

There remain four exceptional passages. In *Pol.* 1342b 23 we have *ἐπιτιμῶσι καὶ τοῦτο Σωκράτει*, where the reference is clearly to the *Republic*; but (a) Susemihl and Burnet regard the section in which this occurs as spurious; and (b), if it is genuine, Professor Cook Wilson's emendation *τῷ Σωκράτει* may well be right after *τοῦτο*. In *Rhet.* 1415b 30 we have *λέγει Σωκράτης ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ*, where the *Menexenus* is referred to; it is pardonable to suggest that in this one passage *ὁ* has dropped out before the similar letter *σ*. In *Met.* 1078b 30, *Rhet.* 1398b 31, *ὁ Σωκράτης* clearly refers to the historical person, but the former passage falls under Kühner's (a) and the latter probably under his (c).

The canon is on the whole confirmed very strongly by Aristotle's usage with other proper names. In *E.N.* VII., for instance, Bywater observes<sup>1</sup> that we have the article where the canon requires it in 1145a 21, 1146a 21, 1148a 33, 1149b 15, 1151b 18, and miss it only in 1145a 20. The rule is observed in twenty passages of the *Politics*,<sup>2</sup> and ignored only in 1342b 23 (dealt with above) and in 1338a 28, where it is natural to restore <ὁ> *Ὀδυσσεύς*. In 1262b 11 *ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης* means the Aristophanes in the *Symposium*. In the *Rhetoric*

there are at least eighteen instances of the observance of the rule. Bywater admits only two exceptions—1415b 30 (dealt with above) and 1400a 27, where we may restore <ὁ> *Ὀδυσσεύς*. Professor Taylor, however, has pointed out several passages in which, of two literary characters referred to, only one has the article,<sup>3</sup> as though Aristotle considered that he had thus given a sufficient clue to his meaning. The article is exceptionally omitted in 1413b 26 (*Ῥαδάμανθους καὶ Παλαμήδους*). The *Rhetoric* also, as we have seen, uses the article occasionally of historical characters; and it would seem that in this, the most highly finished of Aristotle's works, rhythmical grounds have led to a relaxation of the usual principle. In the *Poetics* there are at least thirty-one cases of the use of the article in accordance with the canon,<sup>4</sup> and only the following exceptions: *ὁ θρῆνος Ὀδυσσεύς ἐν τῇ Σκύλλῃ* 1454a 30 (not really an exception, because *θρῆνος Ὀδυσσεύς* was presumably the regular way of referring to this part of the *Scylla*), *Ὀδυσσεύς* 1454b 26, *Ὀρέστης* *ib.* 31, *Οἰδίπους* 1460a 30, *Σίσυφος* 1456a 22. The dropping out of *ὁ* before *ο* and occasionally before *σ* is clearly *exceptio probans regulam*.

<sup>3</sup> 1396b 15, 1399a 21, b 28, 1400a 27, 1401b 35.

<sup>4</sup> 1451a 22, 1452a 25, 27, b 5, 6, 7, 1453b 6, 23, 24 *ter*, 29, 1454a 1, 2, 5, 29, 31, b 14, 1455a 5, 6, 7, 27, b 18, 1460a 30, b 26, 1461a 12, 29, b 5, 7, 21 *bis*.

<sup>1</sup> *Cont. to Text. Emend. of Aristotle's Nic. Eth.* 52.

<sup>2</sup> Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, 228.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### PREHISTORIC CORINTH.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,

I should be glad to be allowed to refer to Dr. Leaf's paper in the *Class. Rev.* for May-June, so far as it relates to Corinth, as he mentions my name in that connexion.

Those who have followed the controversies raised by his *Homer and History* must be surprised that he does not mention the article in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for 1920, by Mr. Blegen, head of the American School at Athens. Surely he has not seen it. Mr. Blegen is the highest authority on the pre-history of the Corinthia, and his paper is devoted expressly to the refutation of Dr. Leaf's view, both on the main issue and on the subordinate points of commerce, havens, agriculture, and climate. He asserts 'the importance and the prosperity of the Isthmian region throughout the whole Bronze Age.' Of the eleven settlements discovered, 'six at least,' he says, 'continued to exist until late Hellenic civilisation was blotted out by the Dorian invasion.' He also describes Dr. Leaf's identification of the Homeric Ephyra as 'hypothetical,' and suggests he should now, as promised in *Homer and History*, p. 214, 'admit that he has used a faulty block as the cornerstone of his theory.' Dr. Leaf, on the contrary, in his present paper, reasserts his theory, and

would have us believe that '70 per cent. of the sites in the district which were inhabited in pre-Mycenaean times seem to have been abandoned in the Mycenaean period.' But this is far from an accurate statement, as any one can see from Mr. Blegen's detailed account of the eleven sites. And finally, no one acquainted with the facts will admit that the opponents of Dr. Leaf's theory must prove the existence in Mycenaean times, on the very site of classical Corinth, of a Mycenaean capital, 'at least as big as Mycenae, with walls and palaces.' Effective Mycenaean occupation of the Isthmia and active commerce are the main points in justification of the *ἀφνειὸς Κόρινθος* of the *Catalogue*, and Mr. Blegen has proved both.

I cannot go into the matter here in greater detail, but I think it desirable that Mr. Blegen's conclusions should be mentioned at once for consideration with Dr. Leaf's paper.

Yours, etc.,

August 23, 1922.

A. SHEWAN.

### A CORRECTION.

IN the notice of Professor Meister's book in the last issue of the *Class. Rev.* the proposed rearrangement of η 270 is erroneous. It should read thus: *ἡ γὰρ οὐκ' ἐπι ξυνέσσειται ἐμελλον*, as I suggested long ago in my 'Homerica,' *ad loc.*

T. L. AGAR.