

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Classics

From the Renaissance to the nineteenth century, Latin and Greek were compulsory subjects in almost all European universities, and most early modern scholars published their research and conducted international correspondence in Latin. Latin had continued in use in Western Europe long after the fall of the Roman empire as the lingua franca of the educated classes and of law, diplomacy, religion and university teaching. The flight of Greek scholars to the West after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 gave impetus to the study of ancient Greek literature and the Greek New Testament. Eventually, just as nineteenth-century reforms of university curricula were beginning to erode this ascendancy, developments in textual criticism and linguistic analysis, and new ways of studying ancient societies, especially archaeology, led to renewed enthusiasm for the Classics. This collection offers works of criticism, interpretation and synthesis by the outstanding scholars of the nineteenth century.

The Politics of Aristotle

William L. Newman (1834–1923) published Volume 3 of *The Politics of Aristotle* in 1902. It contains his reconstructed text of books 3-5 with critical notes, commentary, and an introduction to the manuscript sources. Newman's reconstructed text is based on the edition of Susemihl (1872) and his own fresh collations of a number of manuscripts, including MS. Phillipps 891 (z), which contains William of Moerbeke's Latin translation. Newman's cautious text, always supported by extensive manuscript evidence, was widely regarded as an improvement on Bekker's more conjectural 1837 version. Newman's detailed commentary was highly praised and has been used for over a century by students of the *Politics*. As a scholar and pedagogue Newman had a significant impact on nineteenth-century classical studies. His four-volume edition of the *Politics* stands as a monument of Victorian scholarship and will continue to be read and studied by scholars and students of Aristotle.



Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.



The Politics of Aristotle

With an Introduction, Two Prefatory Essays and Notes Critical and Explanatory

VOLUME 3: TWO ESSAYS; BOOKS III, IV AND V - TEXT AND NOTES

EDITED BY W.L. NEWMAN





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paolo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108011297

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2010

This edition first published 1902 This digitally printed version 2010

ISBN 978-1-108-01129-7 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.



THE

POLITICS OF ARISTOTLE

NEWMAN

VOL. III. a*



Zondon
HENRY FROWDE, M.A.



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.



THE

POLITICS OF ARISTOTLE

WITH AN INTRODUCTION, TWO PREFATORY ESSAYS

AND NOTES CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY

EΥ

W. L. NEWMAN, M.A.

HON. LITT.D. CAMBRIDGE

FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, AND FORMERLY READER IN ANCIENT HISTORY

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

VOLUME III

TWO ESSAYS
BOOKS III, IV, AND V—TEXT AND NOTES

[All rights reserved]



PREFACE

TO THE THIRD AND FOURTH VOLUMES.

My first words must be words of regret. The lamented death of Professor Susemihl not many months ago, which no one deplores more than I do, leaves a great gap in the ranks of Aristotelian scholars. His learning, his industry and powers of work his thoroughness, and his acuteness will long be missed. The students of Aristotle's writings have abundant cause to be grateful to him, and none more so than myself. Even when I have differed from him most, I have always found his views suggestive and instructive. It was from him that I first learnt what the close study of a work of Aristotle's meant.

Of the friends who gave me assistance in the revision of the proofs of my first two volumes three—Mr. Alfred Robinson, Mr. R. L. Nettleship, and Mr. Evelyn Abbott—are, to my deep regret, no more. I have especially often missed the valued help of Mr. Alfred Robinson, whose death several years ago was a great loss to many besides myself.

Owing to weak health, the Warden of Wadham, Mr. G. E. Thorley, has, unfortunately for me, been unable to give me the assistance which he kindly gave me in the revision of the proofs of the first two volumes. Professor Bywater's suggestions have been but few—far fewer than I could have wished—but, on the other hand, I have gained a new and very valuable ally in Mr. Herbert Richards, whose Greek scholarship needs no



iv PREFACE.

commendation from me, and who has most kindly found time to peruse all the proofs of the explanatory notes contained in the third and fourth volumes and to give me the benefit of his comments on them, which have been, I need not say, of great use to me, though I am alone responsible for the views expressed in this work. The references in the General Index under the name of Mr. Richards will suffice to show how many valuable suggestions I owe to him. For emendations of the text and transpositions not explicitly attributed to him I am responsible.

In five or six of the Additions and Corrections to Vols. I, II, and III placed at the end of Vol. III I have profited by some remarks on my commentary on the first two Books kindly sent me by Prof. Robinson Ellis in 1888 shortly after its appearance.

To all who have assisted me with information or suggestions in the correction of the proofs, and among them to the readers of the Press, my best thanks are due.

To Mr. F. G. Kenyon I am greatly indebted for the collation of MS. Harl. 6874 which I publish in an Appendix to my third volume. Many students have had cause to testify to his unvarying kindness and readiness to assist, and I can add my emphatic testimony to theirs.

I have not carried my collation of the Politics in O¹ (MS. 112, Corpus Christi College, Oxford) beyond the first two Books, but I have completed my collation of MS. Phillipps 891 (z), a manuscript of William of Moerbeke's Latin Translation which, as will be seen from my critical notes (see for instance those on 1306 a 24 and 1315 b 31), occasionally offers excellent readings, found in no other MS. of the Latin Translation hitherto collated. It is throughout akin to a, though it sometimes differs from a, but the original reading of a has often been erased by a corrector, and where this has happened, the original



PREFACE.

v

reading of z commonly remains intact and furnishes a probable clue to the original reading of a. I have again to thank the owner of the Phillipps Library, Cheltenham, for giving me every facility for the collation of this MS.

A list of the symbols and abbreviations used in the work will be found at the end of the fourth volume.

In my third and fourth volumes I have been able to refer to the English translation by Messrs. Costelloe and Muirhead of the volume of Zeller's Philosophie der Griechen which relates to Aristotle, and to the English translation by Messrs. Brooks and Nicklin of the first volume of Gilbert's Handbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer. The first volume of Gerth's edition of the Syntax of Kühner's Greek Grammar did not appear till my revision of the proofs of the third volume was almost completed. My references to Dittenberger's Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum are for a similar reason mostly to the first edition. The references in the first two volumes to Meisterhans, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften are to the first edition of the work, those in the third and fourth to the second edition, published in 1888.

November, 1901.



CONTENTS.

			PA	GF
On the Manuscripts of the Politics and	CHE	Lat	IN	
TRANSLATION OF WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE. II	•	•		vii
On the Contents of the Third, Fourth (Sevi	ENTH), A	ND	
Fifth (Eighth) Books		•	. xx	vi
Text of Book III	•			1
Text of Book IV (VII)			• ,	34
Text of Book V (VIII)			. (69
CRITICAL NOTES			. :	85
Notes to Book III			. I	2 9
Notes to Book IV (VII)			. 30	07
Notes to Book V (VIII)				99
APPENDICES :			•,	
APPENDIX A. Collation of Brit. Mus. MS. Harl. 687	, ,		_	
•	-	•	_	75
APPENDIX B. On the use of Hyperbaton in the Polis		٠		79
APPENDIX C. On the variations in the order of	word	ls in	Π^1	
and Π^2			. 5	81
APPENDIX D. Reminiscences in the Politics of pas	sage	s in 1	the	
writings of Plato and other Greek authors and				
notable men				84
Additions and Corrections to Vols. I, II, and II	т Т	•	_	
TIDDITIONS MAD CORRECTIONS TO VOLS. 1, 11, AND 11	T	•	• 5	91



ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE POLITICS AND THE LATIN TRANS-LATION OF WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE. II.

