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](#)

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. VII.–XII. (July to December, 1920). Pp. 255; 4 plates, 70 illustrations. 1921.

D. S. Robertson

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 7-8 / November 1922, pp 193 - 194

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00017455, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00017455

How to cite this article:

D. S. Robertson (1922). The Classical Review, 36, pp 193-194 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00017455

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

drawing a hard and fast line between the short story and the novel and in regarding the novel as the offspring of the second sophistic movement.
H. E. BUTLER.

The Shadows of the Bronze of Piacenza.

By E. GALEOTTI-HEYWOOD. Pp. 48.

Perugia: Unione Tipografica Cooperativa, 1921.

THE great majority of books and magazine articles written on the literature and antiquities of Italy and Greece leave things pretty much as they were before. Scholars—a polite name for the writers—are for the most part content to repeat what previous scholars have said, and shrink from the mental effort of thinking out things for themselves. But every now and then comes a publication which brushes away the yearly accumulation of litter and reveals some feature of the past as it really and truly was. An address by Dr. Mackail (*C.R.* XXXV. 2)¹ admits us to the inner shrine, and dazzles us with a view of an ode of Horace—the real soul of the ode (and what a world away from the traditional commentaries!). A pamphlet of Warde Fowler takes the scales from our eyes when we read a book of the *Aeneid*. Hardie's *Res Metrica*, not yet truly appreciated by its reviewers, we would add to the list.

This booklet—*si parva licet componere magnis*—shows us one side of Etruscan divination—the esoteric lore of the soothsaying guild, an eerie, uncanny thing. It makes our flesh creep as we read the strange details so successfully collected by Signora Galeotti's patient, persistent investigation.

In 1877 a ploughman in the Piacenza district turned up a bronze object (in size and shape like the longitudinal half of a kidney) interspersed by lines like a spider's web, and with names of Etruscan deities written in the interspaces—the Bronze of Piacenza. What was it? Clearly something connected with divination. But how precisely?

The problem has now been solved.

¹ A recent number of a German magazine reviewed the contents of *C.R.* XXXV. We turned to it curious to know what message the reviewer had taken for his countrymen from Dr. Mackail's words. 'Alas! only that 'Pyrrha was a suitable name for a blonde.'

Labor omnia vincit. Our readers should read for themselves the authoress' fascinating story how she discovered after many a year's experiments that the bronze was cleverly and scientifically shaped to record the shadows of the sun and moon at each hour of day and night, and thus to indicate the ruling deity at each and every division of time.

Verily, there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, nor hid that shall not be known. What shall we learn when excavation in the Etrurian borderland provides a bilingual inscription (like the Rosetta stone) and enables us to read the Agram *liber linteus*?

W. M. LINDSAY.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.

VII.-XII. (July to December, 1920).

Pp. 255; 4 plates, 70 illustrations.
1921.

BESIDES two articles dealing with architectural and sculptural remains of the Byzantine period found in the neighbourhood of Demetrias, this number contains much matter of direct interest to classical scholars. In a detailed account of the excavations at Argos in 1912, W. Vollgraff shows some reason for identifying the temple, already partly published, with that of Artemis Peitho, mentioned by Pausanias. He also describes new work on the Agora, and the exploration of a Roman Odeum (south of the great theatre) built on the site of a large open place of assembly, with rock-cut steps, resembling the Pnyx. Several interesting reliefs were found in these excavations. L. Bizard discusses the inscriptions found in the Ptoion sanctuary in 1903. The most important are two dedications, the first made by Alcmaeonides, son of Alcmaeon, probably between 554 and 539; the second made by Hipparchus during the reign of his brother. In a very elaborate article Ch. Picard discusses the Society of the Posidoniasts of Berytus at Delos. He concludes that the Society was more commercial than religious, and that it lasted only from c. 110 B.C. to 69 B.C., when the establishment was destroyed by Athenodorus. An interesting article

by P. Cloché deals with the effects of the creation (under Philip's influence) of the college of *tamiai* at Delphi in 339 B.C. The consequent changes in the *personnel* of the *naopoioi* are examined in detail; some are explained as due to professional pique, others to the anti-Macedonian politics of the

states represented. The remaining articles are of somewhat technical interest; but the *Chronique des Fouilles*, etc. (November, 1919, to November, 1920), contains much important matter. It is, however, impossible here to summarise this fascinating summary.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY REPORTS.

FITZGERALD'S CANON.

[The Journals Board has arranged with the Council of the Oxford Philological Society that reports and summaries of papers read to the Society shall in future be printed in this *Review*. The following is a paper read on February 24, 1922, by Mr. W. D. ROSS.—EDD. C.R.]

