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](#)

Schmekel's Stoic Philosophy *Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange dargestellt* von A. Schmekel. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892. pp. viii. 484. 14 Mk.

Harold N. Fowler

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 08 / October 1892, pp 349 - 351

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186482, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186482

How to cite this article:

Harold N. Fowler (1892). Review of Ian Richard Netton 'Allah Transcendent: Studies in the Structure and Semiotics of Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Cosmology' The Classical Review, 6, pp 349-351 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186482

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

give a short specimen, from Book vi. 407:

Καημένε, τὸ φιλότιμο θὰ σ' ἀφανίσει ἐσένα,
καὶ τὸ παιδί τ' ἀνήλικο δὲν τὸ πονᾷς, κι' ἐμένα
τῇ μάβρῃ ποῦ παντέρρημη σὲ λίγο θὰ μ' ἀφήκεις.
τί γλήγορα ὅλοι οἱ Δαναοὶ θὰ τρέξουν νὰ σὲ
σφάξουν.

Μὰ ἂν εἶναι νὰ σὲ στερηθῶ, καλότερα γιὰ μένα
νὰ μὲ σκεπάσει ἡ μάβρη Γῆς! Γιατὶ ἄλλο πῶς
ἀντιστῆμι
δὲ θὰ μου μείνει, μὲν καημοὶ, τὰ μάτια σὰ
σφαλίσεις.

WALTER LEAF.

SCHMEKEL'S STOIC PHILOSOPHY.

Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange dargestellt von A. SCHMEKEL. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892. pp. viii. 484. 14 Mk.

THIS excellent book treats of Panaetius and Posidonius, with chapters on Hecaton, Dionysius and Menarchus. 'In regard to the title,' says the author in his preface, 'it might seem to be more comprehensive than the work itself, but, in the first place, Panaetius and Posidonius are decidedly the most important and distinctive representatives of the middle Stoa, since in their predecessors the break which divides the middle from the earlier Stoa has not yet taken place in the chief points, and, secondly, the chief teachings of the others are noticed in a variety of places.' Another sentence of the preface deserves to be quoted. The author says that in writing the book 'he demanded clearness of himself, and his constant endeavour was to give clearness to the reader.' This endeavour has been crowned with unusual success. The meaning of the author is always plain.

The introduction gives the 'external history,' that is, an account of the life and writings of Panaetius and Posidonius with the few facts known about the three less important philosophers mentioned above. In his list of the works of Panaetius, the author assigns an independent position to the 'epistola ad Q. Aelium Tuberonem.' In my dissertation (*Panaetii et Hecatonis Librorum Fragmenta*, Bonn, 1885) I expressed the opinion that the 'epistola' in question was identical with the treatise *περὶ εὐθυμίας*, an opinion based upon identity of contents. Dr. Schmekel (p. 9) says I am wrong, but gives no reason for his assertion.¹ In general the introduction, though brief, gives an excellent account of

the lives and writings of the philosophers treated, with enough of argument to show the correctness of the facts as stated.

The body of the book is divided into three parts:—(1) Sources, (2) System of Philosophy, (3) Position of the middle Stoa relatively to the (a) preceding and (b) following times. Parts 1 and 2 are also subdivided systematically. Not only is Dr. Schmekel systematic in his own work, but he takes it for granted that the writers of whom he treats were no less so in theirs. His first effort in discussing a given treatise is therefore to find the 'disposition' of it. The treatise is analysed with a view to finding what the author must have intended to say, and then passages are adduced to show that he said it. This method would be perfect if we could be sure that the ancient philosophers were infallibly logical and consistent, but in view of the liability of mankind to error the inverse method has its advantages. Dr. Schmekel, however, handles his method in such masterly fashion as to inspire considerable confidence in his results.

Cicero (*Ep. ad Att.* xvi. 11) says: 'Τὰ περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος quatenus Panaetius absolvi duobus; illius tres sunt.' Panaetius (*Cic. de Off.* i. 3, 9) makes a triple division of his subject, and the first and second books of Cicero *de Off.* treat of the first and second divisions. Panaetius, however, treated only the first two divisions in his three books (*Cic. Ep. ad Att.* xvi. 11). Cicero's two books must therefore correspond to the three books of Panaetius. Schmekel observes (p. 23) that the first of Cicero's books forms a complete treatise, as does also the second; but the third division of Panaetius (the conflict of the *honestum* and the *utile*) must have followed the discussion of the *utile* (Cicero's book ii.). Panaetius never wrote on the conflict of the *honestum* and the *utile*, therefore Cicero's book ii. must correspond to Panaetius' book iii. In like manner, Cicero's first book corresponds to Panaetius'

¹ Besides frgs. 13—17 of my edition, I should have assigned frgs. 45 and 46 to the same treatise, as my friend Gercke (not Gehrke, as Schmekel, p. 180, has it) has pointed out to me.

second, and the first book of Panaetius is to be sought in the opening chapters of Cicero's first book. The first book of Panaetius is very much abridged, and Cicero derives his abridgment in part from Posidonius, which may explain some apparent contradictions. Schmekel's discussion of this matter is eminently satisfactory. It does not appear whether Dr. Schmekel regards Posidonius as the chief source of the third book of Cicero *de Off.* or not.

