

morality comparable to the *Greek Popular Morality* of K. D. Dover. His limitations and sillier side are blatant, but there is much more to him than that. No Hippocrates, to be sure; but also, no Hippocratic oaf!

Calgary

Barry Baldwin

## PARISINUS A AND THE TITLE OF PLATO'S REPUBLIC

In a note in ICS 6 (1981) 112–115, L. G. Westerink studies the evidence for the title of Plato's *Republic*. He argues that up to the beginning of the sixth century A. D. the work is constantly referred to as Πολιτεία, in the singular. On pp. 112–113 Westerink discusses two apparent earlier occurrences of the plural title Πολιτεῖαι (namely Arist., Pol. IV 7, 1293a42–b1 and Proclus, In Timaeum II 227,2–4 Diehl), thus suggesting that these are the only instances of the plural before ca. A. D. 500, which in fact is untrue<sup>1</sup>). The plural Πολιτεῖαι appears with considerable frequency in

1) I have found the following instances of the plural in authors before ca. 500 A.D. The Antiaticista Bekkeri (*Anecdota Bekkeri* I 100,20), s.v. *ιδίωσις*, refers to Plato τετάρτη Πολιτικῶν: I suppose that Πολιτικῶν is a corruption of Πολιτειῶν (this corruption is also found in the anonymous *Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* 27,9 [recorded by Westerink 114]). At p. 110,19, s.v. *οἰκοδομεῖν*, the Antiaticista refers to Πλάτων Πολιτείας. In the numerous remaining places the Antiaticista has the title in the singular. Further, the plural occurs twice in Moeris: p. 110 Pierson-Koch, s.v. *διαγράφειν*: Πλάτων Πολιτικῶν ᾗ (the same corruption as in An. B. I 100,20); p. 190, s.v. *κομψούς*: Πλάτων (...) Πολιτειῶν ᾗ. On p. 176, s.v. *ἔκτατος*, Moeris has Πλάτων Πολιτεῖα. Both the Antiaticista and Moeris belong to the second half of the second century A.D. One should realize that the lexicographical MSS employ many compendia, so that it is possible that in some cases the plural is due to a scribal error. In the other lexicographers before 500 A.D. (Pausanias, Aelius Dionysius, Didymus, Harpocration, Timaeus, Philoxenus, Pollux) I have found either the singular or no indication of the title at all. In later lexicographers such as Photius and *Suda*, too, the title is usually found in the singular; I have checked all the references in *Suda*; the only instances of the plural are found at π 2126 (IV 181,28 Adler), and possibly at τ 1061 (IV 597,10 A.), where

the school of Ammonius, as is well illustrated by Westerink 113 f., but the authors in which the plural is found are by no means consistent in this usage. As a possible explanation for the difference in usage between one work and another by the same author, Westerink 114 submits that this “can be accounted for by the fact that these commentaries (...) were taken down by different redactors”. To explain the use of the plural Westerink 114 submits that it arose from the attempt at “constructing a correspondence between Plato's and Aristotle's political writings”. At first sight this would seem to be plausible (see Ps.-Elias, in Porph. *Isag.* 22,8, quoted by Westerink 114), but the fact that there are also differences in usage within one and the same work<sup>2</sup>) shows that the occurrence of the plural can hardly be due to a deliberate choice by the authors in which it is found; Westerink offers no explanation for the alternation of singular and plural in one text<sup>3</sup>).

A further conclusion drawn by Westerink is that Parisinus gr. 1807 (A, one of the leading MSS of the *Republic*), which has the title Πολιτεῖαι, derives “from a sixth-century copy in the Alexandrian school” (115)<sup>4</sup>). Westerink himself adds the proviso “if such

GM read Πολιτείας, and at δ 1451 (II 135,13–14 A.), where we read ἐν τρίτῃ Πολιτεῖα.

2) I take the following figures from Westerink 113 f.: Olympiodorus, in *Gorgiam*: plural 9, singular 5, id., in *Meteora*: plural 1, singular 1 (in his commentaries on the *Alcibiades* and the *Phaedo* Olympiodorus uses the singular throughout); Asclepius, in *Nicomachum*: plural 1; Philoponus, in *Nicomachum*: plural 1 (in a passage quoted from Asclepius' commentary); (Asclepius, in *Metaphysica*, and Philoponus, *De Aeternitate Mundi*, use the singular throughout); anonymous *Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy*: plural 5, singular 4; Ps.-Elias, in *Isagogen*: plural 2, singular 2. Westerink adds that in the other Olympiodoreans (Elias, David and Stephanus) and in the Athenians (Damascius and Simplicius) there are no instances of the plural.