THE following remarks are in continuation of those contained in vol. ii. p. xli sqq. My object in them has especially been to study the characteristics of the two families into which the MSS. of the Politics fall and the errors to which they are most liable, and also to throw light on the methods of translation adopted in the vetus versio, in the hope that these inquiries may help us to discover the true reading in the many cases in which the MSS. of the two families offer different readings.

It has long been observed (see vol. ii. p. lvii) that the Omissions MSS. of the first family (Π^1) are prone to omit both sentences and words. These omissions occur less often in some Books than in others. They are less numerous in the Sixth (old Fourth), the Seventh (old Fifth), and the Eighth (old Sixth) than in the other Books. Very few omissions occur between 1326 b and 1330 a (inclusive of these columns), none in 1332 b and 1333 a, 1334 a, 1338 a, and 1340 a.

Sentences are omitted in Π^1 owing to a similarity of ending in 1253 b 25, 1275 a 28, 1287 b 38, 1337 a 29, b 25, and 1299 a 8, owing to a similarity of the beginning in 1324 b 28 and 1311 b 37, and for no clear reason in 1275 a 11 and 1331 a 21.

Single words are still more often omitted in Π^1 , and



viii ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE

especially small words, as I have pointed out in Class. Rev. 7. 305 (1893). Out of 184 omissions in Π^1 117 are omissions of words of one syllable. 'If I do not err, rai is omitted in Π^1 twenty-four times in the course of the Politics, $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ eight and $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ nine times, $\tau \iota s$ and its parts six times, elvat five times, av five times, and ex thrice. M's P1 omit the article thirty-five times, and τ_{ϵ} eight times, and very possibly Γ did the like, though of this we cannot be sure, for the Vetus Interpres seldom renders $\tau \epsilon$, and, writing in Latin, of course seldom renders the article' (Class. Rev. ibid.). Π^1 are particularly prone to omit $\tilde{\eta}$, $\kappa a l$, and the article, where these small words are repeated near together. See as to 1/1268 a 6, 1282 a 17, 1324 b 30, 1298 b 32, and 1305 a 32 (it is in these passages only that $\mathring{\eta}$ is omitted in Π^1); as to $\kappa \alpha i$ 1253 a 1, 25, 1255 a 5, 1259 b 31, 1260 b 17, 1263 a 23, 1264 a 16, 1317 b 6; as to the article 1265 a 12, 1266 b 3, 1268 a 17, 1269 a 38, 1272 b 28, 1279 a 34, 1282 a 40, 1285 a 6, 1325 a 8, 1331 b 5, 8, 1332 a 22, 1316 a 36.

Nor is it only sentences and words that Π^1 are apt to omit. These MSS. often omit syllables, mostly the first or last syllables of words—the first in 1262 a 30, 1273 a 10. 1283 a 11 (here, however, the αν- of ανισότητα is omitted because πâσαν precedes), 1285 b 36, 1342 b 32, and 1298 a 31; the last in 1268 b 16, 1276 b 20, 1278 b 40, 1283 b 20, 1287 b 19, 1335 b 35, and 1315 a 15. In 1336 b 20 and 1300 b 28 the first two syllables are omitted in Π^1 . 1335 b 4 and 1317 a 36 a syllable or more than a syllable is omitted from the middle of the word. The first letter of a word is clearly omitted in II1 in 1324 b 30 and 1315 b 18, and probably in 1265 b 19, 1297 b 7, and 1320 a 29; the last letter often disappears, especially when it is a ν or s (see 1255 a 39, 1265 b 21, 1267 b 40, 1337 b 41, 1297 a 17, 1300 a 32, 1308 b 25, and 1309 a 31). On the other hand, two or three words are repeated in Π^1 in 1333 b 38 and 1297 a 24.

Omissions, Many omissions occur in Π^2 also, and some of them are etc. in Π^2 . omissions of a sentence or of more sentences than one.



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. ix

Such omissions occur in 1334 a 37, 1337 b 16-20, 34-35, 1298 a 6, 1301 a 30-31, 1307 b 32-34, but they are easily explained, for they are caused by a similarity of ending. In 1292 b 32, if Π^2 are wrong in omitting the sentence omitted, they have not this excuse. In 1336 b 18 the words omitted by Π² are probably rightly omitted. Omissions of two words occur in 1285 b 16 (αὶ πάτριοι), 1326 b 32 $(\tau \delta \nu \ \tilde{o} \rho \sigma \nu)$, and 1335 a 37 $(\delta \epsilon \hat{i} \ \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota)$: at least it seems likely that Π^2 are wrong in omitting these words. Omissions of a single word occur in 1259 a 37 ($\mu \ell \rho \eta$), 1276 a 33 $(\tilde{\epsilon}\theta\nu\sigma)$, 1288 b 16 $(\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\sigma\nu)$, 27 $(\tilde{a}\gamma\alpha\theta\delta\nu)$, 1306 a 6 $(\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\theta\tilde{\nu}s)$, and perhaps in 1304 b 6, where altial may have dropped out after ai. Omissions of small words, and especially of καί and the article, are frequent in Π^2 , though not nearly as frequent as in Π^1 . Omissions of a syllable occur in Π^2 in 1294 b 26 (ἄδηλος for διάδηλος), 1314 b 7 (δόξει for δόξειεν), and 1320 a 38 (συναθροίζων Π^1 , αθροίζων Π^2). It is not often that Π^2 can clearly be shown to omit a letter.

We note in Π^2 a certain tendency to substitute o for ω (e. g. in 1269 a 23, 1274 b 13, 1286 a 37, 1294 b 38, 1302 b 6, and 1317 a 39), and these MSS. substitute ov for ω in 1273 a 9 and 1314 a 18, and ω for ov in 1301 a 38 and 1307 a 38.

In five passages Π^2 have the aorist infinitive, while Π^1 (or at any rate M^8 P^1 , for the reading of Γ is uncertain) have the present infinitive. These passages are 1260 b 36, 1267 a 35, 1284 a 5, 1332 b 1, and 1317 a 36.

