

SHORTER CONTRIBUTIONS

ON THE SOURCE OF BURNET'S CONSTRUAL OF *APOLOGY* 30B 2-4: A CORRECTION

Abstract: The construal of *Apology* 30b 2-4 which in *JHS* 123 (2003) I attributed to John Burnet had appeared in print sixteen years before his edition of *Euthyphro, Apology* and *Crito*. I now suggest that it probably originated in the mind of J.A. Smith, who was an undergraduate contemporary of Burnet's at Balliol College, Oxford, and later Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy. The unexpected construal, transmitted by Balliol tradition, is typical of Smith's cast of mind.

IN a recent issue of this journal I wrote on behalf of John Burnet's construal of the sentence οὐκ ἐκ χρημάτων ἀρετὴ γίγνεται, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀρετῆς χρήματα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀγαθὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαντα καὶ ἰδία καὶ δημοσία at Plato, *Apology* 30b.¹ Burnet argues that ἀγαθὰ does not go with τὰ ἄλλα ἅπαντα, but is predicate to the verb γίγνεται which we supply from the previous clause. The result may be translated as follows: 'Virtue does not come from wealth, but it is virtue that makes wealth or anything else, in private or public life, a good thing for human beings.' Contrast the standard translation, 'Virtue does not come from money, but from virtue money and all other good things come to human beings in both private and public life', which claims that virtue will make you rich – a claim that is both implausible in itself and contrary to everything we know about Plato's Socrates. Burnet's construal yields a quite different and philosophically superior interpretation:

[T]his splendid utterance is not to be confounded either with the Biblical exhortation, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you', nor with the Stoic doctrine of the self-sufficiency of the 'wise man' (cf. Hor. *Ep.* I i. 106: *sapiens uno minor est Iove, dives, liber, honoratus, pulcher, rex denique regum*): the lesson here taught is 'that without ἀρετὴ the so-called good things of this life are nothing worth: it is the possession of ἀρετὴ that gives them their quality of goodness'.

These, however, are not the words of Burnet. They appear in a school edition of the *Apology* published by Harold Williamson in 1908, sixteen years before Burnet's well-known edition.² I should not have credited the better construal to Burnet.

Yet I hesitate to claim it should be credited to Williamson. His frontispiece describes the author as Assistant Master at Manchester Grammar School, Late Tutor and Lecturer of Balliol College, Oxford. Born in 1872, educated at Manchester Grammar School, Williamson went up to Balliol in 1891 and graduated in 1895 with Firsts in Mods and Greats. He won the Craven Scholarship in 1893. He was Lecturer and Tutor at Balliol from 1895 to 1898, but not a Fellow. Then he went back to be a master at his old school. We might expect to have heard more from him if he had the capacity to see how to solve a philosophical crux by exploiting a syntactical possibility undreamed of by generations of earlier scholars.

¹ M.F. Burnyeat, 'Apology 30b 2-4: Socrates, money, and the grammar of γίγνεσθαι', *JHS* 123 (2003) 1-25.

² Harold Williamson, *Plato's Apology of Socrates*, edited with introduction and notes (London: Macmillan, 1908); John Burnet, *Plato's Euthyphro, Apology of*

Socrates, and Crito, edited with notes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924). I owe deep thanks to Paul Kalligas for pointing me to Williamson's anticipation of Burnet's construal.

Now according to Balliol records, when Williamson was a student his tutors were W.H. Hardy and J.A. Smith.³ This latter was exactly the sort of grammatical virtuoso I am looking for. His little-known 1917 article 'On general relative clauses in Greek'⁴ was a powerful blow to the (still widespread) belief that Plato posited a Form corresponding to every general term in the language. The sole evidence in the corpus for Plato wishing to extend the realm of Forms that far is *Republic* 10.596a 6-8:

εἶδος γάρ πού τι ἐν ἕκαστον εἰώθαμεν τίθεσθαι περὶ ἕκαστα τὰ πολλά, οἷς ταῦτόν ὄνομα ἐπιφέρομεν.