3) That Olympiodorus did not make any significant distinction between the two titles appears most clearly from a passage in his commentary on the *Gorgias* (46,9; p. 241,11–13 ed. Westerink), where he says: τρεῖς τοίνυν μόναι εἰσὶν νέκυνται, μία ἐν ταῖς Πολιτεῖαις (ὁ γὰρ μῦθος τῆς Πολιτεῖαις περὶ ψυχῶν διαλέγεται); here the plural and the singular occur in one line of text. – J. L. V. Hartman, *Notae criticae ad Platonis de Republica libros I–V* (diss. Leiden, Hagae Comitum 1896) 2 f., suggests that the plural title is partly due to the description of the several types of states (πολιτεῖαι) in books VIII and IX, and may also have been inspired by the plural title of Aristotle's *Politica*. – Prof. C. W. Müller suggests to me that the plural title may have come into being in analogy to other plural titles, such as Ἱστορίαι instead of Ἱστορία. He points out to me that for the title of the *Τριταγμός* by Ion of Chios (Callimachus fr. 449.7 Pf.) there is a younger variant reading *Τριταγμοί*.

4) Westerink's report of the title of the *Republic* in Venetus gr. 185 (D), namely that D has the title in the plural, is mistaken, due to a wrong report in

an inference can be drawn from the title alone". In fact, I believe that the occurrence of the plural in A has nothing to do with the use of the title Πολιτεῖαι in the sixth-century Alexandrian commentators, but that the plural Πολιτεῖαι in A must be explained in a quite different way.

In the organization of the Platonic corpus which is usually associated with Thrasyllus (see Diogenes Laertius III 57), but which in reality must be older<sup>5</sup>), the number of the dialogues was 56, τῆς μὲν Πολιτείας εἰς δέκα διαιρουμένης (. . .) τῶν δὲ Νόμων εἰς δυοκαίδεκα; nevertheless, there were nine tetralogies, ἑνὸς βιβλίου χώραν ἐπεχούσης τῆς Πολιτείας καὶ ἑνὸς τῶν Νόμων. It appears that although the ten books of the *Republic* were counted as separate διαλόγοι, ten Πολιτεῖαι, the *Republic* as a whole was regarded as a self-contained βιβλίον and one member of a tetralogy, the Πολιτεία *tout court*. Alline<sup>6</sup>) draws attention to the fact that the numbering of the books of the *Republic* in A results from this ordering of the dialogues. In A, the title of the first book of the *Republic* is πλάτωνος πολιτεῖαι ἢ περὶ δικαίου λ (= 30)<sup>7</sup>); the second book is entitled πλάτωνος πολιτεῖαι ἢ περὶ δικαίου λα (31), and so on<sup>8</sup>). Thus the scribe of A followed the separate numbering of each book of the *Republic* within the whole corpus, and placed the plural title above each new book<sup>9</sup>).

Burnet's edition. In D the title of the first book of the *Republic* runs πλάτωνος πολιτείας ᾧ (which is equivalent to πολιτείας πρῶτον in Vindobonensis Suppl. Gr. 39 [F]). Further, Westerink remarks that D and M (Caesenas Malatestianus D 28,4) form one group with A; in reality D is more closely related to F than to A (see my book, *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic* [Leiden 1989] 70–77), while M is a derivative of A, and can be discarded as a primary source (Tradition 111–116).

5) A.-H. Chroust, *The Organization of the Platonic Corpus in Antiquity*, *Hermes* 93 (1966) 34–46, argues that the tetralogical classification of the dialogues can be traced back at least to Tyrannion (ca. 50 B.C.). Cf. A. Carlini, *Studi sulla tradizione antica e medievale del Fedone* (Rome 1972) 24 f. But C. W. Müller, *Die Kurzdialoge der Appendix Platonica* (München 1975) 27–41, 328 f., illustrates that the tetralogical ordering of the dialogues originated in the Academy in the first century B.C.; for his refutation of Chroust's position see *Kurzdialoge* 29 n. 2 and 33 n. 1.

6) H. Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon* (Paris 1915) 176.

7) This shows that A had all the dialogues in the tetralogical order. The *Republic* is the second dialogue of the eighth tetralogy.

8) The number of each book within the *Republic* (1–10) is indicated in the margin before the first line of the book, and not in the title above each book.

9) It is remarkable that in T (Venetus App. Cl. IV 1), which derives from A (see my article, 'The Venetus T of Plato', *Mnemosyne* IV 39 [1986] 102–111; Tradition 111–116), the title of the work differs from book to book. The title of book I is πλάτωνος πολιτείας ἢ περὶ δικαίου ᾧ, while the number λ is written below the title; at the beginning of book II we read πλάτωνος πολιτεῖαι ἢ περὶ δικαίου β, at

But Alline is only telling the first half of the story, because in A each book of the *Republic* has a subscription πολιτείας ἢ περὶ δικαίου  $\bar{\alpha}$  (etc.), with the title in the singular. This shows that the alternation between πολιτεῖαι and πολιτεία exactly reflects the ordering into 56 dialogues *and* nine tetralogies: the plural is used for the number of each separate book within the corpus of 56 dialogues; the singular is used for the internal numbering of the ten books of the *Republic*, and thus indicates the proper title of the work itself.

