

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](#)



Harris' *Plato as a Narrator* *Plato as a Narrator*. A Study of the Myths, by W. A. Harris. A Dissertation presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Johns Hopkins University, Richmond, Va. Pp. 48.

Σ.

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 03 / April 1896, pp 170 - 171
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203697, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203697

How to cite this article:

Σ. (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 170-171 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203697

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

follow that, because they did not take spare oars, they did not take the launching rollers with them, and (2) to attribute to the Argonauts a prophetic knowledge that they would never need the rollers again, seems to me unjustifiable and inartistic. Merkel, reading *νήος*, clearly refers the word *φάλαγξ* to one of the rollers they had with them, and so does the scholiast.

8. Referring to the drawing of lots for seats, M. de Mirmont remarks that this was not the heroic custom, and accounts for it by the consideration that the Argonauts were not ordinary rowers, and that therefore lot alone could distribute their places. I confess I do not see how the extraordinary character of the Argonauts could make it more necessary that their places should be assigned by lot than the places of ordinary rowers. But I am disposed to think that, although such assignment by lot is not mentioned in Homer, Apollonius would not have set it down without some authority. Virgil apparently alludes to this custom in *sortiti remos* (*Aen.* iii. 510)—as to the interpretation of which I entirely agree with Mr. Page—and so does Propertius (iv. 21, 11). If it be objected that Virgil is merely following Apollonius, I would reply that he does not follow blindly, and that he would probably not follow Apollonius in an anachronism.

9. In i. 566 we have ἐπ' ἱκρίοφιν δὲ κάλῳας | ἔστῃσιν περόνησι διακριδὼν ἀμφιβαλόντες.

There is certainly some difficulty here, for how could these ropes (halyards) be fastened to the small decks (*ἱκρία*) at the prow or poop? Accordingly M. de Mirmont in his translation suggested ἐπικριόφιν, 'to the yard.' He now returns to the usual reading, and follows Cartault in interpreting 'to the mast,' which he justifies by the statement of schol. (*ad loc.*) and of Eustathius that ἱκρίον = part of the mast. However that may be, Homer uses *ἱκρία* only in the sense of 'decks' and elsewhere Apollonius uses it only in this sense. It seems therefore in the highest degree improbable that Apollonius should also use ἱκρίον in the sense of 'mast.' They are two very different things—to use a non-Homeric word which Apollonius often does, and to use a Homeric word in a non-Homeric sense, a distinction which M. de Mirmont seems to overlook. For the present passage, I can suggest no better solution than that given by Vars, viz. that the *περόναι* (*cabillots*, belaying-pins) round which the ropes were fastened were attached to something of the nature of an ἱκρίον, such as a 'fife-rail' (*ratelier*). I feel it is not satisfactory, but I know no better at present.

There are several other points I should have liked to deal with, especially with the interpretation of the difficult lines i. 1276, 1277, but too much space has been already occupied.

R. C. SEATON.

HARRIS' PLATO AS A NARRATOR.

Plato as a Narrator. A Study of the Myths, by W. A. HARRIS. A Dissertation presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Johns Hopkins University, Richmond, Va. Pp. 48.

LIKE many other dissertations for the doctor's degree, this is meant to be written, not to be read. The composition of this thesis, with the research involved, was eminently useful to the author, and the work displays sufficient scholarship and acquaintance with philological methods to justify the university in conferring the desired degree. But the composition is crude, and the Platonic scholar will find little to interest him. Plato's originality in this matter consists, according to the

author, not in the use of the myth, but in the 'blending of *μῦθος* and *λόγος*.' 'For philosophical narrative we are dependent upon Plato, and since Plato is the department [*sic*], the study of the myth is a study of philosophic narrative.' Platonic myths are divided into two classes, Socratic and non-Socratic,—a division which does not prove particularly fruitful. To the second of these two classes the author assigns (only) the myths of *Protagoras* 320 f., *Symposium* 189 f., and *Republic* 359 f. The myth of the *Gorgias* is called 'the simplest and apparently the most naive,'—whatever the latter adjective may mean. The writer's familiarity with the contents of the Platonic dialogues does not seem perfect; at least his words with regard to

the *Phaedo* are strangely inadequate: 'The scenery and situation of this dialogue is pathetic; the theme is courage in the face of death, and the argument turns mainly on the immortality of the soul. Socrates endeavours to show that one should necessarily be courageous, for, since the soul is immortal, there is no such thing as death.' Other passages puzzle the reader; like the following: 'In the *Republic* (iii. 414 C) we have a display of Socratic modesty. Here Socrates professes himself unable to tell an old Phoenician lie, and the humour is still further heightened by the remark of Glaucon after hearing a portion of the tale.' The best part of the

dissertation is in the last twenty pages, where the author sums up the results of his examination of the myths and comments on the rhetorical quality of Plato's narratives, with some good observations on special usages. Occasionally, as in the study of the use of tenses and of the participle, we note the marks of the writer's training under his distinguished teacher, Professor Gildersleeve. At times the writer seems to imitate his master's vivid style, but goes beyond him when he remarks upon Protagoras's 'large use of the imperfect, and the *vulgar frequency* of the historical present.'

Σ.

HAYLEY'S INTRODUCTION TO THE VERSE OF TERENCE.

An Introduction to the Verse of Terence, by
H. W. HAYLEY, PH. D. Boston: Ginn
and Co. 1894.

THE object of this little book of twenty-five pages is stated by the editor to be, 'not to present any new or original discoveries, but simply to state clearly and concisely the facts most important for the student of Terentian verse to know.' It begins with an account of the peculiarities of early Latin prosody as they appear in Terence. This is followed by a brief general description of the verse of Plautus and Terence, in which the versification of the two Roman poets is compared with that of the Greek Comedy, and the versification of Plautus with that of Terence. Then the metres

used by Terence are taken up in detail and illustrated by full metrical schemes, by an abundance of well-selected examples, and finally, in many cases, by lines of English poetry in the same metres. A brief description of a Latin *comœdia palliata* concludes the work.

The treatment, which is based on the best authorities, is exceedingly clear, and the book will not only be of service to those who read Terence from text-editions, but will also supplement the accounts of the metres in many of the annotated editions of the plays. The excellent typography and arrangement add not a little to the clearness of the presentation.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

FISHER'S TRANSLATION OF BOISSIER'S *PROMENADES ARCHÉOLOGIQUES*.

Rome and Pompeii: Archaeological Rambles, by GASTON BOISSIER of the French Academy, translated by D. HAVELOCK FISHER. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 7s. 6d.

THE honoured name of M. Gaston Boissier is likely to draw some attention to this book; and the title might seem to suggest its suitability for a school-prize. It may be worth while therefore to say in a word or

two what it is. The deficiencies of M. Boissier's *Promenades Archéologiques* as well as its merits are well known to scholars. It contains a pleasantly written account of some of the more interesting excavations visited by M. Boissier nearly twenty years ago. The book corresponded pretty well to its French title; its scrappiness makes its English title quite inappropriate. Apart from this, the translation is probably one of the most incompetent that has been published for many years. The translator does not often blunder over his French, though