Some errors in the MSS. go back to an early date; thus Errors of the errors of $\phi\iota\Lambda\iota\iota\iota$ for $\phi\iota\Delta\iota\iota\iota$ in Π^1 (1271 a 27, 1272 a 2, tion of b 34), of $O\iota\sigma\iota\iota\iota$, $Ov\sigma\iota\iota\iota$ for $Ov\sigma\iota\iota\iota$, $Ov\sigma\iota\iota\iota$ in Π^1 (1285 b 10, early date 16), and of $\Delta\epsilon\iota$ for 'A $\epsilon\iota$ in Π (1296 b 7) no doubt originated wise. in days when uncials were in use.

Errors shared by all the MSS. and the Vetus Interpres must also have originated early. Under this head fall—

1274 b 7, ἐπίσκεψω for ἐπίσκηψω
1275 b 39, καὶ for κᾶν
1276 b 9, λέγοιμεν for λέγομεν (or has ᾶν been omitted?)



 \mathbf{x}

Cambridge University Press 978-1-108-01129-7 - The Politics of Aristotle, Volume 3 Edited by W. L. Newman Frontmatter More information

ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE

1278 a 34, αὐτῶν for ἀστῶν (αὐτῶν ΓΠ, but ἀστῶν Vat. Pal. and Codex Hamilton)

1280 b 4, ἀδικήσωσιν for ἀδικήσουσιν

1287 a 4, βασιλείας for πολιτείας (Julian seems to have read βασιλείας: see critical note)

1324 b 37, δεσπόζον for δεσποστόν

1327 a 21, πολεμίους for πολέμους

32, ὑπάρχον for ὑπάρχοντα

1337 a 1, καλῶς for κακῶς

1296 a 9, πολιτειῶν for πολιτῶν

1300 a 2, ἢ ἡ μισθὸς for ἢ μισθοῦ

1306 a 30, σάμον for σῖμον

1317 b 41, ἐπὶ for ἔτι.

Errors which we find in all extant MSS., though they were probably not present in the Greek text used by the Vetus Interpres, will also be of early date. Under this head fall—

1260 b 41, ἰσότης for εἶς ὁ τῆς 1266 b 2, δὴ or δὲ for δ' ἤδη 1278 b 20, περὶ for παρὰ 1283 a 7, ὑπερέχειν for ὑπερέχει.

Confusions of letters.

The mistakes which have given rise to these erroneous readings are mistakes easily made, and they frequently recur in the MSS. of the Politics. We often note a confusion of ϵ and η (as in 1274 b 7), of ι and $\epsilon\iota$ (as in 1260 b 41), of ω and ov (as in 1280 b 4), of $\pi a \rho a$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ (as in 1278 b 201), of $\pi \delta \lambda is$, $\pi \delta \lambda i \tau \eta s$, and $\pi \delta \lambda i \tau \epsilon ia$ (as in 1296 a 9), of πολέμους and πολεμίους (as in 1327 a 21). For the interchange of κάν and καί reference may be made to 1282 b 8 and 1290 a 1, for that of o and oi in 1276 b 9 to 1271 a 40 and to Vat. Pal. in 1275 b 10, and for that of καλώς and κακῶs to 1294 a 7, while the change of ἀστῶν into αὐτῶν, of Σίμον into Σάμον, and of ἔτι into ἐπί needs no explanation. The substitution of ὑπάρχον for ὑπάρχοντα is probably due to the omission of a τ over the last syllable of $i\pi d\rho \chi o\nu$. That of δεσπόζον for δεσποστόν appears to point to a confusion of $\sigma\tau$ and ζ . The erroneous readings in the four

¹ This error may probably be due to the misreading of a contraction.



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. хi

remaining passages (1287 a 4, 1300 a 2, 1266 b 2, 1283 a 7) are easily explainable.

Among other confusions of letters which are of frequent occurrence in the Politics may be mentioned those of a with at (1290 b 19, 1309 b 37, 1318 a 3, 1322 b 37), of at with or (1268 a 11, 1274 b 14, 1285 a 24, b 5, 1339 a 1. 1294 a 37, 1313 b 39), of av with ov (1274 a 4, 1280 a 29, 1338 a 31), of ois with ovs (1292 b 36, 1309 b 14) and perhaps with ων (1272 a 29, b 16, 1302 b 30), of a with ευ, which occurs in 1288 a 15 not only in Π^2 , but also in Vat. Pal., and of η with $\epsilon \iota$ and o with ω and ov, which are too common to need illustration.

The variations of reading hitherto noticed have been due Errors in to errors of transcription, but many variations of reading in the MSS. arising the MSS. are evidently due not to this cause, but to the from the occasional use in the MSS. copied by the scribes, or perhaps biguous in the archetype, of ambiguous contractions or contractions contraceasily misread or misinterpreted. Just as in the first the like. of the four handwritings of the papyrus of the $A\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ Πολιτεία o written above the line stands indiscriminately for -oι -oν -oν -oιs and -oνs (see Sandys, 'Aθ. Πολ. p. xxxvi), so in the MSS. from which the existing MSS. of the Politics were copied the terminations of words, and especially of common words like the cases of autós and outos, were probably often represented by ambiguous contractions.

In 1337 a 28, where the true reading is αὐτὸν, Ms has ἀν with τ added over it, and it is very likely that the Vetus Interpres found the same contraction in the Greek text used by him and took it to represent αὐτῶν, for his rendering is ipsorum. The next word in the same line is variously given by $P^3 \Pi^3$ as $a \partial \tau o \partial v$, by M^s as $a \partial \tau \hat{\omega}$, and by ΓP^1 as αὐτῶ, the fact probably being that the writers of all these MSS. had before them an ambiguous contraction (perhaps $a\hat{v}$ with τ over it). So in 1312 b 9 P^{2.3} have $a\hat{v}$ with τ over it, and the other MSS. make more or less successful attempts to interpret this contraction, Γ P1 having αὐτη̂s rightly, M^e αὐτη̂s, P⁴ Ald. αὐτοῦ, and so forth. The same



xii ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE

thing holds of ovros. In 1297 a 1 Ms has τ ov with τ over it, Γ P¹ τ ov τ ω , and the rest rightly τ ovrovs, the ambiguous contraction reproduced in Ms being interpreted with varying success by the rest.