FITZGERALD'S canon maintains that it is Aristotle's practice to refer to the historical Socrates as Σωκράτης, and to the Platonic Socrates as ὁ Σωκράτης.¹ The question of the validity of the canon is an interesting one, not only as a matter of Aristotelian *Sprachgebrauch*, but in its bearing on Aristotle's attitude towards Socrates. Professor Taylor has recently maintained that the canon is quite unfounded,² but it seems to be accurate in principle, though requiring some modification as regards the *Rhetoric*. The general practice in Greek is that the article is omitted with the names of persons except (a) in referring to a person already named in the context without the article (here δ= 'the said'); (b) to a person who is present and is pointed to; (c) to a particularly famous person. So the practice is stated by Kühner.³ Aristotle's practice agrees with this in general. In *Met.* A there are fifty references to philosophers and poets without the article, and two with it—ὁ γὰρ Παρμενίδης, 986b 22; ὁ μὲν γὰρ Πλάτων, 990a 29 [both explicable by (a) above]. In the other books of the *Metaphysics* we find Πλάτων eleven times; in one passage⁴ the best MSS. are divided as between Πλάτων and ὁ Πλάτων, and the latter form occurs nowhere else in these books. In the *Rhetoric* historical characters are mentioned at least 234 times without the article, and there are (as far as I know) only twenty passages (other than those explicable by Fitzgerald's canon) in which they occur with the article.⁵ Some of these⁶ are explicable by (a) above, and the rest probably by (c). On the other hand, Σωκράτης occurs in Aristotle's

genuine works 19 times without the article and 22 times with it. This at once suggests that there is some special reason for the use of the article with this name, and the reason which naturally presents itself is that Socrates is both a historical character and a character in Plato's dialogues. The use of the article when he is referred to in the latter capacity may be explained as a sort of generalised form of such expressions as ὁ ἐν Φαίδωνι Σωκράτης, ὁ ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ Σωκράτης.⁷ If this distinction is intended by Aristotle, we should expect to find Σωκράτης used generally with a past tense and ὁ Σωκράτης with the present. Σωκράτης occurs with a past tense in *Soph. El.* 183b 7; *P.A.* 642a 28; *Met.* 987b 1, 1078b 17, 1086b 3; *E.N.* 1127b 25, 1144b 18, 28, 1145b 23, 25, 1147b 15; *Pol.* 1260a 22; *Rhet.* 1398a 24, 1419a 8; ὁ Σωκράτης with the present in *Pol.* 1261a 6, 12, 16, b 19, 21, 1262b 6, 9, 1264a 29, b 7, 1291a 12, 1316a 2, b 27. There are other passages in which the verb throws no light on the question whether the real or the Platonic Socrates is meant, but the sense does so. In *An. Post.* 97b 21, *Met.* 1078b 28, *Rhet.* 1390b 31, where there is no article, the sense clearly demands a reference to the historical Socrates. In the *Politics* the passages with the article (including 1263b 30, 1264a 12, b 24, 29, 37, as well as those mentioned above) occur, with one exception, in contexts in which the *Republic* is mentioned by name and its theories are under discussion. (The exception is 1265a 11, πάντες οἱ τοῦ Σωκράτους λόγοι, where the article is appropriately used, since Aristotle is referring to the Platonic dialogues; but the special reference is to the *Laws*. Aristotle either speaks carelessly, as if Socrates had been a character in that dialogue, or deliberately identifies the 'Athenian Stranger' with Socrates. Grote suggests that Plato intended this identification, and did not call the chief speaker Socrates only because it was well known that Socrates had never been in Crete, where the scene is laid.) Thus Fitzgerald's canon accounts for 35 out of the 41 passages. Further, it is not surprising if the article occasionally occurs with a past tense: 'as Mr. Micawber said' is hardly less natural than 'as Mr. Micawber says.' *E.N.* 1116b 4 Σωκράτης ψῆθη refers to *Laches* 125, *Prot.* 360; *Rhet.* 1367b 8 ὁ Σωκράτης ἐλεγεν to *Menex.* 235d.

¹ W. Fitzgerald, *Selections from the Nic. Eth. of Aristotle*, p. 163.

² *Varia Socratica*, pp. 41-51.

³ *Gr. Gramm.*, § 462 (a).

⁴ *A.* 1070a 18.

⁵ 1357b 34, 1364a 19, 1365a 28, 1367a 9, b 17, 19, 1368a 20, 1377a 19, 22, 1384b 15, 1386a 19, 1392b 12, 1398a 17, b 31, 1399a 33, 1400b 17, 1401b 32, 1402b 11, 1405b 24, 1417a 7.

⁶ 1357b 34, 1398a 17. *Cf. Pol.* 1270a 4-7, 1274a 31 f.; *Poet.* 1453a 24-9.

⁷ *De Gen. et Corr.* 335b 10; *Pol.* 1342a 32.