

τὸν μὲν λέβητος ἐς κύτος χαλκήλατον,  
 <σφαγεῖον Αἰτναῖον γε, πελέκεων γνάθοις  
 ἔσφαξ' ἑταίρων τῶν ἐμῶν, ῥυθμῶ τινι,>  
 τὸν δ' αὖ κτλ.

in which ῥυθμῶ τινι is allowed to contrast with the ἀρρυθμία described in τὸν δ' αὖ κτλ. This also creates a more orderly syntax: ἔσφαξε can be taken anyway only with τὸν μὲν κτλ. For the postponed genitive compare e.g. *El.* 1357–9, *Hel.* 1126–8. For the exegetical γε with a noun in apposition see Denniston, *Greek Particles*, pp. 138 f. Polyphemus' cauldron makes a huge and terrifying σφαγεῖον. The corruption was probably due to the scribe's eye passing from τὸν μὲν to τὸν δέ.<sup>5</sup> He then realized his error and wrote the missing lines in the margin.

Axes were sometimes employed in the sacrifice,<sup>6</sup> though not, so far as I know, for cutting the throat; but (despite 241–2) this is no normal sacrifice. Both axe and cauldron have replaced more civilized instruments.

Brasenose College, Oxford

RICHARD SEAFORD

<sup>5</sup> As Diggle observes (op.cit., p. 48).

<sup>6</sup> e.g. *Il.* 17. 520, *Od.* 3.442.

## A NOTE ON ARISTOTLE, *POLITICS* 1.1

1252<sup>a</sup> 18–23 reads in Ross's text and lineation:

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τὸ σύν-  
 θετον μέχρι τῶν ἀσυνθέτων ἀνάγκη διαφεῖν (ταῦτα γὰρ ἐλά-  
 χιστα μόρια τοῦ παντός), οὕτω καὶ πόλιν ἐξ ὧν σύγκειται 20  
 σκοποῦντες ὁψόμεθα καὶ περὶ τούτων μᾶλλον, τί τε δια-  
 φέρουσιν ἀλλήλων καὶ εἴ τι τεχνικὸν ἐνδέχεται λαβεῖν περὶ  
 ἕκαστον τῶν ῥηθέντων.

Newman ad. loc. regarded it as 'on the whole . . . most probable that both τούτων and ἕκαστον τῶν ῥηθέντων refer to δεσποτικός, οικονομικός, πολιτικός, and βασιλικός', on whose generic differences Aristotle insists so strongly earlier in the chapter; Susemihl and Hicks ad. loc. merely asserted Newman's tentative view dogmatically, and it now seems to have become almost canonical. I think it needs to be challenged.

The crucial word is καὶ in <sup>a</sup>21 (commonly and perhaps justifiably omitted in translation): 'we shall see better about these *as well*, in what respect they differ from each other'. 'As well as what?', we naturally ask. Clearly the answer is the ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις . . . ἐλάχιστα μόρια τοῦ παντός, whose inspection is to be the model (ὥσπερ . . . οὕτω καί) for the examination of the constituent elements of the state (πόλιν ἐξ ὧν σύγκειται σκοποῦντες): οὕτω καὶ πόλιν marks out the state as the particular σύνθετον that is to be analysed in accordance with the general method, and καὶ τούτων correspondingly marks out the parts of this σύνθετον as seen better as a result of the analysis. Just as ταῦτα in <sup>a</sup>19 refers to ἀσυνθέτων, the parts of any σύνθετον, so does τούτων refer to ἐξ ὧν, the elements of which the σύνθετον that is the state is made up. Aristotle's argument and method is thus neat enough, being presented (intendedly or not) in the following form:

A = σύνθετον,

a = ἀσυνθέτων,

α = ταῦτα.

B = πόλις,

b = ἐξ ὧν συγκείται,

β = τούτων.

α and β are references (admittedly for different purposes) to a and b respectively.

If this *schema* is accepted, τούτων are not πολιτικοί etc. but the ἀσύνθετα of an οἰκία and hence of a πόλις (master, slave; man, woman, etc., as discussed in subsequent chapters, especially 1.3 *init.*); a πολιτικός, *qua* πολιτικός, does not qualify as an ἀσύνθετον). Aristotle's explanation is precise and full: and understanding of the 'parts' of the πόλις facilitates understanding of the roles of the πολιτικός etc., because differences in the nature of these roles are in various senses *dependent* on the differences between the 'parts' (see Newman on 13 and on 20 sqq.). This point about the differences between the 'parts' is expressed in ὁψόμεθα καὶ περὶ τούτων μᾶλλον, τί τε διαφέρουσιν ἀλλήλων. To take τούτων as referring to πολιτικοί etc. suppresses this important step in the argument. I translate/paraphrase: '... from an inspection of the parts of the state we shall see better *both* [τε] the differences between these parts too (καὶ 21) [sc. as we do in the case of the ἀσύνθετα of any σύνθετον] and (καὶ 22) whether [as a result of seeing those differences], any systematic knowledge can be acquired about each of the roles mentioned [πολιτικός etc]. As Newman says, ἕκαστον picks up ἕκαστον in <sup>a</sup>10. Τούτων and ἀλλήλων on the one hand, and ῥηθέντων on the other, thus have different references, as a natural reading of the Greek indeed suggests.

This last point emerges from a consideration of the alternative posed by an imaginary objector: 'May not the *schema* A:a:α:B:b:β be misleading? Why should we not render "by examining the ἀσύνθετα of the πόλις we shall see better about the πολιτικοί etc. *also* (i.e. as well as about the ἀσύνθετα)?" After all, on your own showing, the understanding of ἀσύνθετα facilitates the understanding of πολιτικοί etc.' This is indeed Aristotle's over-all point; but on this interpretation, τούτων, ἀλλήλων, and ῥηθέντων would all have the same reference (πολιτικοί etc.), which for Aristotle seems uncharacteristically verbose; and in particular one would expect the sentence to end at ἕκαστον.

*Pace* Newman, nothing can be argued about the reference of τούτων from διαφέρουσιν: in <sup>a</sup>10 διαφέρειω admittedly refers to πολιτικοί etc., but in <sup>a</sup>12 to the differences between οἰκία and πόλις.

Of the translations I have been able to consult (most of them English) only Sinclair's (Penguin) and Ellis's and Warrington's (Everyman) refer τούτων to ὧν. So too does that of Jowett (1885), but in the 1921 revision of Jowett's version (*The Works of Aristotle translated into English*, vol. x) Ross adopted the other view. R. Congreve (*The Politics of Aristotle*, London, 1855) on περὶ τούτων stated roundly 'i.e. ἐξ ὧν σύγκειται, the component elements'.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

TREVOR J. SAUNDERS

## FIERY PARTICLES

Attenderes Physicis; quaereres, utrumne ignis esset initium rerum, an vero<sup>1</sup> minutis editus et mirabilibus elementis perpetuus hic mundus, an mortalis esset.

<sup>1</sup> The Minor Declamations cannot be dated; but it is noteworthy that *utrumne* . . . *an vero* . . . is a late usage: Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* ii.466 (Cyprian); also *Thes. Ling. Lat.* s.v. *an*

col.12,27 (*an vero* Ulpian). As to the author, he was, if not Quintilian, someone who had read Quintilian. For the present passage, compare *inst.or.* 7.2.2 'ergo cum de re agitur aut quid factum sit in dubium