In 1283 b 9 M⁸ has $\hat{v}\pi a \rho'$ with χ added over ρ' , $P^1 \hat{v}\pi \dot{a}\rho \chi \epsilon \iota$, the rest rightly ὑπάρχη: in 1307 b 12 Ms has χειροτονησαν with τ over a and P1 χειροτονήσαντας, the true reading being χειροτουήσουτα: in 1335 a 27 Ms has πλη with θ' over η , which Vet. Int. perhaps interprets, though wrongly, by his rendering multum: in 1303 b 33 Ms has a symbol for the termination of the word which Vet. Int. renders Estiaeis: in 1309 b 28 P³ has $\pi o i \eta$ with σ over η and M³ pr. P² $\pi o i \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$, the true reading being ποιήσει. It is probably owing to the use of an ambiguous contraction for πάντας that many MSS. have $\pi d\nu v$ in 1286 a 25, and we may explain in a similar way the frequent interchange in the MSS. of πόλις πολίτης and πολιτεία (see for instance Susemihl's apparatus criticus in 1326 b 5, 1304 a 17, and 1318 a 9), and the false reading $\hat{\epsilon}\pi \alpha \imath \nu o \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu$ in place of $\hat{\epsilon}\pi \alpha \imath \nu o \hat{\nu} \sigma \imath \nu$ which we find in Π^1 in 1280 a 1 (cp. 1267 a 25, where Ms has ἐπιθυμοῦ in place of $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu o \hat{\nu} \sigma \iota \nu$, the reading of P^1 , and $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma o \nu \sigma \iota \nu$, the reading of $\Gamma \Pi^2$, and 1258 b 4, where Π^1 have $\epsilon \pi \sigma \rho \iota \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ and Π^2 έπορίσθη). The divergence of the MSS. in 1282 a 27, where P2. 3 etc. have μέγιστον, M8 μέγιστοι, P1. 4 μέγισται, and Γ μέγιστα, may also be thus explained. For other possible instances of the same thing see the passages referred to in vol. ii. p. l, note 2.

That errors may have arisen from this cause at a very early date is clear from the fact that the papyrus of the $A\theta\eta\nu al\omega\nu$ $\Pi o\lambda\iota\tau\epsilon la$ is full of contractions, though, according to Mr. Kenyon (Palaeography of Greek Papyri, p. 92), it is 'highly probable' that it was 'written not very far from the year 90'. If the writers of the MSS. of the Politics which have come down to us, or the writers of the MSS. they copied, have had to any large extent to expand contractions of the kind described above, skill will have been needed by them in the discharge of their function no less than fidelity. We must bear this in mind in reference to



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. xiii

the question of the comparative claims of the two families of MSS. There can be little doubt that they both descend from an archetype in which ambiguous contractions were occasionally, and perhaps frequently, used, and the question evidently arises, which set of copyists, those of the first or those of the second family, was the more successful in expanding these ambiguous contractions. This is a question which it is not easy to answer positively, but the presumption is in favour of the more careful copyists, and, if we may judge by a comparison of omissions, the copyists to whom we owe the MSS. of the second family did their work more carefully than those to whom we owe the MSS. of the first. It would be rash, however, to dogmatize as to the superiority of either of the two families of MSS. in passages which are likely to have been affected by this source of error.

So far we have been concerned with variations of reading Variations of a more or less minute kind. In not a few cases, however, of a less the readings offered by Π^1 diverge widely from those minute offered by Π^2 . The following list comprises most of the more marked and less easily explicable of these divergences:—

```
\Pi^2
BOOK I.
                     \Pi_I
                                          δέ
  1254 a 15, 🐠
  1255 a 24, δλως (Π1 P6 Mb Tb Ls)
                                          ãμα
          32, έξ ἀρχῆς
                                          πανταχοῦ
        b 26, τούτων
                                          τῶν τοιούτων
  1256 b Ι, κομίζονται
                                          πορίζονται
                                          τρίτον
  1258 b 27, τέταρτον
BOOK II.
  1260 b 28, ris (T?)
                                          έν τούτοις δὲ μιμεῖσθαι τὸ ἐν
  1261 b 2, τοῦτο δὲ μιμεῖται τὸ ἐν
                                            μέρει τούς ἴσους εἴκειν (ΟΓ
                μέρει τοὺς ἴσους εἴκειν
                                            οίκεῖν) όμοίους (οτ όμοίως)
                τὸ δ' (τόδ' Γ) ώς όμοίους
                είναι έξ άρχης
                                            τοίς έξ ἀρχής
                                          γὰρ
  1264 b 31, dè
```



xiv	ON THE MANUSCRI	PTS OF THE
	Π^1	Π^2
1265 a 4	, εἰς (Γ?)	πho òs
	, ἔξιν	χρῆσιν
1266 a 37	, ἀναγκαῖον added after εἶναι	ἀναγκαῖον omitted
1267 b 26		κόσμω πολυτελεῖ
1268b 5	, δίκης	κρίσεως
1269 b 21	, τοιοῦτος ἐστίν	φανερός έστι τοιοῦτος ἄν
1271 b 28	, κρῆτες	λύκτιοι
1272 a 35	, ἔκ τινων	έκ τῶν
1273 a 41	, ταύτην ούχ οδόν τε βε-	ταύτην οὐχ οἶόν τ' εἶναι βε-
	βαίως ἀριστοκρατεῖσθαι	βαίως ἀριστοκρατικὴν πολι-
	την πολιτείαν	τείαν
Book III.		
1281 a 17	, δεῖ (Γ?)	χρη
	, σπουδαΐα	δίκαια
1282 a 32		μεγάλων
	, διορίσαι	δηλώσαι
1285 a 12,	γὰρ	γοῦν (οὖν Ρ⁴)
	πάντας Π¹ P4	πάνυ
1287 a 31,	φθείρει οτ διαφθε ί ρει	διαστρέφει
Book IV (VII).	
1326 a 21,	μερῶν	μορίων
25,	οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ	άλλὰ μὴν
1328 a 14,	νομίζουσι	ύπολαμβάνουσι
ь 15,	å (r?)	ών
1329 a 20,		γένος
ь 13,		γὰρ
1330 b 14,	-	τοιαύτην
	οἰκείων	<i></i> lδίων
	τὸν τοιοῦτον	τοῦτον τὸν
1335 b 4,		παιδονομίας
	$\delta \epsilon \hat{i} (\Gamma ?)$	χρη
	καὶ	$\hat{\eta}$
1336 b 20,	θετέον (θετητέον Ms)	νομοθετητέον
Воок V (V	III).	

περὶ

_έλέχθη

b 22, εἴρηται (Γ?)

1337 a 36, διὰ



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. XV

Π_{I}	Π^2
1339 b 21, γὰρ	γοῦν
1340 b 7, δè	γὰρ
1341 b 1, ἴαμβοι	σ ο μβύκα ι
1342 b 32, διάνοιαν	παιδείαν οἷον
Book VI (IV).	
1289 a 5, 7	$ au o \hat{v}$
8, γάρ οτ γάρ δή	$\delta \hat{\epsilon}$
1292 a 17, ὁ δημος οὖτος	ό τοιοῦτος δῆμος
1293 a 21, † oi	εὶ μὲν
24, πολλῶν	ἄλλων
b 24, ἀποδοθείσας	ἄρτι δηθείσας
1294 a 36, â	ων
1298 b 13, τρόπον	διορισμόν
1300 b 30, παρόντι	παντὶ
Воок VII (V).	
1301 b 26, πανταχοῦ Π¹ P²	πάντων
1308 b 17, οὖτω ρυθμίζειν	οῦτως ἄγειν
1310 b 17, αι τυραννίδες	τῶν τυραννίδων
1315 a 38, ἀφαίρεσιν (Γ?)	παραίρεσιν ΟΓ παραίνεσιν
Воок VIII (VI).	
1317 b 17, τοιούτων	τούτων
1319 a 7, τοις παλαιοίς	τοῖς πολλοῖς
1320 a 4, μηδ'	$\hat{\eta}$
 b 9, τὴν ταραντίνων P¹, τὴν ταραντίνων followed by a lacuna Ms, τὴν ταραντίνων ἀρχήν Γ? 	τὰ ταραντίνων
1321 a 5, μάλιστα	κάλλιστα

