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 Πολιτείαι (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. The plural Πολιτείαι appears with considerable frequency in

1) I have found the following instances of the plural in authors before ca. 500 A.D. The Antiatticista Bekkeri (*Anecdota Bekkeri* I 100,20), s.v. ἴδιώσεις, refers to Plato τετάρτῳ Πολιτείον: I suppose that Πολιτείον is a corruption of Πολιτείαι (this corruption is also found in the anonymous *Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* 27,9 [recorded by Westerink 114]). At p. 110,19, s.v. οἰκόδομεν, the Antiatticista refers to Πλάτων Πολιτείαις. In the numerous remaining places the Antiatticista has the title in the singular. Further, the plural occurs twice in Moeris: p. 110 Pierson-Koch, s.v. διαγράφειν: Πλάτων Πολιτείων ἃ (the same corruption as in *An. B.* I 100,20); p. 190, s.v. κομψοῦς: Πλάτων (…) Πολιτείων ἃ. On p. 176, s.v. ἱκταμ, Moeris has Πλάτων Πολιτείᾳ. Both the Antiatticista 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, Harpocratin, Timaeus, Philoxenus, Pol-lux) 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 work² 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 text³).

A further conclusion drawn by Westerink is that Parisinus gr. 1807 (A, one of the leading MSS of the Republic), which has the title Πολιτείας, derives "from a sixth-century copy in the Alexandrian school" (115)⁴). Westerink himself adds the proviso "if such GM read Πολιτείας, and at δ 1451 (II 135,13–14 A.), where we read ἐν τῷ τρίτῃ Πολιτείᾳ.

²) I take the following figures from Westerink 113 f.: Olympiodorus, in Gorgiam: plural 9, singular 5, id., in Meteoria: 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.-Élias, 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 τοῖς μόνον εἶδον νέκυιάς, μία ἐν ταῖς Πολιτείαις ὅ γὰρ μέθος τῆς Πολιτείας περί ψυχῶν διαλέγεται; here the plural and the singular occur in one line of text. – J. L. V. Hartman, Notae criticæ ad Platonis de Republica libris 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 (πολιτείαι) 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 Ἰστορίαι instead of Ἰστορία. He points out to me that for the title of the Τύπῳς by Ion of Chios (Callimachus fr. 449.7 Pf.) there is a younger variant reading Τύπῳ."
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 Πολιτεία in the sixth-century Alexandrian commentators, but that the plural Πολιτεία 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\(^5\), the number of the dialogues was 56, τῆς μὲν Πολιτείας εἰς δέκα διαμορφώμενης (…) τῶν δὲ Νόμων εἰς δυοκαίδεκα; nevertheless, there were nine tetralogies, ἕνως βιβλίου χώραν ἐπεχούσης τῆς Πολιτείας καὶ ἕνως τῶν Νόμων. It appears that although the ten books of the Republic were counted as separate διάλογοι, ten Πολιτείαι, the Republic as a whole was regarded as a self-contained βιβλίον and one member of a tetralogy, the Πολιτεία tout court. Alline\(^6\) 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 πολιτείαι ἣ περὶ δικαίου λ (= 30)\(^7\); the second book is entitled πλάτωνος πολιτείαι ἣ περὶ δικαίου λά (31), and so on\(^8\). 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\(^9\).

Burnet’s edition. In D the title of the first book of the Republic runs πλάτωνος πολιτείαι ἣ (which is equivalent to πολιτείαις πρώτον 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.


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 ἣ περὶ δικαίου α, while the number λ is written below the title; at the beginning of book II we read πλάτωνος πολιτείαι ἣ 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 ἡ περὶ δικαίου ἀ (etc.), with the title in the singular. This shows that the alternation between πολιτεία 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 ἐξιπάλλει δὲ καὶ τὰς Πολιτείας διὰ τὸ πολλαῖς εἴναι λόγους (…) later on (l. 9–10) he writes οἷς (sc. διάλογοις) προστιθεμένους ἵδ τῶν Νόμων καὶ δέκα τῆς Πολιτείας (…) In the context of the 56 διάλογοι 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 ἡ νομοθεσίας ἃ (etc.) it appears that he recognized Νόμων, in the plural, as the genuine title of this work. But the subtitle of the Laws provides us with a nice parallel for the alternation between πολιτεία and πολιτεία: at the heading of each book of the Laws we read πλάτωνος νόμων ἡ νομοθεσίας (followed by the number of the διάλογος in the whole of the Platonic corpus), but the subscription of each book is νόμων ἡ νομοθεσίας ἃ (etc.); thus the scribe of A indicated the whole of the Laws as νομοθεσία, while designing the separate books, διάλογοι, 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 ἡ περὶ δικαίου γ. In books II and III the numbers λα and λβ, 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 ἡ περὶ δικαίου ὃ/β, 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) διό καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τὴν Πολιτείαν ἔπεγραψεν 'Πολιτεία ἤ περὶ δικαίου'. 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. 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.

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 Antiatticista 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 Jo 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.