

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 συγκείται, 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

So the manuscripts at 'Quintilian', *decl. min.* 283 (p.148,23 Ritter). The eccentric punctuation is Ritter's. In fact, of course, the two *quaestiones* suggested are: Is fire the origin of things or just a material substance composed of atoms? and, Is our world eternal or doomed to perish? In the first, the emotive *mirabilibus* goes uneasily with the scientific *minutis*. Hence conjectures: *mutabilibus* (Rohde), and further back *innumerabilibus* or *insecabilibus* (Aerodius). But our declaimer wrote *mobilibus*: for Epicurean fire atoms, if not round like those of Democritus,<sup>2</sup> were certainly easily moved. Lucretius<sup>3</sup> knew this well, and he supplies the crowning parallel: 'ignem / constituit natura minutis mobilibusque (montibusque *OQ*) / corporibus' (6.225-7; cf. also 4.343 'mobiliior . . . minutior').

Worcester College, Oxford

MICHAEL WINTERBOTTOM

venit aut quid fiat aut quit sit futurum, ut in generalibus "an atomorum concursu mundus sit effectus, an providentia regatur, an sit aliquando casurus" . . .

<sup>2</sup> See Aristotle, *de anima* A2, 405<sup>a</sup>11 τῶν δὲ σχημάτων εὐκωητότατον τὸ σφαιροειδὲς λέγει (sc. Democritus) • τοιοῦτον δ' εἶναι τὸν τε νοῦν καὶ τὸ πῦρ. Mr. R.D. Brown, to whom I am much

indebted for his help with this matter, points out to me that according to the scholiast on Epic. *ad Hdt.* 66.5 (cf. Lucretius 2.456-63) Epicurus regarded fire atoms as considerably different from the smooth, round soul atoms.

<sup>3</sup> He could have supplied more: for fire as origin of things 1.635 seq., for the time span of the world 2.1105 seq.

## ADDENDUM TO 'A EUPOLIDEAN PRECEDENT FOR THE ROWING SCENE IN ARISTOPHANES' "FROGS"?

In a recent article of the above title published in *CQ* N.S. 24 (1974), 250-2, I supported Lobel's suggestion<sup>1</sup> that the scholia of P. Oxy.2740 relate to Eupolis' *Taxiarchs*, and I further argued that Dionysus was probably involved in a rowing scene in the play. The article was prepared before I had the opportunity to see a copy of C. Austin's edition of the Comic fragments from papyri<sup>2</sup>, and I was unaware that he had been able to publish a new fragment of Eupolis from Photius<sup>3</sup>, explicitly cited from *Taxiarchs*, which matches a partly preserved lemma in the scholia of P. Oxy.2740. The discovery of this new fragment makes it certain that the scholia do comment on *Taxiarchs*, and I am indebted to Dr. Austin for drawing my attention to this new evidence.

Gateshead

ALLAN M. WILSON

<sup>1</sup> *Oxyrhynechus Papyri*, xxxiv (1968), p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta*, (Berlin and New York,

1973).

<sup>3</sup> Austin, *op.cit.*, fr.98, line 16 n. (p. 114).