particular kind....' I think that *ἡ ἀπλῶς οὖσα ἡ κατὰ τι μέρος* goes with *ἡ ἀκρασία* (a 2), not with *κακία τις* (a 3).

P. 217, vii. 4, 1148 a 17. 'Hence we should call a person more licentious, if without desire....' Here Mr. Welldon, together with some other scholars, seems to me to go wrong in taking the words *μᾶλλον ἀκόλαστον* = *ἀκολαστότερον*. The writer is distinguishing between the *ἀκόλαστος* and the *ἀκρατής*, and says, as I understand him, that the term *ἀκόλαστος* is applied to the man who pursues excessive pleasures without desire *rather than* to the man who does so from a violent desire—the latter is *ἀκρατής*.

P. 267, viii. 10, 1160 b 7. 'Tyranny is the opposite of kingship, as it pursues the good of the tyrant himself. *It is clear that kingship is the best form of polity*: but it is still clearer that tyranny is the worst. The opposite of the best is always worst.' The comparison in *φανερώτερον* is not, I think, between *τυραννίς* and *βασιλεία*, but between *τυραννίς*, the worst of the *παρεκβάσεις*, and *τιμοκρατία*, the worst of the *ὀρθαὶ πολιτεῖαι*.

J. A. STEWART.

#### THE SATIRES OF PERSIUS BY CONINGTON AND NETTLESHIP.

*The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus*, with a translation and commentary by JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. Third edition, edited by Prof. H. NETTLESHIP.

THE duty of preparing a notice of this work has been changed from a pleasure into an occasion of sorrow by the death of Professor Nettleship, which occurred while I was reading the volume. This is hardly the place to dwell on those personal qualities which will cause his memory to be warmly cherished by all who knew him. But I cannot pass by the opportunity for expressing my very strong feeling of the loss which Latin scholarship has sustained by his premature removal. In the last of many delightful conversations which I had with him, he spoke to me at length about the tasks in which he was already engaged, and about others which he hoped to accomplish. Much as he has done, the best and ripest results of his labours were still to be gathered in.

The changes which this third edition exhibits are more considerable than those which were introduced into the second. A good *apparatus criticus*, which was much needed, has been supplied, along with a description of the evidence on which the text must rest. But the passages in which readings have been altered are very few; and in these cases the reasons are strong, as in III. 100 (*trientem* for *triental*) and III. 12 (*querimur* for *queritur*). Prof. Nettleship has treated Conington's work with true *pietas*; he has extended it and enriched it everywhere, but has reconstructed it as little as possible. The references and illustrations now added to the notes for the first time are numerous and valuable. Many bear evidence to much study of inscriptions, glosses, and other remote sources of information. The longer notes which have been inserted are for the most part of a lexicographical character. Many notes of this class which had been introduced into the second edition are now extended.