Shorey translates,

We are in the habit, I take it, of positing a single idea or form in the case of the various multiplicities to which we give the same name.

Without exception, the same effect is conveyed, in one set of words or another, by the 21 other translations of the *Republic* on my shelves, from the very first English rendering by Spens (1763) to the most recent by Griffith (2000). They all say that there is to be a Form for every general term.

What Smith pointed out in his article is that the sentence is ambiguous. The syntax can equally well be parsed to mean: 'for we are, as you know, in the habit of assuming [as a rule of procedure] that the Form which corresponds to a group of particulars, each to each, is always one, in which case we call the group, or its particulars, *by the same name as the Form*' (italics mine). The standard translation just assumes that 'the same name' means 'the same name as each other'. But Plato's words allow both construals. And Smith's claim was that the standard rendering, which takes the relative clause at the end as general, would normally require either a different relative pronoun instead of the simple ὅς, or ὅν plus subjunctive instead of the indicative verb that Plato wrote.⁵ Never mind whether readers find this effort as successful as Burnet's construal of *Apology* 30b 2-4. I think it considerably more relevant to its context than the standard rendering, and its mere possibility blunts the case for supposing there to be a Form for every general term. But the point I am urging here is that Smith's proposal reveals the same cast of mind as Burnet's construal of *Apology* 30b 2-4.

The title of Smith's article has ensured that to this day very few people are aware of it. To the best of my knowledge, the first published reference to it is in an article of my own dating from 1989.⁶ It is never mentioned by Harold Cherniss, who aspired to read everything on Plato and who regularly cited *Republic* 596a to bolster his belief in a Form for every concept.⁷ But it seems to have survived by word of mouth in Balliol tradition. I first learned of it from Jonathan

³ Kinch Hoekstra kindly took the time and trouble to search the Balliol records on my behalf and send me this and other information used below.

⁴ *CR* 31 (1917) 69-71.

⁵ For this last point he cites Goodwin, *Syntax of Greek Moods and Tenses* §§532, 534. The same construal is advocated, independently of Smith and on philosophical rather than grammatical grounds, by John M. Rist, 'The theory and practice of Plato's *Cratylus*', in Douglas E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy. Studies in Honor of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984) 207-18; repr. in John M. Rist, *Man, Soul and Body. Essays in Ancient Thought from Plato to Dionysius* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1996) ch.2. Rist has confirmed to

me that he did not know of Smith's article.

⁶ 'The practicability of Plato's ideally just city', in K. Boudouris (ed.), *On Justice. Plato's and Aristotle's Conception of Justice in Relation to Modern and Contemporary Theories of Justice* (Athens 1989) 95-104 at n.4; more easily available in Jim Hopkins and Anthony Savile (eds), *Psychoanalysis, Mind and Art. Perspectives on Richard Wollheim* (Oxford: Blackwell 1992) 175-87, or Gail Fine (ed.), *Plato 2: Ethics, Politics, Religion, and the Soul* (Oxford University Press 1999) 297-308.

⁷ See, for example, *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy* 1 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press 1944) 244.

Barnes, then teaching at Balliol. He got it from his Balliol tutor R.M. Hare, who insisted on the importance of Smith's construction. Hare was taught by Cyril Bailey (editor of Epicurus and Lucretius), who in turn was taught by J.A. Smith. I shall suggest a similar, though shorter, chain of influence for the case of *Apology* 30b 2-4.