This explanation of the alternation of plural and singular in A appears to find some support in a passage in the anonymous *Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* 26 (p. 47 ed. Westerink). The author states (l. 6–7) that Proclus ἐκβάλλει δὲ καὶ τὰς Πολιτείας διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς εἶναι λόγους (...); later on (l. 9–10) he writes οἷς (sc. διαλόγοις) προστιθεμένοις ἰβ̄ τῶν Νόμων καὶ δέκα τῆς Πολιτείας (...). In the context of the 56 διαλόγοι the Anonymus writes τὰς Πολιτείας, in the plural; when indicating the ten books of the *Republic*, he writes τῆς Πολιτείας, in the singular.

In the *Laws*, the scribe of A follows the same procedure as in the *Republic*: the twelve books of the *Laws* each bear a separate number (43–54). Of course, this does not imply that the scribe of A treats the *Republic* and the *Laws* in the same way with regard to the title of these works. From the subscription of each book of the *Laws*, νόμων ἢ νομοθεσίας  $\bar{\alpha}$  (etc.) it appears that he recognized Νόμοι, in the plural, as the genuine title of this work. But the sub-title of the *Laws* provides us with a nice parallel for the alternation between πολιτεία and πολιτεῖαι: at the heading of each book of the *Laws* we read πλάτωνος νόμοι ἢ νομοθεσίαι<sup>10</sup> (followed by the number of the διάλογος in the whole of the Platonic corpus), but the subscription of each book is νόμων ἢ νομοθεσίας  $\bar{\alpha}$  (etc.); thus the scribe of A indicated the whole of the *Laws* as νομοθεσία, while designing the separate books, διαλόγοι, as νομοθεσίαι.

With regard to the occurrence of the plural in Olympiodorus c.s., it is certain that at least Olympiodorus regarded Πολιτεία as the genuine title of the whole work, because he explicitly states (in

---

the beginning of book III πλάτωνος πολιτείας ἢ περὶ δικαίου  $\bar{\gamma}$ . In books II and III the numbers  $\bar{\lambda}\alpha$  and  $\bar{\lambda}\beta$ , found in A, are absent (the old part of T breaks off at 389d7, so that we have no information about the later books of the *Republic* and the dialogues which come after the *Republic* in T). The subscription of books I and II runs πολιτείας ἢ περὶ δικαίου  $\bar{\alpha}/\bar{\beta}$ , just as in A.

10) It is noteworthy that the regular sub-title of the *Laws* as it is found in Diog. Laert. III 60, namely περὶ νομοθεσίας, is changed in A.

Alc. 75,23–24, p. 50 ed. Westerink) διὸ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τὴν Πολιτείαν ἐπέγραψεν Ἰσολιτεία ἢ περὶ δικαίου<sup>11</sup>). Those places where the plural is used in Olympiodorus c.s. reflect the plural title which was used to indicate the separate books of the *Republic* in the continuous numbering of the dialogues<sup>12</sup>). Therefore it is possible that Olympiodorus c.s. consulted an edition in which the dialogues were presented in the same way as in A.

My conclusion is that both in A and in the indirect tradition the genuine title of the *Republic* is Πολιτεία, as it is found in the other primary MSS as well<sup>13</sup>).

Amsterdam

Gerard J. Boter

---

11) Although it is true that Olympiodorus' commentaries "are not writings, but lectures, (...) taken down by different redactors" (Westerink 114), this explicit statement about the title cannot be supposed to have been influenced by a redactor.

12) This will also be valid for the plural in *Antiaticista Bekkeri* and *Moeris*.

13) The fact that A gives the continuous numbering of the dialogues, and has the singular and the plural title of the *Republic*, is in accordance with the learned character of this MS; the other two primary MSS, D and F, omit the continuous numbering, and accordingly only have the singular title *πολιτείας πρῶτον* (etc.), as it is found in the subscriptions in A. D and F basically follow the tetralogical ordering of the dialogues; F contains tetr. VI 3–IX 1 (with *Menexenus* and *Io* in the reverse order), and could thus form part of a complete tetralogical edition; D has tetr. I–IV and tetr. VIII 1,2, which shows that D cannot have been (part of) a complete tetralogical edition. – I wish to express my thanks to Prof. C. W. Müller and Dr S. R. Slings for commenting upon an earlier draft of this paper.