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](#)

The Pauly-Wissowa *Encyclopaedia Pauly's Real-Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* herausg. von G. Wissowa. Neunter Halbband : Demogenes—Donatianus. Stuttgart (Metzler), 1903. 1532 columns. 8vo. 15 mk.

G. F. Hill

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 04 / May 1904, pp 228 - 229

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209943, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209943

How to cite this article:

G. F. Hill (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 228-229 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209943

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

throughout (some MSS, as Monacensis 408, agree with ω even less than O does, and with P even more than O does). Therefore, on Mr Owen's showing, not one known MS is a mere MS of the ω class. Therefore every known MS is similar in this respect to O. And Mr Owen here believes himself to be arguing that O is a unique MS.

Here I should stop, but for one circumstance, of which I think it right that readers should be warned. Mr Owen has an unfortunate habit of saying things which he believes to be true. He says on p. 126 a—

Whereas Mr Housman (Journal of Philology xxi 101 ff., xxii 84 ff.) depreciated the Neapolitanus of Propertius and appreciated four late MSS of the 15th century or thereabouts, and denied the supremacy of the Neapolitanus, which he wished to assign to the 15th century, this house of cards has been lately overthrown, since Mr Montagu James has proved (C.R. xvii 462) that the Neapolitanus was written in the 12th century, as Keil long ago maintained, and is consequently by far our earliest MS of Propertius.

The reader needs to be told that when Mr Owen says I depreciated the Neapolitanus he is attempting to state the fact that I made the most elaborate defence of the Neapolitanus which is anywhere extant; that when he says I appreciated four late MSS he is attempting to state the fact that I pulled down those four MSS from the elevation on which they had been placed by Baehrens; and that when he says I wished to assign the Neapolitanus to the fifteenth century he is attempting to state the fact that I declared myself totally indifferent to the question whether the Neapolitanus belonged to the fifteenth century or the twelfth. I think I am right in supposing that an incautious student might be misled by Mr Owen's phraseology. Or let me take,—again to avoid any suspicion of picking and choosing,—the very first passage

which he selects for discussion, Persius i 23, where Madvig adu. ii 128 proposed *articulis* for *auriculis*. Mr Owen here makes two statements, which I contradict. He affirms that this conjecture of Madvig was based on a false reading printed in the text of Priscian by Putsche. I affirm on the contrary that it was based on an examination of all the possible meanings of the MS reading, on an exposure of the absurdity of all of them, and on an explanation of the requirements of the sense; and that Madvig expressly stated that he had made the conjecture before he knew of any external support for it, false or true: 'ueram scripturam iam tum coniectura repertam, cum nondum Iahnii apparatu utebar.' Mr Owen affirms that the traditional text of Pers. i 23 was explained by Nettleship in his edition of Conington. I affirm on the contrary that Nettleship did not even attempt to explain the traditional text, and that what he did was to support a particular interpretation of the two words *cute perditus*, words which Madvig did not propose to alter. The issues are simple, the two books are accessible, and our respective assertions can easily be verified or falsified. If Mr Owen's statements are found true, then you are welcome to believe anything he says about me; even when he attributes to me (p. 126 a) an 'avowed disinclination to allow preponderating authority to one MS or group of MSS,' which I conjecture to be his closest possible paraphrase of my remark (vol. xvii p. 390 b) that P is far superior to the whole pack of the other MSS of Juvenal. But if his statements are found false, then I request as a matter of right that when he makes assertions tending to my discredit he may be disbelieved.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

March 14, 1904.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

THE PAULY-WISSOWA ENCYCLO- PAEDIA.

Demogenes—Donatianus.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft . . . herausg. von G. WISSOWA. Neunter Halbband: *Demogenes—Donatianus*. Stuttgart (Metzler), 1903. 1532 columns. 8vo. 15 mk.

