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](#)

Greek Ideals *Greek Ideals: A Study in Social Life*. By C. Delisle Burns. One vol. Octavo. Pp. ix+275. London: G. Bell and Sons, and Macmillan Co., 1917. 5s. net (and \ \$2.00).

R. G. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 32 / Issue 7-8 / November 1918, pp 189 - 190
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00012051, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00012051

How to cite this article:

R. G. Bury (1918). The Classical Review, 32, pp 189-190 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00012051

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

and interesting, and besides its *protreptic* value it undoubtedly contains much that is true and important for the student of Ancient Thought—amongst other things this: ‘the silly allusions to enigmatic teaching and the statement

that Plato never had written and never would write down his true principles are sufficient to prove the so-called Platonic Epistles a forgery’ (p. 199). It is a pity the book has no Index.

R. G. BURY.

GREEK IDEALS.

Greek Ideals: A Study in Social Life.

By C. DELISLE BURNS. One vol. Octavo. Pp. ix + 275. London: G. Bell and Sons, and Macmillan Co., 1917. 5s. net (and \$2.00).

MR. BURNS has taken for his book a subject highly attractive but hardly less elusive. For, as Mr. Lowes Dickinson once put it (in his excellent little book on *The Greek View of Life*), ‘there is nothing so misleading as generalisation, specially on the subject of the Greeks. Again and again, when we think we have laid hold of their characteristic view, we are confronted with some new aspect of their life which we cannot fit into harmony with our scheme. There is no formula which will sum up that versatile and many-sided people.’ This versatility which renders definition so difficult is fully recognised by Mr. Burns, who says in his Preface that ‘the versatility of the Greeks is more emphasised (in his book) than any single idea such as “harmony” or “beauty” to express the Greek ideal’; but the point he most emphasises and regards as most characteristic is that ‘in all their ideals what is most prominent appears to be sociability.’ By ‘Greek’ Mr. Burns means mainly Athenian, and his earlier chapters are devoted to an account of Athenian religion and the chief festivals connected with it. He teaches us once again how the *polis* is fundamentally a religious institution ‘having very close likeness to a democratic church’—a church without clergy or congregation or sacred book. We used to be taught that *Homer* was ‘the Greek Bible,’ but Mr. Burns tells us that that is ‘false,’ since ‘no one was compelled to “believe in” *Homer*.’ He does not tell us, however, what other English book can be compared more adequately with *Homer*.

After religion and politics, Mr. Burns turns mainly to philosophic literature for his illustrations of the Greek social ideal. He has useful chapters on ‘The Fifth Century’ and ‘The Old School,’ as well as on Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; and his last chapter, entitled ‘The After-Glow,’ is mainly concerned with the views of the Stoics and Epicureans, concluding with what we may call the application of the moral to the men of to-day. As regards Socrates and Plato, it is interesting to compare and contrast the views here set forth with those expressed in Mr. P. E. More’s *Platonism*. Whereas Mr. More will have none of the Socrates limned by Professors Burnet and Taylor, or of their emasculated Plato, Mr. Burns enthusiastically accepts both. His *Socrates*, as Form-Theorist and Orphic-Pythagorean-Brother, is ‘a much greater Socrates than historians have generally supposed to exist’; while as for Plato, ‘although the new view may seem to make him less original as a thinker, it makes him much more skilful as an artist’ (p. 147). How, we wonder, would Plato appreciate this compliment! ‘All great men’ (we quote again from Mr. Burns, p. 243) ‘must be astonished at their followers: and *si quis piorum animis locus*, in some other sphere the original author must often stand aghast at what his commentators make him say’—and still more aghast, we may suppose, must stand the original author who wasn’t an author. However, Mr. Burns has the highest admiration for his bean-eschewing Socrates, as well as for his Boswellised Plato, and that, after all, is the main point. Unlike Mr. More, he says curiously little of the Socratic *daimonion*; but on the other hand he has much to say about the educational and political views of Plato.

The general reader will find in this volume much to interest as well as to instruct: it is written brightly and with constant reference to the needs and

ideals of the modern *polites*. I have noticed only two misprints (pp. 184, 185); but the Index is over-scanty.

R. G. BURY.

PROLEGOMENA TO AUSONIUS.

Prolegomena to an Edition of the Works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius. By SISTER M. J. BYRNE, Ph.D., Professor of Latin in the College of St. Elizabeth. Octavo. One vol. Pp. viii+101. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. 5s. 6d.

PROFESSOR BYRNE'S book was no doubt written as a thesis: it is issued with the *imprimatur* of the Department of Classical Philology of Columbia University. It is a careful and thorough digest of information about Ausonius, his life, his works, and the expository accretions of learning thereupon. Are they Prolegomena to an ideal edition, or to an edition actually designed? We are not told. A new text is much needed. Schenkl's reputation has been blown by Mr. Garrod: Peiper is an ugly and awkward work. Would that Fr. Martindale's long-promised contribution to the Oxford Classical Texts showed any signs of appearing! Professor Byrne's references are made to Souchay; but we are not made aware of this until p. 83: it ought to have been done on the front page. Schenkl and Peiper having introduced disorder into the order of the poems, all reference becomes sinfully confused. But probably most scholars would have been grateful for a direct page-reference to Peiper.

There are theses literary or speculative, and theses of which it may be brutally asserted that the perfect form is an *index verborum*; as it stands, this present work suffers a certain disadvantage. It reveals no ambition to rival or to supersede the literary critical estimates of Ausonius which are already to be found in Boissier, La Ville de Mirmont, Pichon, Plessis, etc.; indeed, such estimates, by their nature, do not go out of date. And yet, lacking an index, it is not very convenient for consultation as a repertory of materials. Reviewers

have a vile trick of constructing two stools and placing one on each side of the victim, who is then accused and found guilty of falling between them. But in this case are not the two stools real, and no mere instruments of the carnifex? A finished literary judgment by your Boissier or your Plessis has value; and a book lying wholly within the banausic part of literature, such as Teuffel, the Bradshaw of Latin, whose judgments are of course altogether negligible, has value as a great piece of clerkwork. Is there room for such a book as Sister Byrne's between the two? Yes, on condition that these be really Prolegomena. Read strictly in connexion with an edition in one indexed volume together, these chapters would fully justify their utility, which for the nonce remains somewhat fragmentary or provisional.

Ausonius was *par excellence* the poetical Don, a professor in whom the study of expression had quite outrun an impotent imagination and an atrophied heart. He is a far less real and interesting person than Paulinus or Sidonius Apollinaris. The *Mosella* is a readable poem, with feeling enough and historic substance enough to keep it alive. Otherwise the only real thing about the writings of this magnificent prototype of a Head of a House (a hundred years ago) is the breach with Paulinus. This is a bit of Oxford Movement: to draw out the parallel would be an interesting essay. It is an episode of tragical pathos—two friends who no longer speak the same language. Baudrillart's *S. Paulin de Nôle* should be added to the Bibliography.

One may criticise a few details in the chapter on Metre and Prosody. It is to be regretted that the authoress continues to use the discredited equivoque of *arsis* and *thesis*. Havet's substitutes 'temps fort' and 'temps faible' will go