Of the above sixty-two divergences twelve are due to Tendency a source of error which—and this has not, I think, been of the MSS., and espendither to pointed out—especially affects the first family of cially of \$\pi^1\$, MSS. I refer to the tendency of these MSS. to introduce word or a word into the text which they repeat from a neighbouring words from a contiline, often the preceding or following line, the word thus guous line.



xvi ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE

repeated sometimes extruding another word from the text and sometimes not doing so. Thus in Π^1 —

in 1255 a 24 $\Hau\mu a$ is displaced by $\Hau \lambda \omega s$ probably repeated from 21; in 1255 a 32 $\pi a \nu \tau a \chi a \hat{v}$ is displaced by $\rau \xi \mathring{\xi} \rau \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ repeated from 30 sq.;

in 1265 a 35 χρησω is displaced by έξω probably repeated from

in 1266 a 37 ἀναγκαῖον is added after εἶναι, being repeated from ἀναγκαίων in the preceding line;

in 1272 a 35 ἐκ τῶν is displaced by ἔκ τινων repeated from the preceding line;

in 1326 a 21 $\mu o \rho i \omega \nu$ is displaced by $\mu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ probably repeated from $\mu \epsilon \rho o s$ in the preceding line;

in 1328 a 14 ὑπολαμβάνουσι is displaced by νομίζουσι repeated from νομίζουσιν in the following line;

in 1329 a 20 γένος is displaced by μέρος perhaps repeated from 23; in 1289 a 5 τοῦ is displaced by η repeated from the preceding line:

in 1298 b 13 διορισμόν is displaced by τρόπον repeated from the preceding line;

in 1320 a 4 η δλιγαρχεῖσθαι is displaced by μηδ' δλιγαρχεῖσθαι repeated from μηδ' δλιγαρχικὸν in 2.

In 1268 b 5 Π^2 appear to fall into a similar error, $\delta i \kappa \eta s$ being displaced in these MSS. by $\kappa \rho i \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ repeated from the preceding line.

Occasionally all the MSS., and not those of the first or second family only, may be reasonably suspected of this error. Thus in 7 (5). 7. 1306 b 39, where all the MSS. except Γ have $\delta\hat{\eta}\lambda o\nu$ $\delta\hat{\epsilon}$ $\kappa a\hat{\iota}$ (Γ omits $\kappa a\hat{\iota}$) $\tau o\hat{\nu}\tau o$ $\hat{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\hat{\eta}s$ $\tau \nu \rho \tau a\hat{\iota}o\nu$ $\tau o \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ $\tau \hat{\eta}s$ $\kappa a\lambda o\nu \mu \epsilon \nu \eta s$ $\epsilon \nu \nu \nu \iota \omega s$, the words $\kappa a\hat{\iota}$ $\tau o\hat{\nu}\tau o$ are probably repeated by mistake from the preceding line. So again it is possible that in 2. 5. 1263 a 13, where almost all the MSS. have $\lambda a\mu \beta \dot{a}\nu o\nu \tau as$, and in 2. 6. 1265 b 2, where all have $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\iota}$ τas $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \iota s$, they have suffered in a similar way, $\lambda a\mu - \beta \dot{a}\nu o\nu \tau as$ being repeated from $\lambda a\mu \beta \dot{a}\nu o\nu \sigma \iota$ in the following line and $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\iota}$ τas $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \iota s$ from $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\iota}$ τas $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \iota s$ in the preceding line. The same thing may have happened to all the MSS. in 2. 7. 1267 a 8, where $\hat{\epsilon}\pi \iota \theta \nu \mu o \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ may have taken the place of $\hat{a}\delta \iota \kappa o \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ through repetition from $\hat{\epsilon}\pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \hat{\iota} a\nu$, 6 (see explanatory note



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. xvii

on 1267 a 5), in 2. 8. 1268 b 1, where $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ may have displaced some other word owing to the presence of $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho - \gamma \rho \hat{\upsilon} \nu \tau as$ in the preceding line, and in 4 (7). 9. 1329 a 14, where $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \iota a \nu$ may be a repetition of $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \iota a \nu$ in 1329 a 12 and may have pushed out some other and more appropriate word (see explanatory note on 1329 a 13).

 Γ Ms are sometimes affected by this cause of error when P^1 escapes. Thus in 2. 6. 1265 b II ållais repeated from ållais in the preceding line has displaced $\pi \lambda \epsilon l \sigma \tau a is$ in Γ Ms, in 4 (7). 4. 1326 a 3 $\beta \epsilon l \lambda \tau i o v$ from the preceding line has displaced $\kappa a l \lambda \iota o v$ in Ms and probably Γ (Vet. Int. melius), and in 4 (7). II. 1330 b 25 $\tau \rho \delta \pi o v$ from the preceding line has displaced $\chi \rho \delta v o v$ in Γ Ms.

The MSS. of the second family are not free from this kind of error, though they have suffered much less from it than those of the first. We have already seen that in 1268 b 5 $\kappa \rho i \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ repeated from the preceding line probably takes the place of $\delta i \kappa \eta s$ in Π^2 . So again in 2. 4. 1262 b 33 Π^2 prefix ϵls to $\tau o u s$ address because ϵls $\tau o u s$ address occurs in the preceding line, and in 6 (4). 14. 1298 b 35 $P^{2\cdot 3}$ add $\tau u s$ $\tau u s$ after u s u

Twelve, then, of the sixty-two variations of reading which Other have been enumerated may be thus accounted for. Five causes to which variothers (1255 b 26, 1330 b 14, 1332 b 40, 1292 a 17, 1317 b ations of 17) are due to an interchange of over and $\tau older variotics$, four the less minutekind (1264 b 31, 1329 b 13, 1340 b 7, 1289 a 8) to an interchange are due. of $\delta \epsilon$ and $\gamma \delta \rho$ (the contractions being somewhat similar), and the eleven following to an interchange of not very dissimilar words—

```
1256 b 1, κομίζονται and πορίζονται
1282 b 5, διορίσαι and δηλῶσαι
1285 a 12
1339 b 21
1287 a 31, διαφθείρει and διαστρέφει
1341 b 1, ἵαμβοι and σαμβύκαι
1293 a 24, πολλῶν and ἄλλων
```

VOL. III.



xviii ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE

1293 b 24, ἀποδοθείσας and ἄρτι ἡηθείσας 1300 b 30, παρόντι and παντὶ 1319 a 7, τοῖς παλαιοῖς and τοῖς πολλοῖς 1321 a 5, μάλιστα and κάλλιστα.