IN something like twenty years from now, with a total of thirty volumes, we may

perhaps hope to see the completion of this great work. It is true that in the first volume the estimate was ten volumes and as many years; but as that volume was completed in 1894, and we are now half-way through volume 5, the other estimate seems more probable, especially if we allow for the supplements which are in prospect. None the less, the student who uses the book, the publisher, and above all the editor are to be congratulated on the steady progress, and

on the extraordinarily high level of minute completeness, which are maintained. Specialists in every branch will doubtless find gaps here and there; and those which I notice here are mainly discernible from the numismatic point of view. As regards the use of numismatic evidence in general, one finds several instances in the minor topographical articles, such as *Derbe*, *Dikaia*, *Diocaesarea Ciliciae*, *Dioshieron*, *Dipaea*, *Dium* in Syria, where the writer either altogether omits the fact that the place issued coins, or seems to be unacquainted with the more recent literature. In the article *Demos*, the portion relating to the coin-types should have been expanded in view of Waser's exhaustive list in *Rev. Suisse de Num.* 1898. *Dendrophoros*: the representation of the dendrophoros on the coins of Magnesia ad Maeandrum should have been mentioned. *Derbe*: we are not told that this place was called Claudioderbe, or that it was a member of the Lycanian *Κοινὸν*. *Derronikos*: the important piece of evidence provided by the Paeonian coin published by Th. Reinach (*Rev. Num.* 1897), with the head of Apollo *Derronaïos*, has been missed. *Diadema* (col. 304): the diadem worn by Caracalla (also by Commodus and Elagabalus) at Tarsos is rather the demiurgic crown (see *B. M. Catal.* p. xcvi.) than the Persian diadem. *Diia*: a cross-reference under *Δῖα* is desirable. Note also the occurrence of the *Δεῖα* at the Lydian Philadelphia (*B. M. Catal.* p. xc.). *Δίκαιος*: there is no mention of the use of this epithet as a regal title. *Dikte*: the writer seems to be unaware of Mr. Hogarth's important account of his excavation of the cave (*B.S.A.* vi. pp. 94-116). *Dionysos*: the list of cult-places is very inadequate as regards Asia Minor. *Dioscuri*: the discussion of the Pisidian cultus and monuments by M. Perdrizet (*B.S.A.* iii. pp. 156-169) has escaped the writer, who also fails to mention the cultus at Tripolis in

Phoenicia. (On col. 1103 we find the curious form *Sidibundu* for *Sibidunda*). *Dirke*: Studniczka's article on the group of Apollonios and Tauriskos in *Ztschr. f. bild. Kunst*, N.F. xiv. is passed over. *Dolon*: the representation of his capture on the British Museum sarcophagus was certainly worthy of mention. Lastly, by a curious dislocation—the first of the kind which I have noticed—*Δώπεα* has found its way into this volume between *Dipoïnos* and *Dipolis*.

G. F. HILL.

THOMAS' PÉTRONE.

Pétrone: l'envers de la société Romaine. Par ÉMILE THOMAS. Paris: Fontemoing, 1902. 2nd ed. Pp. viii, 237. 3.50 fr.

THIS is the second edition of M. Thomas' book on Petronius, which was originally reviewed in the *Classical Review* in 1893. A little has been added, but the general character and impression of the book is much the same. M. Thomas analyses and discusses, and takes us very fairly over the ground,—of course there are areas where he cannot take us—but on the whole it must be reluctantly confessed that his book does not greatly stimulate the reader. We agree and disagree from time to time, but we have something of Omar's feeling when 'evermore' he 'came out by that same door where in he went.' Of course, this is just one's impression; but one must own that the book sums up a good deal, and puts one in touch with a certain amount of bibliography, and will be useful in consequence. Perhaps M. Thomas' best thing is his characterization of Petronius as an author who has 'assez peu de cœur et plutôt trop d'esprit.'

T. R. GLOVER.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE DATE OF SEILANION.

BEFORE the discovery of the Amphiaraian catalogue dating the victory of the athlete Satyros, whose statue was made by Seilanon, at about 328,¹ the Plinian date of the sculptor was for two reasons disregarded:

firstly, he made a portrait of the sculptor Apollodoros, possibly the friend and companion of Plato,² and secondly, a portrait of Plato himself dedicated by the Persian Mithradates,³ usually identified with the ruler of Kios said to have been assassinated

¹ *Revue de Philologie*, 1894, p. 162.

² Plin. *N.H.* xxxiv. 81.

³ Diog. Laert. iii. 25.