

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](#)



Aristotle *Ethics* I. 6

R. G. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 01 / February 1904, pp 17 - 17

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209074, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209074

How to cite this article:

R. G. Bury (1904). Aristotle *Ethics* I. 6. The Classical Review, 18, pp 17-17 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209074

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

possible, though we should look for it usually in a more compressed style, such as that of Aristotle. *Anal. Post.* i. 24, 86A 12 for instance illustrates it: ὁ δὲ τὴν καθόλου (ἀποδείξιν) ἔχων οἶδε καὶ τὸ κατὰ μέρος· οὗτος δὲ τὸ καθόλου οὐκ οἶδεν, where οὗτος means the man who has to do with (in this case the man who knows) τὸ κατὰ μέρος, and does not refer to τὸ κατὰ μέρος itself. The meaning

of παρὰ τὸν χρόνον is that time may bring facts to light, calm angry feelings, &c.

16 Should ὃν be added to help the construction of παροπτεόν? I should incline to αὐτὸν <ὃν>.

23 Should δῶτε be δώσετε (after παραφυλάξετε ὅπως)?

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ARISTOTLE *ETHICS* I. 6.

THE passage in *Eth. Nic.* A 6 which mentions τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον presents a well-known difficulty in interpretation because of its seeming contradiction to a passage in *Met.* M 6. The texts are these:—

E.N. A 6. 1096^a 17 οἱ δὲ κομίσαντες τὴν δόξαν ταύτην οὐκ ἐποιοῦν ἰδέας ἐν οἷς τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον ἔλεγον, διόπερ οὐδὲ τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἰδέαν κατεσκευάζον.

Met. M 6. 1080^b 11 οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀμφοτέρους φασὶν εἶναι τοὺς ἀριθμούς, τὸν μὲν ἔχοντα τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον τὰς ἰδέας, τὸν δὲ μαθηματικὸν παρὰ τὰς ἰδέας καὶ τὰ αἰσθητά, καὶ χωριστοὺς ἀμφοτέρους τῶν αἰσθητῶν.

Various methods of reconciling these statements have been suggested, as may be seen in the full discussions of Zeller and Sussemihl. Now that Bonitz and others have clearly proved that the 'Before and After' was a technical term in the Ideal arithmetic to indicate the relation of the factor (τὸ γεννῶν) to the product (τὸ γεννώμενον), the *metaphysics* passage by itself is quite explicable and does not require emendation, as Trendelenburg supposed. The difficulty lies rather in the *Ethics*. Three methods of solution have been proposed: (1) Trendelenburg and Brandis hold that the sense of τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον in *E.N.* A is different from that in *Met.* M, viz., numerical, not notional, order. (2) Sussemihl and Bonitz (on *Met.* B 3) hold that the sense of the phrase in *E.N.* is wider and less definite than in *Met.* M. (3) Zeller maintains that the sense is the same in both passages, viz. to denote Ideal, logical sequence. The only important discussion of the point by an English scholar is, so far as I know, that by Mr. Stewart ('*Ethics*' *ad loc.*). He sides against Zeller. 'I agree with Bonitz and Schwegler that the μαθηματικοὶ ἀριθμοὶ are intended in *Met.* B 3. 999^a 6. If so the presumption is strong that they are intended in *E.E.* i. 8. 1218^a 1, and if in the

latter passage then in *E.N.* i. 6. 2.' And as to the use of the term in *Met.* M 6, he remarks: 'When the εἰδητικοὶ ἀριθμοὶ equally with the μαθηματικοὶ ἀρ. are described as involving πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον (*Met.* M 6. 1080^b 12) the description is to be taken as one awkwardly transferred from the ἀριθμητικοὶ ἀριθμοὶ, which are not independent entities, to entities which, though called ἀριθμοὶ, are yet regarded as independent of one another.' Burnet (*ad loc.*) also appears to agree with the view that it is the 'priority and posteriority' of numerical series which is meant. To this interpretation I cannot assent. I have no doubt that Zeller is right in interpreting the phrase in all these places as belonging to the Ideal arithmetic and denoting the γέννησις of Ideal Numbers. The *Ethics* passage, as Stewart and others have observed, cannot be dissociated from that in *Met.* B 999^a 1 ff. Into the discussion of the latter passage I cannot here enter; but my belief is that, rightly interpreted, it proves τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον to refer to logical (κατ' εἶδος) production and sequence. The view there stated is, as I understand it, that so long as the process (γέννησις) which involves πρ. κ. ὕστερον is going on we have not yet arrived at an εἶδος proper: this we do only when that process comes to its term in ἀπομόν τι. 'Ἀριθμός, e.g., is divisible into a variety of εἶδη, and hence does not constitute in itself an ἰδέα.

Accordingly the sense of our passage, *E.N.* A 6, will be: 'The Idealists did not view the higher (logically soluble) genera as Ideas, wherefore they formed no (single, generic) Idea of the numbers' (i.e. of the εἶδη-ἀριθμοὶ). This is similar in effect to Zeller's explanation, but he appears to construe the argument in *Met.* B somewhat differently.

R. G. BURY.

C