

# 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](#)



---

## **Bosanquet's *Companion to the Republic A Companion to Plato's Republic ; for English Readers*, by Bernard Bosanquet, M. A., LL.D. Rivington. 1895. 5s.**

J. B. Mayor

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 02 / March 1896, pp 120 - 121

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203442, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00203442](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203442)

### **How to cite this article:**

J. B. Mayor (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 120-121 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203442

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

for *in his paucis diebus* (p. 144), and 'as to the fact that' for *quod* (pp. 116 and 168) are out of place in a book of this character, or indeed in any edition of a Latin author.

Some of the syntactical notes are not in harmony with the latest views on the subject: for example, p. 84, *fuit cum...arbitraretur*: 'the ind. in such sentences marks of course the simple fact'; p. 102, *concesserit* and p. 173, *suaserit*: where one should no longer refer without comment to the statement of the grammars that the pres. and perf. subj. do not differ in meaning, after the careful investigation of Elmer (*A Discussion of the Latin Prohibitive*); p. 90, *confirmavit*: where the note on the use of the perf. ind. is not satisfactory; p. 122, *optaret*: this passage is rightly cited by Schmalz (*Antibarbarus*, ii. p. 200) as an

instance of the use of the acc. and inf. which is the natural one in the connection; p. 126, *postulet*: 'the more usual construction being *ut* with the subj.' Add 'in the writers of the Classical Period,' and cf. Schmalz, *Syntax*, § 228. Also open to objection are the notes on *quodam* (in § 14); on *quod sentio* = *sensa* (p. 114); and on *satis...factum* (p. 156).

The book ends with a Critical Appendix, the usefulness of which in a work of this class may perhaps be questioned. The student for whom the grammatical references are designed could make no use of such an Appendix, while more advanced students would prefer to use a complete *apparatus*.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

### BOSANQUET'S COMPANION TO THE REPUBLIC

*A Companion to Plato's Republic; for English Readers*, by BERNARD BOSANQUET, M. A., LL.D. Rivington. 1895. 5s.

THIS book is not at all what one might have expected from its title and from the fact that (as we learn from the Dedication) it is the outcome of a series of University Extension Lectures. Far from being an easy introduction for the use of schoolboys, it might rather be described as an attempt to explain the logical and metaphysical difficulties of the *Republic*, as viewed from a Hegelian stand-point. That is, the author dwells upon that aspect of the Dialogue which, to nine out of ten readers, is the least useful and the least interesting. I think too that many of his readers would find the difficulties of the original rather increased than diminished by the explanations here given. Those, however, who are not frightened away by such phrases as 'sensed' (= τὰ αἰσθητά), 'categories of the understanding,' 'atomistic theories of society,' 'unified sense-perception,' 'the real nature of the soul lies in a simplicity to be attained not by unification but by abstraction,' 'Plato takes the position which is at once absolutely practical and absolutely critical,' 'a significant negative is always a concealed positive and therefore asserts a content and does not embody bare not-being,' 'the primitive undiscriminated flux or continuum of sensation'—such readers must recognize the

honesty and ability of the writer and will, I think, find much that is suggestive and stimulating in his comments.

The two main points which Mr. Bosanquet seems to set before himself are (1) to guard his readers against being misled by Davies and Vaughan's translation (which he takes as his text-book), where it attributes to Plato a more advanced technology than he really was master of. Compare for instance p. 156, where, in his comment on the words used by D. and V., 'the conditions of health and disease,' he adds 'literally "the healthy and the unwholesome." There is nothing about "abstract" or "qualified" or "correlative" or "object," or "member of relation," or "relative term" in the whole section we are considering. Yet the use of this technical language may not only be necessary, etc. Perhaps he is inclined to insist too much on this, and his own literal translations are at times both awkward and obscure; but he certainly compels us to remember that Plato had to invent expressions for what appear to us the most familiar abstractions, and he sometimes corrects carelessnesses into which the earlier translators had fallen. As the second main object of the book, I would specify the warning against confounding the pictorial expression with the philosophical meaning, in regard to such questions as the nature of the soul, the future life, the divine personality, etc. It is the 'shadowed hint' on such points which

I think would more than anything else cause perplexity to the ordinary reader.