In two other passages (1271 b 28 and 1308 b 17) a gloss has probably displaced the true reading in Π^1 , and in three (1335 b 4, 1336 b 20, and 1342 b 32) one or more syllables have been omitted in Π^1 . The variations of reading in 1267 b 26 and 1269 b 21 are probably due to the tendency of Π^1 to omit words. In 1286 a 25 the substitution of πάνυ for πάντας, and in 1301 b 26 that of πάντων for πανταχού, may well be due to ambiguous contractions. 1258 b 27 the substitution of τέταρτον for τρίτον, though wrong, is natural enough, $\tau \rho i \tau \sigma \nu$ having occurred in 25. 1330 b 21 the substitution in Π^1 of olkelwy for $l\delta l\omega y$ is explained in the critical note on the passage. In 1282 a 32 the interchange of μειζόνων and μεγάλων resembles that of πλείουs and πολλούs in 1290 b 2, that of βέλτιστον and βέλτιον in 1333 b 7, and that of φανερωτάτη and φανερωτέρα in 1293 b 32. As to 1261 b 2 and 1273 a 41 something has already been said in vol. ii. pp. 234 sq. and lv. The following variations of reading remain, sixteen in number:-

$\Pi_{\rm I}$	Π^2
1254 a 15, ὧν	ર્ક
1260 b 28, τίς (Γ?)	ή
1265 a 4, els (Γ ?)	πρὸς
1281 a 17 1335 b 28 δεί (Γ?)	$\chi ho \dot{\eta}$
1281 a 28, σπουδαία	δίκαια
1326 a 25, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ	ἀλλὰ μὴν
1328 b 15 1294 a 36	ών
1335 b 39, кай	$\hat{oldsymbol{\eta}}$
1337 a 36, διά	περί
b 22, εἴρηται (Γ?)	ϵ λ $\epsilon\chi heta\eta$
1293 a 21, 🕯 oi	εὶ μὲν
1310 b 17, αἱ τυραννίδες	τῶν τυραννίδων
1315 a 38, ἀφαίρεσιν (Γ?)	παραίρεσιν οτ παραίνεσιν



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. xix

 Π^1 Π^2

1320 b 9, την ταραντίνων P1, την τὰ ταραντίνων ταραντίνων followed by a lacuna Ms, την ταραντίνων άρχήν Γ?

In seven of these passages (1260 b 28, 1265 a 4, 1281 a 17, 1335 b 28, 1281 a 28, 1335 b 39, 1337 b 22) words not themselves similar, but of similar meaning are interchanged, and in an eighth (1315 a 38) the interchange of αφαίρεσιν and παραίρεσιν may well be the result of accident. The divergences in the remaining eight (1254 a 15, 1326 a 25, 1328 b 15, 1294 a 36, 1337 a 36, 1293 a 21, 1310 b 17, 1320 b 9) are less easily explained.

A certain number of variations of reading are probably Variations due, as has been said already in vol. ii. p. liii, to grammarian due to revisers of the text. Thus, while both families use the rian revisers nominative μόναρχος (1292 a 11, 15 and 1313 b 39), not of the text. μονάρχης, Π^2 use the oblique cases of μόναρχος, Π^1 almost always those of $\mu o \nu d\rho \chi \eta s^{-1}$. So again M⁸ P¹ and possibly Γ have $\delta \psi \circ \pi \circ \iota \eta \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ in 1255 b 26, while Π^2 have $\delta \psi \circ \pi \circ \iota \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$, and in 1256 a 6 Ms P1 and possibly Γ have κερκιδοποιητική, while Π^2 have κερκιδοποιική. In 1289 b 32, again, $M^{g} P^{1}$ and possibly Γ have $don \lambda o v$, $\Pi^{2} dvon \lambda o v$. differences of reading seem to be due to intentional correction, but others which are at first sight of a similar nature are probably due to accidental causes. Thus Π^1 inherit the form $\phi_i \lambda i \tau_i a$ and Π^2 the form $\phi_i \delta i \tau_i a$, the rival forms originating at the outset no doubt in the resemblance of Λ and Δ . It is probably also owing to accident that in 1280 a 29 Π^2 have εἰσενέγκαντα and M^8 P^1 (we cannot be certain as to Γ) εἰσενεγκόντα, in 1283 b 14 Π^2 δόξαιεν and M^{s} P^{1} δόξειαν, in 1285 a 24 and b 5 Π^{2} πάτριαι and ἐκούσιαί τε καὶ πάτριαι and M⁸ P¹ πάτριοι and ἐκούσιοί τε καὶ πάτριοι, in 1202 b o Π^2 είπαμεν and M⁸ P¹ είπομεν, in 1302 b 4 Π^2 διὰ μικρότητα and M⁸ P¹ διὰ σμικρότητα, in 1307 a 31 Π² ἐδύναντο

¹ In 1312 a 29, however, P¹ has τοι̂ς μονάρχοις with Π², while Γ M⁵ have τοις μονάρχαις. See also Additions and Corrections.

b 2



ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}$

and M^s P^1 ἢδύναντο, and in 1311 b 14 Π^2 vi $\epsilon \hat{\iota}$ and M^s P^1 vi $\hat{\omega}$. It is easy to confuse $a\nu$ and $o\nu$, $a\iota$ and $o\iota$, a and o, ϵ and η . If in 1338 b 23 Ms P^1 Ls Ald. have $\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\rho\iota\kappa\grave{\alpha}$ and Π^2 (except L^s Ald.) $\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\grave{a}$, we remember that τ and $\tau\rho$ are easily confused, and that in 1336 b 30 Π^2 have $\theta \epsilon \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ and Π^1 $\theta \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \nu$.

When II1 ent readings, Π² are probably to be followed than Π^1 .

In cases in which the two families of MSS. offer different and II- offer differ- readings I am still of opinion, as I have been from the first, that the MSS. of the second family deserve our confidence more often than those of the first. The comparative merits of the readings offered by the two families vary from Book more often to Book, and in no Book does the first family stand the comparison as well as in the Second, yet even there it seems to me that the second family has the advantage. My reasons for so thinking have been given in an article which appeared in the Classical Review in July, 1893 (7. 304 sqq.).

> Even where the readings of the first family receive the support of the Vatican Palimpsest, they are not always to be adopted. This will be evident on a reference to 1287 a 32, b 41, and 1288 a 13.