A somewhat better known article of Smith's, under the characteristically untempting title 'Aristotelica',⁸ includes a definitive account of the difference between the prepositions *κατά* and *μετά* as they are used when Aristotle at *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.13.1144b 24-30, discusses the question whether virtue should be conceived as *κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον* or as *μετὰ τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου*. To readers of this journal Smith will be most familiar as co-editor with W.D. Ross in the initial stages (1908-1912) of the magnificent Oxford translation of Aristotle, to which he contributed an excellent rendering of the *De Anima*, where he often sees subtleties that other translators miss.⁹ Ross wrote of him,

He was deeply versed in philology (and, as became a Highlander, not least in Celtic philology) and acquired with extraordinary facility at least a reading knowledge of many languages. He had a very acute feeling for the precise meaning, and the development of the meaning, of words.¹⁰

To confirm the picture formed so far, I cite two examples from the large quantity of Smith's unpublished notes and discussions preserved in Balliol College Library. The first is a short but subtle note written in September or October 1930 to decide exactly what sort of dative is involved at Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 3.5.1114b 2: ἕκαστος ἐαυτῷ τῆς ἕξεως ἐστὶ πως αἴτιος. The second, dating from October 1929, favours taking διὰ τὸ λογικῶς ζητεῖν at *Metaphysics* 2.1.1069a 26-8 with the main clause rather than joining Ross and everyone else in the view that it goes with what immediately precedes. All eight *Metaphysics* translations on my shelf agree with Ross, and I have no doubt that they are right to do so.¹¹ But, as before, my interest is in the cast of mind that sees a combinatory possibility in the syntax that no one else has dreamed of, either before or since.

Now Smith became a Fellow of Balliol in 1891, the very year that Williamson arrived, and remained there until 1910, when he moved to Magdalen on being elected Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy. In this latter capacity he taught a version of Idealism strongly influenced by Croce and Gentile, and wrote in a lyrical style markedly different from his contributions to classical studies.¹² The question is whether he could have influenced Burnet as well as Williamson.

Easily, for Burnet was a Balliol man too. Admittedly, he graduated in 1887, before Smith became a teaching Fellow. He became a Prize Fellow at Magdalen College in 1889, but in 1890/91 was away on temporary professorial stints in Scotland, and he took up the Chair of Greek in St Andrews in 1891. So he was out of Oxford when Smith was elected to his Fellowship. On the other hand, Smith went up to Balliol as a student in 1884, only one year after Burnet. They were contemporaries.

⁸ *CQ* 14 (1920) 16-22.

⁹ In 'De Anima II 5', *Phronesis* 47 (2002) 28-90, I point to several examples, esp. at n.63.

¹⁰ *DNB* 1931-1940, 819-20.

¹¹ Ironically, it was Ross's punctuation in his edition of 1924 that made Smith's conjecture feasible. For Ross put parentheses round τὰ γὰρ γένη ... ζητεῖν, whereas previous editors had printed a high stop after τιθέασιν in line 27, which enforced the standard construction. Now all Smith had to do was close the parenthesis four words earlier, after μᾶλλον.

¹² Both style and content are illustrated by his autobiographical contribution 'Philosophy as the development of the notion and reality of self-consciousness' in J.H. Muirhead, *Contemporary British Philosophy* (2nd series, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1925) 227-44. Readers of this journal may like to know that Smith's interest in Croce and Gentile was shared by his successor in the Waynflete Chair, the philosopher and ancient historian R.G. Collingwood, who graduated from University College, Oxford, in 1912. I conjecture that Collingwood attended Smith's lectures. At any rate, they became good friends: R.G. Collingwood, *An Autobiography* (Oxford University Press, pbk edn 1970) 18.

I conclude that, if I am right to hail J.A. Smith as the most likely originator of Burnet's construal, there are two possible routes of transmission. The first possibility is that the construal, together with an explanation of its philosophical significance, passed from Smith to Williamson in an undergraduate tutorial, and then in written form to Burnet, who consulted Williamson's edition of the *Apology* when preparing his own. This would help to explain why Williamson's note on 30b 2-4 conveys the philosophical moral of the passage in fuller and clearer terms than Burnet's note on the same text. Williamson was closer to the source.

