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](#)

Die Kirchengeschichte des Theodoret von Kyrrhos. Eine Untersuchung ihrer Quellen von Dr A. Güldenpenning. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1889. pp. 101. 2 Mk.

A. Plummer

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 05 / May 1890, pp 228 - 228

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190419, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190419

How to cite this article:

A. Plummer (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 228-228 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190419

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

a few very slight notes added by Mr. Fausset, who has already done better work in his edition of the *Pro Cluentio*.

Dr. Munk's article is so entirely bloodless that it is hard to state what view he takes with regard to the cardinal questions of Cicero's acts, position, and influence, though on the whole it may be said to be probably that to which the majority of English scholars incline, as a compromise between the unscrupulous admiration of Middleton and the unqualified attacks of Mommsen and Drumann. The text of the book is about equal in length to Professor Ramsay's article in the *Dictionary of Biography*, and is of little more than the dictionary character; but it certainly does not sum up the results of criticism so well for 1889 as Professor Ramsay's did for 1873, since few authors have had so much done to illustrate them as Cicero in the intervening sixteen years. Mr. Fausset's translation for the German part of his work seems to be satisfactorily done throughout; in the quotations from Cicero (where he curiously explains that he 'thought well to go direct to the originals') he renders any ordinary passage fairly and carefully enough, but fails in almost every crucial test. Thus *o tempora! o mores!* he actually leaves untranslated altogether. The famous *abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit* becomes 'he has [*sic*] gone, departed, escaped, broken loose.' *O fortunatam natam me consule Romam*, for which a dozen vigorous translations might have been used, is rendered 'Rome by my consulate born anew to weal!' (p. 67), though with a late repentance (p. 235) he quotes Gifford's masculine rendering. In minor details Mr. Fausset is generally accurate: such spellings as *Caius* and *Mithridates* may perhaps pass by their common use, but *Cneius* (p. 32) was too much even for Mr. Froude. To call Asinius Pollio 'Cicero's chief rival in antiquity,' besides giving a wrong impression of Pollio's position, misdates him by a whole generation. Pollio was twelve years old in Cicero's consulship.

G. E. JEANS.

Ausgewählte Gedichte des P. Ovidius Naso.

Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von H. S. SEDLMAYER. Leipzig: Freytag, 1889. 1 M. 20 pf.

THIS well-printed little volume consists of 187 pages of selections from Ovid without notes, the first part from the *Metamorphoses*, the second from the elegiac poems. At the end is a mythological-geographical vocabulary of 37 pages. The introduction (pp. xvii.) contains a brief account of Ovid's life and works, and a clearly written section on the prosody and metre of the hexameter and elegiac couplet. It seems well suited for the object for which it is intended, a school reading book, and is supplemented by a Schulwörterbuch (1 M. 60 pf.) by Jurenka. At the end of the introduction are a collection of *versus memoriales* or 'tags,' upon which the beginner may practise his unfledged wings, deriving at the same time therefrom much sapient moral counsel. Thus he is taught courage (*Tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito*): he must pursue virtue for its own sake (*ipsa quidem virtus sibi met pulcherrima merces*), and spurn pleasures (*sperne voluptates: nocet empti dolore volupt-*

tas). He is consoled with the thought that if successful, *donec eris sospes, multos numerabis amicos*; but alas! if the reverse be his lot his plight will be indeed pitiable, for *crede mihi: miseros prudentia prima relinquit*. At the same time he learns his prosody, as the scansion of some of the lines is marked, and in a footnote is initiated into the mysteries of elision and aphaeresis.

S. G. OWEN.

Die Kirchengeschichte des Theodoret von Kyrrhos. Eine Untersuchung ihrer Quellen von Dr. A. GÜLDENPENNING. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1889. pp. 101. 2 Mk.

THIS investigation is conducted in a clear and satisfactory manner, and leads to some substantial results. About a few of the sources from which Theodoret drew his materials there is no doubt, for he names them. Athanasius is by far the most often mentioned, and his *Apologia de fuga sua* is the treatise most often used. Besides him he quotes or alludes to Eusebius once or twice, citing the *Life of Constantine*. The archheretic Arius and Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, are also quoted; and he seems to have known the writings of other Arians. He had seen some of the letters of Chrysostom, and one or more of his orations: at least he mentions them. He tells us also that he got some of his information at first hand by word of mouth. But when all these are added up together, they cover only a small portion of the ground.

It can be shown, however, that he uses Eusebius, Athanasius, and probably Arius, in other places where he does not name his authority. Can it be shown that he makes use of other sources without ever naming them? Valesius believed that he used both Socrates and Sozomen. Holzhausen contended that all three are quite independent. Our author is satisfied that Sozomen made use of Socrates, but Theodoret makes use of both. He dates the three works as follows, arguing from internal evidence; Socrates, A.D. 439-443; Sozomen, 434-447 and probably 443, 444; Theodoret, 441-449. He gives good reasons for believing that Theodoret certainly made use of Rufinus: thirteen instances of similarities are examined. Three coincidences between Theodoret and Socrates are pointed out, and eight between Theodoret and Sozomen. Dr. Guldpenning pronounces them to be fatal to the independence of Theodoret. Reasons are also given for placing the epitome of Philostorgius, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, and Ephraem Syrus among the unnamed sources of Theodoret.

Just a third of the treatise (pp. 62-96) is taken up with a most useful summary of the evidence in a tabulated form. Theodoret is taken chapter by chapter, and the supposed source of each passage that is not independent is indicated. The conclusion drawn is, that Theodoret has not told us much which we should not have known equally well without him; and that he would have done far better had he described the events of his own time instead of re-telling a thrice-told tale.

A. PLUMMER.

NOTES.

EUR. *Rhesus*, 59 60.

εἰ γὰρ φαεινὸν μὴ ζυνέσχεον ἡλίου
λαμπτήρες, οὐκ ἂν ἔσχοιεν εὐτυχοῖν δορυ.

The use of the same verb in its primitive and com-

pounded form leads one to give to it in each case a similar meaning. 'For had not the bright rays of the sun withdrawn themselves, I should not have withdrawn my conquering spear.'