

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

**Delphi *Delphi*. By Frederik Poulsen. Translated by G. C. Richards, with a preface by Percy Gardner. Pp. x + 338, with 164 illustrations. London: Gyldendal, 1920. £1 1s.**

J. D. Beazley

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 5-6 / August 1922, pp 132 - 134

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00016735, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00016735](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00016735)

**How to cite this article:**

J. D. Beazley (1922). The Classical Review, 36, pp 132-134 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00016735

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

super-cigar. Indeed, he seemed unaware of its existence, though it is mentioned in Schenkl's account of English Libraries, and though Studemund (who *had* an inkling of U.) had already made a collation, now in the University Library at Breslau.

Luckily Vollmer intervened, Vollmer the Munich colleague of that Traube whose genius raised 'Ueberlieferungsgeschichte' to an exact science. With the help of Lehmann, Traube's successor, the whole history of the text was traced. All Renaissance MSS. are mere transcripts of the ninth-century Vatican MS. Off to limbo with them and their changeling 'Caelius'! The two ninth-century MSS. are the only foundation for an edition, if it is not designed 'for a warning to editors.' They were transcribed, at Tours and some other English settlement on the Continent, from a Fulda MS., now lost.

All that the eighth- (?) century Fulda archetype could rescue from the title-page of its uncial (?) exemplar, a MS. of the ancient world, was

API  
CAE  
LI,

which the Renaissance scholars expanded to *Apici Caeli* (and the last German books of reference conserve this fiction of 'Caelius who was nicknamed Apicius'). Vollmer proposes, plausibly enough, a restoration to something like

APICII ARTIS MAGIRI  
CAE COMPENDII  
LIBRI DECEM.

Vollmer's admirable paper in the *Bavarian Academy Proceedings* of 1920 is condensed in the short preface of this small volume. He finds in the Fulda text's exemplar a mere epitome of Apicius' manual, and ascribes its unliterary features to the fourth or fifth century epitomiser. But is he right? I cling to the idea that the Latin of a cookery-book would be unliterary Latin, and that all this mixture of Imperatives and Futures, all this Change of Subject, non-Consecution of Tenses, and what not, are original and genuine. In this manual (as in Petronius' novel) we get a glimpse at everyday Latin. Even a vulgarism like *esicium* I would not banish as Vollmer does. The seventh-century glossographers, in whom I see Donatus himself, attest it with the derivation *ab ense et secando*, i.e. 'ensisicium,' a popular etymology which gives a clue to the pronunciation. (So Aelius Stilo's *quia petit vitam* confirms Horace's trisyllable against Catullus' affectation *pituitā*.)

The ninety-six pages of this new gem of the Teubner series offer to us *multum in parvo*, e.g. a complete collection of the Greek papyrus fragments on Cookery, of Athenaeus' recipes, and so forth. Take it for model, ye dilettante editors. And contrast its modest preface with the flamboyant style of X, or Y, or Z.

W. M. LINDSAY.

## DELPHI.

*Delphi.* By FREDERIK POULSEN.

Translated by G. C. Richards, with a preface by Percy Gardner. Pp. x + 338, with 164 illustrations.

London: Gyldendal, 1920. £1 1s.

DR. POULSEN is well known as a learned and original scholar. He has a wide knowledge, not only of classical archeology, but of classical literature as well. His book is lucid, spirited, and humane: a model, in some ways, of what a general work should be. It not only gives an excellent account of the results of French excavation at Delphi, but also endeavours to determine what

part Delphi played in Greek history, and what Delphi meant to Greece and the Greeks.

In dealing with the monuments, the author's plan is not to enumerate the objects found on the site, but to choose certain characteristic and significant pieces, and to examine them leisurely in all their bearings. The few Cretan finds are illustrated by the fragmentary rhyton: the period of Oriental influence by a Phoenician bronze bowl and an engraved shell. With the rise of Greek art proper, the selection naturally becomes more ample: for Delphi has

contributed a very great deal to our stock and knowledge of archaic sculpture. Two bronzes are effectively contrasted with the Oriental objects and with each other: one is the charming youth of Cretan style and possibly early Peloponnesian, say Sicyonian, workmanship; the other the youth with the necklace, who may be Ionian. A chapter is devoted to a sympathetic description of the metopes which are usually attributed to the Treasury of the Sicyonians: Dr. Poulsen considers that Dinsmoor may be right in ascribing them to the Syracusan Treasury. No less sympathetic is his account of the Naxian Sphinx, compared, in its decorative effect—when first erected and before Delphi became crowded with monuments—to the Lion of St. Mark at Venice; and of the early Argive statues which represent Kleobis and Biton. Dr. Poulsen rejects the Herodotean story of the brothers' end: but I take it that the main facts of the story, the prayer and the deaths, may be true, and that some such strange and solemn series of incidents seems necessary to explain the erection of the statues at Delphi.