But a second possibility is that Smith conceived the idea in his undergraduate days and told Burnet directly, while Williamson got the same message from Smith later. If in their respective editions Williamson expressed it better than Burnet, well, we have it on Smith's authority that as an undergraduate Burnet 'showed no particular interest in philosophy'.¹³ The interest in Plato for which we know him began after graduation when he went to St Andrews to serve as private assistant to Lewis Campbell, to whose Chair he would soon succeed.

On the whole, I favour the second, simpler solution to the mystery.

M.F. BURNYEAT
All Souls College, Oxford

¹³ *DNB* 1922-30, 138.

A HELLENISTIC TERRACOTTA AND THE GARDENS OF ADONIS*

Abstract: A Hellenistic terracotta from Myrina now in the Louvre is interpreted as showing a young woman tending the 'gardens of Adonis' in connection with the rites of the *Adonia*. Further associations are made between the perfume apparently being poured into a planter from an alabastron that the young woman holds, Adonis' mother Myrrha, the provenience of the terracotta (Myrina) and grave rituals.

CONSIDERABLE attention has been paid to the *Adonia* since the 1972 publication of Marcel Detienne's ground-breaking book *Les jardins d'Adonis*, as well as to the Athenian vase-paintings which have been thought to be associated with various aspects of the festival, including the gardens.¹ To these monuments we now would like to add an Early Hellenistic (325-250 BC) terracotta figurine in the Louvre whose subject we believe is connected with the *Adonia* (PLATE 6a-b).²

* We are very grateful to Violaine Jeammet and Michael Maaß for the photographs of the objects in their care and permission to publish them.

¹ M. Detienne, *Les jardins d'Adonis* (Paris 1972); translated by J. Lloyd and republished as *The Gardens of Adonis. Spices in Greek Mythology* (Hassocks 1977). S. Ribichini, *Adonis. Aspetti 'orientali' di un mito greco* (Rome 1981); B. Servais-Soyez, *LIMC* 1.1 s.v. Adonis 222-9; C. Edwards, 'Aphrodite on a ladder', *Hesperia* 53 (1984) 59-72; G.J. Baudy, *Adonisgärten. Studien zur antiken Samensymbolik (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 176, Frankfurt 1986); H. Tuzet, *Mort et résurrection d'Adonis. Étude de l'évolution d'un mythe* (Paris 1987); W.D. Furley, 'Die Adonis-Feier in Athen, 415 v.Chr.', *Ktema* 13 (1988) 13-19; E. Stehle, 'Sappho's gaze: fantasies of a goddess and a young man', in E. Greene (ed.), *Reading Sappho* (Berkeley 1990) 193-225; J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology*

of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece (New York 1996) 188-209; J. Reed, 'The sexuality of Adonis', *CA* 14 (1995) 317-47; R.R. Simms, 'A date with Adonis', *Antichthon* 31 (1997) 45-53; *eadem*, 'Mourning and community at the Athenian Adonia', *CJ* 93 (1998) 121-41.

² Paris, Louvre Inv. Myr. 233: E. Pottier and S. Reinach, *La Nécropole de Myrina* (Paris 1887) 424-30 and 550, no. 233, pls 37-8; F. Winter, *Die Typen der figürlichen Terrakotten* 2 (Berlin 1903) 124, no. 6; S. Mollard-Besques, *Musée du Louvre. Catalogue raisonné des figurines et reliefs en terre-cuite grecs et romains* 2: *Myrina* (Paris 1963) 48, pl. 57d; A. Müller, 'Nikô ou les avatars d'une Béotienne à Myrina et Thasos', *REA* 95 (1993) 171-2, fig. 9; V. Jeammet, *Tanagra. Mythe et archéologie* (Paris 2003) 178-9, no. 122. This terracotta figure was found in a grave as part of a group of thirteen female figurines of various heights. Eleven of the figurines are elaborately draped; three are veiled. They appear to