

# 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](#)



---

## Aristotle's Theory of ΤΟΠΟΣ H. Bergson.— *Quid Aristoteles de loco senserit*. Paris, Félix Alcan. 1889. 2 fr.

J. Burnet

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 07 / July 1892, pp 322 - 322  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186305, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00186305](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186305)

### How to cite this article:

J. Burnet (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 322-322 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186305

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

principle of Pythagoreanism in the face of criticism such as Zeno's. A translation of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν* is appended, which forms a welcome companion to the author's recent edition of the text. Some new conjectures are added, and one or two old ones retracted. The essay on the Stoic definitions of the *πάθη* will be interesting to those who busy themselves with the sources of Cicero's *Tusculans* and with the development of doctrine in the

hands of successive Stoic teachers. It deals mainly with Poseidonios (a fragment of whom Apelt thinks he has discovered in Nemesius), and concludes with a discussion of the definitions in pseudo-Andronikos *Περὶ παθῶν*.

The last two papers, on Cosmopolitanism in Antiquity and on Hippias of Elis, are popular lectures of the usual German type. The latter contains some rather audacious combinations.

JOHN BURNET.

### ARISTOTLE'S THEORY OF ΤΟΠΟΣ.

H. BERGSON.—*Quid Aristoteles de loco senserit*. Paris, Félix Alcan. 1889. 2 fr.

THIS is a Paris thesis by a former pupil of the École Normale and is a good specimen of its class. Aristotle's theory of *τόπος* has not yet been examined so carefully as it deserves, and any contribution to the subject is welcome. The author gives a clear and, so far as it goes, correct analysis of the discussion in Book Δ of the *φυσικὴ ἀκρόασις*, and faces the question why Aristotle set aside the discussion of space altogether and confined himself to an analysis of what is

meant by the place of a body. He also notes the difficulties of the definition of *τόπος* arrived at, and his solution of them (pp. 63 *sqq.*) is suggestive, though its brevity makes it somewhat tantalising. It was of course impossible for M. Bergson, in the narrow limits of a thesis, to define clearly his relation to other writers, and it is to be hoped that he will some day give us a fuller treatment of this important subject. This would have to be based upon a study of the previous history of the problem, and especially of the mathematical difficulties raised in the Academy.

J. BURNET.

### KOERTE'S METRODORUS.

*Metrodori Epicurei Fragmenta collegit, scriptoris incerti Epicurei commentarium moralium subiecit Alfredus Koerte*. Teubner, 1890. Mk. 2.40.

THIS little book forms a valuable supplement to the *Epicurea* of Usener, to whose suggestion it is due. He pointed out to the author, when he was working at the Herculanean papyrus 831 (VH<sup>2</sup> X, f. 71–80, cf. Scott, *Fragm. Herc.* p. 26), the resemblance between a passage in that papyrus and an opinion of Metrodorus otherwise known. This led Koerte to revise all the fragments already collected by Duening and to search the Herculanean rolls for more. The other chief sources are the Vatican *Gnomonologium* and Plutarch (*adv. Col.* and *contra Ep. beat.*). As was to be expected in a work proceeding from the school of Usener, the treatment of these fragments is altogether admirable; what is more open to doubt is the identification of the Herculanean fragment with one of Metrodorus's letters of advice to young men. It must, I think, be admitted that Koerte has shown good reason for holding that the

fragment belongs to the early days of the Epicurean school. No philosophers are attacked except those already attacked by Epicurus (*i.e.* those who impugned the authority of the senses); there is no mention of Stoics or Peripatetics, or even of other Epicurean philosophers. Above all, the terminology is still in a fluid state; *e.g.* we have *ἀναπλάσσειν* used absolutely for the technical *ψευδοδοξεῖν*. Further, the attitude of the writer towards the study of physics is not the common Epicurean one. He says *τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὕψος τούτων τῶν λόγων ἐπαίρο[ν τὴν διάνοι]αν ἑάσει τὰ τ[απεινὰ παρορᾶ]σθαι*, and a similar exalted view of physics is found in *Metrod. fr.* 37 which comes from a similar letter of advice. There are other coincidences besides; but of course they fall short of perfect proof. In any case, the fragment is clearly from a hortatory epistle by an early Epicurean, and such epistles we know that Metrodorus wrote. Whether this be his or not, it is quite in its right place at the end of his fragments; for it helps to complete the picture of the early days of the Garden.

J. BURNET.