Dr. Poulsen has already contributed to the interpretation of the 'Siphnian' frieze: and this adds interest to the present comprehensive treatment. The precise date of the frieze is in dispute, and has been discussed, since the publication of Dr. Poulsen's book, by Dr. Langlotz in his excellent work *Zur Zeitbestimmung der strenggroßfigurigen Vasenmalerei und der gleichzeitigen Plastik*. Dr. Poulsen seems to speak as if the date could be settled by comparison with the parapet reliefs from Ephesus: but the exact date of these is surely not established by external evidence. The sculptures of the old Temple of Apollo and of the Athenian Treasury complete the tale of archaic monumental sculpture. There are one or two slips in the chapter on the Athenian Treasury: Geryon has the usual three bodies, not two, judging by Alinari's photograph: the description of Herakles' attitude in the Cynus metope (p. 180) is odd: surely he has the sword in his right hand and is cutting downwards from left to right: fig. 82 on

p. 186 is from a red-figured, not a black-figured, picture; the subsidiary figures, by the way, are foully restored: the crater on p. 195 is from Arezzo, not from Ruvo. I may add, that in the Siphnian pediment, Herakles is wearing a chiton only, not doublet and chiton as stated on p. 110.

At the very end of the archaic, and at the beginning of the subsequent period, comes the famous Charioteer. Professor Gardner, in his preface, calls it 'the only full-length bronze figure of fifth-century Greek art which we possess.' We have hundreds. Even if he means life-size by full-length, the statement is not true: for the Idolino is life-size. Dr. Poulsen cautiously refuses to connect the Charioteer with any of the names of sculptors which have been preserved to us: he is content to compare it, after Studniczka, with the Capranesi Anadumenus; and with a coin of Gela. He shows the same caution in publishing no reconstruction of the Polygnotan paintings in the Lesche: he is even over-contemptuous, I think, of such exercises.

The monument of the Thessalian Princes gives the author an opportunity of discussing the art of Lysippos: and the portraits found at Delphi form the starting-point for an interesting essay on Greek portraiture, a subject in which Dr. Poulsen has shown himself a master.

A word of praise must be accorded to Mr. Richards, who has produced a very clear and readable version. The material of the engraved shells found in Spain (p. 64) is not a land-shell, but a local shell. On p. 231, it is misleading to say that the Charioteer is 'no normal work of art': canonical would be better, though still ambiguous: what the author means is a work intended, like the Canon of Polycleitos, to embody the whole theory and achievement of the artist. Two long passages (pp. 12 and 88) purport to be quotations, since they are placed between inverted commas: but of course they are paraphrases. "Ἔδραι in *Eumenides* 11 means 'seat,' not 'seats.' On p. 243 we read 'Troy's best heroes, who lie flung away in artistic poses on the steadily rising ground.' The phrase hardly reproduces the spirit of Polygnotan painting.

The book is printed clearly, and the half-tone illustrations are nearly all good. The chief exception is the picture of the Naples Doryphoros on

p. 282, which is made from an old block, and that block from an old photograph taken before the disgusting fig-leaf was removed.  
J. D. BEAZLEY.

### TEXTBOOK OF ROMAN LAW.

*A Textbook of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian.* By W. W. BUCKLAND, M.A., F.B.A. One vol. 9½" x 6". Pp. xiv + 756. Cambridge University Press, 1921. 50s.

IN the first place must be acknowledged the lasting debt under which the author has placed all of us who teach Roman law, and all students of Roman antiquity. Those of us who are primarily English lawyers do not always find the foreign manuals readily accessible. There is besides the important class of students who may or may not become specialists, and who probably will not, without the aid of first-rate English textbooks. There is no English textbook which will stand comparison with this, and it should find a place at once in every legal and classical library.

But Professor Buckland's work deserves to be judged by comparison with the best foreign manuals. It is not a reproduction of any well-known type, but has an original character of its own. By deliberate limitation in certain directions it is able to proceed further in another direction than any general work known to me. The limitations are logical, consistent, defensible. What is omitted is deeply interesting, and, knowing the author's competence in these matters also, one may regret, but one has no right to complain. We have a deliberate choice of a subject of the highest importance, treated the more fully and perfectly because of concentration.

Take first the limitation of period, from Augustus (or, say, Cicero) to Justinian. This is steadily, though not pedantically, observed. On the one hand, the highly speculative earlier period is eschewed: we are told to be real lawyers, studying grown-up law. On the other hand, the fascinating post-Justinian history in the West, not to mention the East, does not appear. It follows that this is no book for beginners, exhibiting the many-sided historical

significance of Roman law. What it exhibits is the full-grown Roman law in itself, acquaintance with which alone explains that significance.

Less obvious, but more remarkable, is the deliberate limitation of outlook. The Pandectist tradition is completely dropped. There is no attempt to treat Roman law as a sort of general jurisprudence or natural law, nor to fit its principles into modern systematic categories. The point of view is that of a Roman jurist of the age of the Antonines, who, by some miracle, knows the developments of the next three centuries. It is the point of view of modern writers on Roman law, but one which is more evident in monographs than—such is the force of tradition—in general works. An illustration of the author's pure Romanism is his faithful adherence to the order of the Institutes, of which no one better than he knows the weak points.

The result is an essentially legal work, giving perhaps the fullest and most detailed account of pure Roman law in its technical perfection that exists. The chosen theme is broad enough; it is the mighty technical tradition that binds Labeo to Modestinus and Tribonian, Augustus to Diocletian and Justinian; that, and, in scope and intention, nothing more. The splendid materials of the *Corpus Juris*, of which Professor Buckland is a complete master, preclude either dullness or narrowness. And it is not to be inferred that he has neglected the literary and other sources; on the contrary, he has used them with rare fullness. But when, for instance, in his preface, he says 'the subject is Private Law, and little is said of such institutions as the Colonate and the privileged and State-controlled trade corporations of later law, of which, important as they were in practice, the chief interest is social and political,' one feels that the reason for exclusion could also be expressed by