The following are some of the passages in which I should take exception to the view put forward by Mr. Bosanquet. P. 42, 'the influence of the Greek poets on the Greeks was more intimate than that of the Bible on us.' The constant use of Homeric quotations as a text for ethical discussions has naturally led people to compare Homer with the Bible; but when we speak of an 'intimate influence,' where are the signs of this to be found? Plato himself asks in this very book (599 D foll.), What community, what man, was ever made better by Homer? and we might ask, What life has ever been moulded on any of the Homeric characters, as thousands have been moulded on the characters presented in the N. T.? Where is the St. Francis or the Luther, the John Bunyan, or John Howard of the Homeric tradition? Christendom with all its vices and virtues has sprung from the Gospel mustard seed; would the history of Greece have been materially affected if Homer had never lived? P. 398, 'the Greek dramatist, though limited in the range of his passion, almost shocks a reader trained upon Shakespeare, by the violence of his recriminations and the ingenuousness of his lamentations.' Can it really be maintained that there is more violence, say, in the *Agamemnon* or *Oedipus of Colonus* than in *King Lear*? Mr. Bosanquet himself tells us elsewhere (p. 137) that 'in Greek art of the great time no characteristic is more striking than sober-mindedness.' P. 384, commenting on 597 B, he says, '*Nature* in Greek philosophy is never far removed from the meaning of the corresponding verb, *to be born, to grow*,' and he proposes to render it by *evolution* taken in a general sense. Thus he translates *μία μὲν (κλίνη) ἢ ἐν τῇ φύσει οὕσα ἦν φαίμεν ἂν θεὸν ἐργάσασθαι* by the words 'one is that which evolution has produced, which we should say, I suppose, was the workmanship of God,' and just below

*εἴτε τις ἀνάγκη ἐπὶ μὴ πλεόν ἢ μίαν ἐν τῇ φύσει ἀπεργάσασθαι αὐτὸν κλίνην, οὕτως ἐποίησε μίαν μόνον αὐτὴν ἐκείνην ὃ ἐστι κλίνη*, by 'whether it was that God was precluded from bringing to pass more than one bed in the course of evolution, he made accordingly one only, that very self of a bed, which is what a bed is.' Yet again, he translates *βουλόμενος εἶναι ὄντως κλίνης ποιητὴς ὄντως οὕσης...μίαν φύσει αὐτὴν ἐφύσεν* by the words 'wishing to be really the maker of bed in its real being... he grew it as a unity by course of nature'—adding, 'here again "evolved it by evolution" would be nearer the thought.' I must say the use of the term evolution in such passages seems to me productive only of confusion. However loosely understood, it must surely imply that the thing evolved is the last in a series; but Plato's 'idea' precedes and underlies all concrete existence. It may of course be said that the perfect realization of this divine idea, though *πρῶτον ἀπλῶς*, is the last stage in the process of evolution, but such a thought is inconsistent with the passages quoted. I think too that Mr. Bosanquet exaggerates the etymological force of *φύσις*, which may be used of the unchanging *ἐν* of Parmenides as well as of the 'dynamical' systems of the Ionic school. P. 386, commenting on 597 E, 'the tragedian is by nature a third from the King and from Trueness,' he adds, 'this seems to bring the imitator, as such, to the level of the oligarchical man... But Plato wants to bring down the tragedian to the level of the tyrannical man, and apparently, so far, the argument is a first approximation.' The same reference to the tyrant is made on p. 387 in regard to the painter. I have explained in the preceding review how I think this passage should be taken. The assumption that there is an allusion to the tyrant of ix. 587 C seems to me to be superfluous and to lead to great confusion.

J. B. MAYOR.

#### MEYER AND NUTT'S VOYAGE OF BRAN.

*The Voyage of Bran to the Land of the Living*, edited with translation by KUNO MEYER. With an Essay upon the Irish Vision of the Happy Otherworld and the Celtic Doctrine of Rebirth, by ALFRED NUTT. Section I. The Happy Otherworld. London: Nutt. 1895. 10s. 6d. net.

It is pretty generally agreed that man had not, to start with, any conception of a state of future blessedness; and yet the Hindoos by the sixth century B.C., and the Egyptians a good deal earlier, had developed a very elaborate belief in future rewards and punishments and very vivid ideas of