> It has been pointed out in vol. ii. p. lix that not much weight attaches to readings supported by M8 P1 against the consent of $\Gamma \Pi^2$, or to those supported by ΓM^s against the consent of $P^1 \Pi^2$. On the other hand (and this has not as yet, I think, been pointed out) readings supported by Γ P¹ against the consent of $M^s \Pi^2$ are very often correct. This will be found to be the case in the following passages:—

```
1261 a 14, διελείν Γ P1, διελθείν the rest;
1270 a 13, αὐτῆς Γ P¹, αὐτὴν the rest;
1276 b 33, where I P1 add a sentence missing in the other MSS.
               except that in two it is added by correctors;
1282 a 32, ἄρχουσιν Γ P^1, ἄρχωσιν M^s, ἔχουσιν \Pi^2:
1285 b 22, ώρισμένοις Γ P1, ώρισμένων the rest;
        33, πλειόνων Γ P1, πλείονος the rest;
1327 b 34, om. kai \Gamma P^1, not so the rest;
1334 a 37, \Gamma P1 add a sentence missing in the rest:
1335 b 11, ελευθέρων Γ P1, ελευθερίων the rest:
```



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. xxi

```
1340 b 14, ἔστι Γ, ἐστι Ρ¹, ἔχει the rest;
1341 a 15, κοινῶ Γ Ρ¹, κοινῶνᾶ the rest;
1289 a 17, ἐκάστοις Γ Ρ¹, ἐκάστης the rest;
1290 a 1, δὴ Γ Ρ¹, δεῖ the rest, except correctors in P². ⁴;
1294 b 29, τῶ Γ Ρ¹, τῶν the rest;
1295 b 34, θέλω Γ Ρ¹, θέλων the rest;
1314 a 25, μὲν οὖν Γ Ρ¹, μὲν the rest;
1316 b 1, πολὺ Γ Ρ¹, πολλοὶ the rest;
1320 a 8, φερομένων Γ Ρ¹ (lege φερόμενον), φερόντων the rest;
b 3, ἀφιεμένους Γ Ρ¹, ἐφιεμένους the rest.
```

For passages in which the accentuation is corrected in ΓP^1 see critical note on 1293 a 28. It has already been remarked (vol. ii. p. xliii, note 3) that Demetrius Chalcondylas, the scribe of P1, was a learned scholar and that many of the good readings peculiar to P1 are probably emendations of his, and the question might be asked whether the good readings which P^1 shares with Γ were not suggested to Demetrius by a study of the vetus versio. How far it is likely that Demetrius would study the vetus versio, I am unable to say, but I doubt whether he owes these readings to it, for it is evident from passages like 1280 b 6, where the true reading is διασκοπουσιν and P1 has διακοπουσιν, while Γ M⁸ have διακονοῦσιν, that P¹ has a good independent tradition of its own. In 1297 a 1 and (if Sus.1 is right, for in Sus.2.3.4 the erroneous reading is ascribed to ΓMs) in 1261 b 27 Γ P¹ agree in a false reading which P¹ is not likely to have borrowed from the vetus versio.

In some passages of the Politics the true reading is The true preserved by one MS. only and in not a few by two or reading is often prethree: thus it is preserved by Γ in 1260 b 41, 1266 b 2, served by 1283 a 7 etc., by Γ M⁵ in 1299 a 1, by Γ P⁴ L⁸ in 1299 a 2, by or three Γ Ald. corr. P² in 1332 a 33, by P^{2. 3} Vat. Pal. in 1278 b 30, MSS. only. by P³ and a correction in P² in 1304 b 28, by P⁴ Ald. in 1286 b 33. We sometimes owe the true reading to quite inferior MSS. (e.g. in 1275 b 39, 1284 b 40, 1295 a 28, 1296 b 31, 1308 b 15, 1317 a 12, 1318 b 17, 1320 a 16).

Not a few good readings are due to the Latin translation Emendaof Aretinus (Lionardo Bruni of Arezzo, who was born in Aretinus.



xxii ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE

1369 and died in 1444). They are probably conjectural emendations of his. Among them the following may be mentioned:—

```
1264 a 19, ὖπομενοῦσι (Γ Π ὑπομένουσι);
1337 a 14, παιδεύεσθαι (Γ Π πολιτεύεσθαι);
1339 a 20, ὅπνφ (Γ Π πολιτειῶν);
1296 a 9, πολιτῶν (Γ Π πολιτειῶν);
1299 a 14 (with 'ut videtur, corr.¹ P¹,' says Sus.¹, and corr.¹ P¹
means Demetrius Chalcondylas), πολιτείαις (Γ Π πολιτείαι);
b 36, αὖται αἱ (αὐταὶ αἱ Π², αἱ αὐταὶ Π¹);
1300 b 4, τό τε (the rest τὸ δὲ οτ τότε δὲ οτ τὸ τὲ δὲ);
1311 a 10, τὸ τὸ (the rest τῶ τὸ οτ τῶ);
1317 b 41, ἔτι (Γ Π ἐπὶ).
```

That the Fifth (old Eighth) and the Eighth (old Sixth) Books are incomplete, we have seen already (vol. ii. p. xxix). It is probable that something is wanting at the end of the Seventh (old Fifth) Book also. The question, however, to what extent ordinary lacunae occur in the text of the Politics is one of a different kind. That a small lacuna exists in the best MSS. in 1285 a 19 has already been noticed (vol. ii. p. lxvi). A somewhat larger one appears to occur in $\Gamma\Pi$ in 4 (7). 15. 1334 b 4 after the word $d\rho\epsilon\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ (see explanatory note on 1334 a 41). It seems likely that several omissions occur in the passage 1300 a 23-b 5. Words appear to have fallen out of the text in 1301 a 6, 1307 a 31, and 1320 b 35 also.

Displacement of passages. In two instances the transposition of passages has seemed to me to be called for: I have suggested the transposition of 7 (5). 3. 1303 b 3, στασιάζουσι—7, ὅντες to after στασιάζουσι in 7 (5). 1. 1301 a 39, and of 7 (5). 10. 1312 a 17, μάλιστα δὲ—20, ἐπιθέσεις to after μεθύοντα in 7 (5). 10. 1312 a 6.

Occasional Traces of the handiwork of an editor piecing together traces of an disquisitions originally unconnected appear to be especially handiwork. visible in the Sixth (old Fourth) Book (see explanatory notes on 1289 b 27 and 1290 b 21-24). Prof. W. Christ remarks in the preface to his edition of the Metaphysics of Aristotle (p. xviii), 'Philosophus iis quae chartae iam

Lacunae.



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. xxiii

mandaverat haud contentus nova subinde in margine adiecit, quae qui post auctoris mortem eius libros divulgarunt parum circumspecte primariae orationi intexuisse videntur'. We may perhaps account in this way for the state in which we find the Third and Fourth Chapters of the Sixth (old Fourth) Book (see vol. i. Appendix A and explanatory note on 1289 b 27).

A few remarks may be added to what has already been Remarks said with regard to the translation of the Vetus Interpres on the vetus in vol. ii. p. xli sqq. A further study of this translation has versio. confirmed my impression (see vol. ii. p. lxiv) that he often misread his Greek text; thus for example in 1285 b 7 he renders πορίσαι emerunt, probably misreading it as πρίασθαι, in 1286 a 35 he renders δργισθηναι impetu ferri, misreading it apparently as δρμηθηναι, in 1330 a 11 he appears to misread πάλιν as πᾶσιν, in 1341 b 31 τύπονς as τρόπονς, in 1291 a 11 κομψῶς as κούφως, in 1319 a 24 θυρανλεῖν as θηρεύειν. It would be easy to add many other instances.

