Aristotle, the theoreticians of rhetoric and style. P. treats of the "appearance" of the Beautiful in early Greek poetry (where an erotic component is essential). Next Plato is discussed, in whose philosophy the Beautiful becomes a keystone of dialectic. Then Plotinus is treated: with him the interiorisation of the Beautiful is completed. There is a short epilogue on the Greek character of Greek aesthetics and the Biblical presuppositions of early Christian aesthetics.

Perpeet's logic might be more severe when he denotes the non-aesthetic usages of ἀπαρατία in early Greek as "metaästhetische" (p. 22, cp. p. 48 on the Idea of the Beautiful in Plato). An interpretation which leads to the statement that Agathon’s speech comes nearest to what Plato intended in writing the Symposium (p. 113) can hardly be right. The "scheinende Schein als Idee des Schönen" (p. 61, cp. pp. 47, 50, 51) is a rather startling concept—I am afraid that too much of Perpeet's thesis is based upon the ambiguity of φαινομενα, "scheinen", "appear".

Nevertheless, even if one is inclined to reject the book as a whole (and the present reviewer is very near to doing so), it deserves careful reading, which will be fully rewarded: as has been said above, P. is a sensitive scholar who offers stimulating remarks on many topics.

AMSTERDAM 10, Victorieplein 47 IV


This book reproduces a number of lectures delivered at Brown University in 1960 by a well-known anthropologist (who died shortly afterwards).

In some of the newer branches of learning there exists a tendency to assume competence in all departments of knowledge which their work brings into their ken. It is to be feared that even a distinguished lecturer as Kl. succumbed to this all too human frailty; apparently he "brushed up" his classical studies of long ago. Be it said to his honour, he was conscious of the limits of his learning and accused himself of "hybris in anticipating that I could in intermittent work over a year encompass enough of the multitudinous original sources and the still more monumental scholarly commentary upon them to give a clear and economical account of the distinctive features of Greek culture" (p. 43). This is very nice; still . . . a year of intermittent work . . . ! One is inclined to say: it was hybris, and the publication of these lectures will hardly contribute to Kl.'s fame. How much one would have welcomed,
from the mouth of such an authority, a methodological discussion of the possibilities offered by the collaboration of anthropological and classical scholars!

Ch. I, "A Historical Retrospect", perhaps comes nearest to a fulfilment of this wish. Here one finds, at least, an attempt to sketch the relations between the two disciplines as they have developed in recent times. That the debt owed by classical scholarship to anthropology is clearly put out whereas the stimulus given by classical scholars to anthropology is only hinted at, is probably only excusable. The work of Dodds and of M. I. Finley is duly praised.

Ch. II, "The Study of Man and a Man-Centered Culture", is a rather superficial survey of the Greek origins of anthropological studies. The author follows them as far as Aristotle. Of the interesting contributions to these studies which were made in Hellenistic times no mention is made. The Romans are entirely ignored, as well as contributors to anthropological studies as as subjects of them. This omission, although conscious (p. 3), can in no way be justified.

In Ch. III, "A Brief Grammar of Greek Culture", a list of thirteen "binary oppositions" is drawn. The author holds it "likely that the distinctive essence of each culture could be defined fairly well if one were able to isolate between ten and twenty thematic principles which in their hierarchic combinations would characterize the structure of that culture" (p. 44). No "hierarchic combination", however, is shown, only a tabulation; nor does the author make clear how such a combination could be found and studied. Moreover, he forgets that his "binary oppositions" are not clear-cut, and he overlooks essential differences and shades of meaning. Hard work in semantics and difficult interpretation of contexts is needed, if the study of "thematic principles" is to bear fruit.

The portrait that Kl. draws of Greek culture is entirely Victorian and rationalistic. Though acknowledging "major shifts" (p. 49) the author maintains that "from Graeco-Roman antiquity to the present day, the way of life of the Greeks from Homer until at least the Hellenistic period has been recognized as an entity in spite of all the internal variations", and he wants "to talk about the dominant". Without carping at the wording ("an entity"—this the "way of the Greeks" would be anyhow!), we may agree that from Graeco-Roman times on the classical period has been regarded as just "classical"—we had expected anthropology to help us to expel this classicistic spectre!

Some details may be mentioned. It is said that "Victorian and Edwardian scholarship... strongly tended to expunge or to