into account that in the Athenian democracy every normal citizen was considered capable to judge and to take decisions about political questions, whereas military (and sometimes also financial) expertise was considered a special branch of knowledge not belonging to every citizen. The difference is not between "loyalty rather than skill" and "skill as well as loyalty", but between general, civic expertise and specialist skill. Has Rh. allowed himself to be influenced by the words attributed to Cleon by Thucydides (III, 37, 3 ff.)? P. 695: Is there any evidence that Athens, after having been forced to abandon Samos in 322 B.C., "recovered control" a few years later? The relevant paragraph in Polyperchon's edict of 319 B.C. (Diod. 18, 56, 7) is no more than an allurement for Athens or, at best, wishful thinking.

The book is concluded by a vast bibliography (which would have been more manageable if it had been divided up into several headings, e.g. Aristotle, Greek history, Athenian institutions etc.), three pages of select addenda, full indexes of passages from Aristotle and of inscriptions, papyri and other manuscripts, and a general index.
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Unquestionably, Mr. Saunders has done a fine job with this revision of Sinclair's translation of the Politics. In order to bring Sinclair's edition into line with the actual needs and standards regarding the presentation and translation of Greek philosophical texts, he did not limit himself to thoroughly revising the translation proper, but he greatly expanded the apparatus as well. 1) The table of contents, first of all, getting 10 lines in Sinclair, now takes 6

pages, giving the reader an insight into the structure of Aristotle's work. 2) Sinclair's original introduction has been retained, but it is supplemented with a "reviser's introduction" that, apart from a presentation of the principles of the revision, also contains a succinct but ad rem discussion of the teaching and research organized in the Lyceum (throwing light therewith upon the special character of Aristotle's preserved writings), the contents and structure of the Politics and Aristotle's philosophical assumptions. 3) As for the apparatus of the translation proper, each book is preceded by its table of contents, whereas each chapter is prefaced by a substantial introduction in italics, elucidating, and eventually criticizing, its contents and structure; historical events and persons, Greek terms, cross-references, etc. are briefly commented upon in the footnotes; finally, at the start of each paragraph the reader gets the page, column and line of Bekker's edition: although a small detail, it reveals the difference between the contemporary historical approach and the more literary one of Sinclair's generation. 4) At the end of the volume Mr. Saunders offers us 11 pages of "select bibliographies", two glossaries (Greek-English and English-Greek) and an index of names. This abundance of aids to the reader, bringing him, as far as feasible, face to face with Aristotle's text and with its historical setting, truly makes this "Penguin Aristotle" a model of its kind. All classical scholars caring about improving the accessibility, in these "Greekless" times, of Greek philosophical texts, will feel greatly indebted for it to Mr. Saunders.

For his revision of Sinclair's translation as well Mr. Saunders' primary concern has been to "enable the reader to immerse himself in the world of the ancient Greeks and to observe it through Aristotle's eyes" (p. 39). This implied that Sinclair's far too free rendering (Mr. Saunders courteously calls it "nicely readable") had to be brought into greater conformity with the original text, "retaining its full complement of detail, qualifications, ellipse, rough edges and awkward nuances which Sinclair ironed out in the interests of readability and swift comprehension" (ibid.). Yet, the translation was to remain "substantially and recognizably" Sinclair's; so Mr. Saunders, in his revision, chose to follow "the principle of economy of intervention", trying to "retain (the) special merits of Sinclair's work" (ibid.). We do not know if Mr. Saunders was happy with this side of his task—why not let him write a completely new translation, instead of dressing up an existing one?—, anyway, we are not. For in almost all the cases where the present translation