It should be pointed out that the Vetus Interpres often uses two different Latin words to render the same Greek word when it is repeated close together; thus in 1338 b 28 he renders τῷ μόνον μὴ πρὸς ἀσκοῦντας ἀσκεῖν eo solum quod ad eos qui non studuerant conabantur, in 1295 b 30 his equivalent for επιθυμοῦσιν is desiderant and in 31 concupiscunt, in 1295 b 32 μήτ' ἐπιβουλεύεσθαι μήτ' ἐπιβουλεύειν is rendered neque insidias patiuntur neque fraudes moliuntur: see also his renderings in 1303 b 14, 15 (διάστασιν), 1304 a 19, 20, 25 (εὐδοκιμῆσαι), 1321 a 21, 22 (καθιστάναι), and several other passages. This is not always so: thus in 1299 b 13 he translates $d\rho\chi ds$ and $d\rho\chi \eta\nu$ occurring in the same line principatus and principatum. On the other hand, he often uses one Latin word in rendering two Greek words occurring close together; thus in 1303 a 35, 36 he translates both εἰσδεξάμενοι and ὑποδεξάμενοι suscipientes, in 1304 a 21-24 he translates both συντονωτέραν and lσχυροτέραν fortiorem, in 1304 b 30, 33 both συστάντες and άθροισθέντες are represented by coadunati, in 1305 a 39, 40 praeses represents



ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE XXIV

προστάτης and praesidem του ἡγεμόνα, and in 1306 a 5, 6 conatus est represents ένεχείρησε and conantur έπιχειρούσι.

In rendering Greek words he often selects, if he can, a Latin word connected in meaning with the Greek; thus his equivalent for δήμευσις is populatio in 1298 a 6, for συμμαχία compugnatio in 1298 a 4, 26, for έλαττουμένου minorata in 1319 a 3, for dorvyestrovas municipales vicinos in 1330a 17.

He sometimes retains the case of the Greek in his rendering, notwithstanding that in Latin it is wrong: so in 1200 b 33 we have populi praeconsiliari for τοῦ δήμου προβουλεύειν, in 1304 a 31 habebat politiae for είχετο της πολιτείας, and in 1304b 11, 12 voluntariorum transmutant politiam and detinent involuntariorum for εκόντων μεταβάλλουσι την πολιτείαν and κατέχουσιν ακόντων: but this he does not always do.

In addition to the inexactnesses in translation mentioned in vol. ii. p. lxiii it may be noted that the Vetus Interpres often renders a verb as passive where it should be rendered as middle¹, and often renders the present tense by the future 2 and a future participle by a present participle 3. He also sometimes renders the singular by the plural 4 and the plural by the singular⁵, the comparative by the positive⁶, the superlative by the positive 7 or the comparative 8, and the positive by the comparative 9 or the superlative 10.

¹ E.g. in 1332 a 27, 1288 b 31, 1289 a 14, 1290 b 4, 1297 b 8, 1298 b 27, 1305 a 16. E.g. in 1281 a 19, 1287 a 32,

1313 b 15, 16.

E. g. in 1291 a 7 and 1298 a 19. E. g. in 1287 a 27 (dant for δίδωσιν), 1307 b 33 (parvae expensae for τὸ μικρὸν δαπάνημα), 1321 a 40 (expensarum for $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ δαπάνης), 1322 a 19 (divisi sunt

for διήρηται).

5 E. g. in 1338 b 11 (speciem for τὰ εἴδη), 1296 a 34, 35 (democratiam and oligarchiam for δημοκρατίας and ολιγαρχίας), 1303 a 14 (vere-cundiam for τας εριθείας), 1310 b 34 (beneficium for everyerias).

⁶ E. g. in 1283 a 35 (generosi for γενναιότεροι), 1287 b 9 (multos for πλείονας), 1331 a 30 (eminenter for έρυμνοτέρως), 1333 b 10 (super-gressivas for πλεουεκτικωτέρας), 1298 a 36 (mediocribus for μετριωτέρων), 1299 b 12 (facile for ρᾶον).

7 E.g. in 1276 a 19 (superficialis for ἐπιπολαιοτάτη).

8 E.g. in 1315 a 26 (ampliori for $\pi\lambda\epsilon i\sigma\tau\eta s$).

9 E.g. in 1330 a 41 (recentiores for εὐχείμεροι), 1293 a 30 (plus for

10 E.g. in 1292 b 29 (necessariissimas for avaykaias).



POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO. II. XXV

Since I wrote in vol. ii. p. lvi that, as Vet. Int. has qui mutaverit in 1269 a 18, he may have found not κινήσαs, but δ κινήσαs in his Greek text, I have discovered that qui mutaverit there probably stands simply for κινήσαs (see critical note on 1340 b 24).

It has already been pointed out (vol. ii. p. lxiv) that the Vetus Interpres sometimes seeks to mend defects in his Greek text by slight conjectural alterations: to the cases already noticed may be added 1284 a 19 (where, finding δοκοῦσι omitted in his Greek text, as in M⁸ P¹, and being consequently unable to make sense of the passage, he translates διώκειν as if it were διώκουσι) and 1329 a 17, where for a similar reason he adds videtur.

Here and there in the MSS. of the vetus versio, as in those of the Politics, words find their way into the text from an adjacent line: thus in Sus. P. 536. 3 quod is wrongly added after aristocratiae, being evidently derived from the following line (see also the readings of a in Sus. pp. 296. 5 and 300. 4). Sometimes two alternative equivalents for a word stand together in the text of the translation: thus in 1283 a 9 two equivalents for $\kappa \rho \epsilon \hat{i} \tau \tau \sigma v$, melior and valentior, both appear in the text; the same thing perhaps happens in 1285 a 10 also, where $\hat{\epsilon} v \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{o} s v \acute{o} \mu \varphi$ is rendered promptus potens lege, the two words promptus and potens being probably alternative renderings of $\hat{\epsilon} \gamma \chi \epsilon \iota \rho o s$.

It is often difficult to decide whether false renderings in the vetus versio are due to error on the part of the translator—for instance, to a misreading or mistranslation of the Greek text—or to corruption in the MSS. of the vetus versio. That they are sometimes due to the latter cause will be seen from the critical note on 1338 a 28. Corruption of the text may be suspected in 1270 a 35, traiciebant (tradebant?) politiam (μετεδίδοσαν τῆς πολιτείας), 1275 a 20, adiectionem (ἔγκλημα: obiectionem?), 1331 a 2, insultus (τὰς πολιορκίας), 1335 a 16, lexatur (ἐπιχωριάζεται), 1305 b 17, invalescens (ἐπιθέμενος), 1318 b 3, permittere (συμπείσαι: persuadere?) and elsewhere.