The close connexion existing between Cicero *de Legg.* and *de Re pub.* iii. is emphasized, and both are shown on good grounds to be derived from Panaetius. A discussion of *de Re pub.* i. and ii. in connexion with Polybius leads to a similar result. It seems to me, however, that Dr. Schmekel goes a little too far in asserting that Panaetius is the author of the books from which Cicero draws his matter; for, although the doctrines are certainly those held by Panaetius, they may have been derived by Cicero from Polybius or even, perhaps, from some other writer who was influenced by Panaetius. It would be enough to say that Cicero *probably* follows Panaetius.

The investigation into the sources of our knowledge of Posidonius leads Dr. Schmekel first to a careful discussion of Sextus *adv. phys.* i. 13—136 and Cicero *de deor. nat.* ii., both of which he shows to be derived from Posidonius *περὶ θεῶν* and then to an exhaustive treatment of Varro *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* i. The sources available for the reconstruction of this book are discussed, and fifty fragments, from Servius, Augustine, Tertullian, Arnobius, etc., are published. The book thus reconstructed is compared with Cicero *Tusc. disp.* i., and Posidonius *περὶ θεῶν* is established as the common source of Varro and Cic. *Tusc. disp.* i. 1—75. The latter half of *Tusc. disp.* i. is derived from Cicero's *Consolatio*, i.e. from Crantor *περὶ πένθους*.

An entire chapter is devoted to the discussion of Cicero *de fato*, the chief source of which is shown to be Carneades. Throughout Dr. Schmekel's book the influence exerted by Carneades upon the dogmatic philosophers, and especially the Stoics, is properly emphasized.

It would be impossible within the limits of a review to touch upon all the points discussed by Dr. Schmekel in his exposition of the philosophical systems of Panaetius and Posidonius. Their systems are for the most part already known, but they are nowhere so completely and satisfactorily treated as here. On one point concerning

which Dr. Schmekel disagrees with me, I venture a word in reply. Tertullian, *de anima* 17, says: 'dividitur autem (sc. anima) in partes nunc in duas a Platone, nunc in tres a Zenone, nunc in quinque [ab Aristotele, Diels, *dox. gr.* p. 205] et in sex a Panaetio.' I maintained (*Pan. et Hec. lib. fr.* p. 15) that the division into six parts was here wrongly attributed to Panaetius, basing my assertion upon Nemesius (*de hom. nat.* cap. xv. p. 96 and cap. xxvi. p. 115).

The first passage reads: Ζήνων δὲ ὁ Στωϊκὸς ὀκταμερῇ φησὶν εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν, διαιρῶν αὐτὴν εἰς τε τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν καὶ εἰς τὰς πέντε αἰσθήσεις καὶ εἰς τὸ φωνητικὸν καὶ τὸ σπερματικόν. Παναίτιος δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος τὸ μὲν φωνητικὸν τῆς καθ' ὁρμὴν κινήσεως μέρος εἶναι βούλεται. λέγων ὀρθότατα· τὸ δὲ σπερματικὸν οὐ τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος ἀλλὰ τῆς φύσεως.

Dr. Schmekel (p. 201) says that if the ἡγεμονικὸν attributed by Nemesius to Zeno and the καθ' ὁρμὴν κίνησις attributed to Panaetius refer to the same thing, there is no reason to think that Panaetius did more than eliminate two parts (the φωνητικὸν and the σπερματικόν) from the eight parts mentioned by Zeno. I still think that the change of expression in Nemesius must have some significance, for neither Nemesius nor Galen (the 'source' of Nemesius) nor Panaetius writes so obscurely as to introduce a new expression without motive. The motive here seems to me fairly evident. A new method of division is to be introduced and therefore a new nomenclature is adopted. It may be that Tertullian intended to say, as Dr. Schmekel does, that Panaetius divided the soul into the καθ' ὁρμὴν κίνησις (= ἡγεμονικόν) and the five senses. This statement is, however, not complete, for the five senses make up the αἰσθήσις, just as the μεταβατικόν καὶ κινητικὸν τοῦ σώματος παντός, the φωνητικόν, and the ἀναπνευστικόν make up the καθ' ὁρμὴν κίνησις (cf. Schmekel p. 200 anm. 4). This gives us for Panaetius a division into two chief parts or eight lesser parts.

Tertullian's statement concerning Posidonius, that 'a duobus exorsus titulis,' the ἡγεμονικόν and the λογικόν, he divided the soul into twelve parts, is excellently explained by Dr. Schmekel (p. 261). His discussion of Posidonius as a historian leads to the doubtless correct conclusion that the relation of his historical work to the history of Polybius was probably in a general way similar to that of his philosophy to the philosophy of Panaetius.

Dr. Schmekel (p. 291 f.) attacks Hirzel (*Unters. zu Cicero's philos. Schriften* ii. a p. 472—514) for ascribing to Hekaton the

division of virtue given by Stobaeus (*Ecl.* ii. p. 62, 7—64, 12 Wachsm.), and says that I (*Pan. et Hec.*, &c., p. 49) simply followed Hirzel. To a certain extent I did, though I ascribed to Hekaton only a part of the passage (p. 60, 9—64, 12 W.) ascribed to him by Hirzel, and Dr. Schmekel's arguments do not convince me that I was wrong, although they show that the possibility (though hardly the probability) exists that the whole passage of Stobaeus may be independent of Hekaton. The verbal similarity between Laert. Diog. vii. 90 and the Stobaeus passage is such as to make it probable that both are derived from the same author.

The section on Dionysius (p. 298 ff.) is a clear exposition of his philosophy so far as it is known, based upon Philodemus *περὶ σημείων καὶ σημειώσεων* col. 1—8, 15 and 19, 9—20, 30. This is the most convenient place to look for an account of the teachings of this imperfectly known thinker.

The chapters on the relations of the middle Stoa to its predecessors and successors contain much that is of interest and value, including an exhibition in parallel columns of passages from Varro, Macrobius, Thrasyllus (Theon), and Philo relating to the Pythagorean theory of numbers and their

symbolism. In general, these chapters cannot be said to contain much absolutely new material, but it is much to have united in one treatise the scattered fragments of knowledge half buried in voluminous or inaccessible writings, and the intelligent and learned discussion of all points by Dr. Schmekel is sure to be of permanent value. The chapter on the 'römische Aufklärung,' which precedes the conclusion, describes the influence of the Stoa, especially of Panaetius, upon Roman thought from Lucilius to Ovid, from Scipio and his friends to Cicero and Varro, and down to Seneca and later writers. The conclusion gives a brief sketch of the development of the Stoic and other schools from Socrates.

Throughout the book, polemic and the discussion of the views of modern writers are confined almost exclusively to the footnotes. This, joined to the fact that Dr. Schmekel writes in a clear, vigorous, and agreeable style, makes his learned work interesting, nay even entertaining—qualities in which it contrasts favourably with most works upon ancient philosophy.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.

Exeter, New Hampshire, U.S.A.

BATIFFOL ON THE ATHANASIAN *SYNTAGMA DOCTRINAE*.

BATIFFOL, P.—*Le Syntagma Doctrinae dit de St. Athanase* (*Studia Patristica*, fasc. 11, pp. 117—160. Paris: Leroux, 1890). 5 frcs.

THE Abbé Batiffol's second instalment of patristic studies, after completing the Greek text, and printing the old Latin version, of the 'Prayer of Aseneth' (see *Class. Review*, Dec. 1890), is mainly devoted to a problem of more general interest.

The early history of Egyptian asceticism, and the relation of Athanasius to the monastic life;—the development of the archaic church-institutions reflected in the *Διδαχὴ*, and the successive adaptations of its code of precepts to the requirements of first one, then another phase of church life;—the history and influence of the creed of Nicaea, especially in the period during which it so strangely became ousted from its unique position by its so-called Constantinopolitan substitute,—these are the main problems directly affected by the estimate we form

of the *Syntagma Doctrinae* and its kindred documents.

It is only within the last twelve years or so that the high interest of the document in question has been recognised.

The *Syntagma* was indeed published as long ago as 1685 by Arnold, from a Vossian MS. of cent. xi., now at Leyden, which (with the exception of what appears to be a fragmentary abridgment in a Vatican MS. of cent. xv., now printed by M. Batiffol) still remains our only representative of the *Syntagma* proper.

Montfaucon included the *Syntagma* among the 'spuria' of Athanasius, on the ground partly of style, which Batiffol endorses, partly of post-Athanasian vocabulary, a point which, as Batiffol shows (p. 130), requires reconsideration. There the matter rested until 1879, excepting that in 1784 Mingarelli (*Graeci Codd. MSS. apud Nanius etc. asservati*, Bologna 1784) printed from a xii.—xiii. cent. MS. a document purporting to be 'The faith of the 318 fathers of