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](#)

Pauly-Wissowa's *Encyclopaedia Pauly's Real-Encyclopauml;die der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung ... herausg. von Georg Wissowa. Xter Halbband: Donatio—Ephoroi. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1905. 9³/₄" × 6³/₄". 1332 cols. Some Plans in Text. M. 15.

G. F. Hill

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 02 / March 1906, pp 126 - 127

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993909, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993909

How to cite this article:

G. F. Hill (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 126-127 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993909

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

determined. By way of introduction, Dr. B. briefly discusses the well-known attitude of ancient writers generally in the matter of imitating or silently appropriating the works of predecessors. Having thus paved the way for an impartial appreciation of the author, if it should turn out that he had, as in the case of Cicero, also laid Seneca under extensive contribution, he proceeds to compare the Octavius with the works of Seneca under two heads, *material imitation* (pp. 7-39) and *stylistic indebtedness* (pp. 39-59). In each case, however, with an admirable freedom from bias or the desire to prove a preconceived hypothesis—a quality deplorably lacking in most of the contributions to this subject,—he invariably distinguishes between three classes of passages: (1) those, where a reminiscence of Seneca is indubitable, (2) those, where indebtedness is highly probable and, (3) where the resemblance may be accidental, but, in view of obligations previously demonstrated, is not intrinsically impossible. It is clear that the determination of indebtedness to the *thought* of Seneca was by far the more difficult part of his task, requiring as it did a most careful weighing of possibilities no less than a very thorough knowledge of the works in question. The methodical and acute discussions accompanying all the principal passages adduced—many of them for the first time—satisfy all the demands that can reasonably be made upon a treatise of this nature. Thus a work that was worth doing has here been done once for all and done extremely well, the laborious comparison now establishing what had so often, but upon insufficient evidence, been asserted, to wit: that the author of the Octavius was satur-

ated with the thought and to a considerable extent with the phraseology of the writer whose ethical discussions seemed to the early Church to possess so close an affinity to Christian doctrine, as to be explicable only on the supposition of his conversion, a conviction which found a concrete expression in the still extant, apocryphal correspondence between Seneca and St. Paul.

But the result of Dr. Burger's investigation also justifies, as I have said, an important conclusion regarding the controversy referred to above. If an author of the intellectual stamp of Minucius Felix reveals so profound an indebtedness, in form and matter, to two pagan writers, such as Cicero and Seneca, it is all but psychologically impossible that he should have been proof against the overpowering individuality of a 'defensor fidei,' like Tertullian, provided, as Harnack and others so confidently assert, he had the celebrated *Apologeticum* before his eyes. But the very few alleged parallelisms in thought and phraseology between the two hitherto adduced are either not sufficiently characteristic or else inevitable in the treatment of similar themes. And when it is remembered that the Octavius contains no direct allusion to the Scriptures, no mention of Christ by name, no reference to the Trinity, the Revelation, or any other fundamental dogma of Christianity, if finally we compare the *σωφοσύνη* of Minucius with the 'furor arduus' of Tertullian, it is difficult for a non-prejudiced critic to believe that the fairly conciliatory Octavius was written under the influence of a pamphlet so 'full of Mars' as the *Apologeticum*.

A. GUDEMAN.

Munich.

PAULY-WISSOWA'S *ENCYCLOPAEDIA*.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung . . . herausg. von GEORG WISSOWA. X^{ter} Halbband: Donatio-Ephoroi. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1905. 9¾" x 6¾". 1332 cols. Some Plans in Text. M. 15.

THE tenth half-volume of this great encyclopaedia has the usual number of invaluable articles, ranging from *Donatio* to *Ephoroi*: articles such as those by Reisch on *Dreifuss*, Liebenam on *Duoviri*, Skutsch on *Ennius*, Crusius on *Elegie*, Swoboda on *Elis* and

Epameinondas, Büchner on *Ephesos*. It is unfortunate that the remarkable results of the recent excavations have not been published in time to be utilized for the last subject. The editing is conducted with Prof. Wissowa's accustomed care; if we proceed to point out weak spots in it, it is only because we feel that the book is so near being perfect that it ought to be nearer still. We have been more than usually struck in this volume by the prominence which is given to what may be called the agricultural interest. Prof. Olck's articles usurp more space than

seems to be justified. A subject like *Δούλοι* has only 5 columns, but *Düngung* has over 20! *Duracinus* (usually a cling-stone fruit) has 4 columns, *Egge* (a harrow) over 3, *Ente* nearly 10, *Eiche* 63½, and *Epheu* 20. In the last two cases the mythological importance of the oak and the ivy partly excuses the length of the articles. But, generally speaking, exuberances of this kind, suitable doubtless to a separate book on ancient *Landwirthschaft*, should be carefully pruned away in an Encyclopaedia. An excrescence of another kind is a quotation from Livy—whose works are presumably accessible to most users of the Encyclopaedia—occupying three-quarters of col. 2529. We have on a previous occasion noted the insufficient numismatic equipment of some of the writers on topography. Here, under *Dora*, nothing numismatic later than de Saulcy is quoted; the British Museum Catalogues seem to be

unknown to those who write on places such as *Emesa* and *Elaeussa*; we are not told that *Eboda* issued coins; and under *Edones* their king Getas, who is known to us by a most remarkable coinage, studied by Babelon in Svoronos' *Journal*, is not so much as mentioned. Doubtless he will find his way in under *G*; but there should at any rate be a cross-reference. It might also have been worth while to include the personification of *Dynamis* on Alexandrian coins. Every specialist is liable to take an exaggerated view of his own subject, and consider it to be unduly neglected. But in the case of sciences like numismatics, which bear on most other studies in an often unexpected way, would it not be worth while to have a bibliography made by some specialist for the purposes of the Encyclopaedia?

G. F. HILL.

BURTON ON THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem. By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON. Printed from Volume V. of the Decennial Publications. The University of Chicago Press, 1904. 4to. Pp. 72. \$1 net.

THIS is a work that satisfies more, the more it is studied. The first glance at it may leave the reader repelled by what he will feel to be an insult to his powers of following an abstract or complicated argument. A careful perusal makes him forget his annoyance, and recognise that there is substantial value in the monograph.

The feature which is at first repellent is the introduction of diagrams or graphs to represent the various theories that have been or may be propounded for the reconciliation of the facts exhibited by the Synoptic Gospels. This is a method which doubtless has its uses for certain branches of mathematics and political economy; but when applied for the purposes of making a literary or philosophical argument not obnoxious to confusion of thought, it seems a concession to lazy thinkers such that its extended use would soon lower the average standard of power to reason.

Once the reader, however, has digested his scruples about this innovation, he will find the writer to be a sane and subtle judge of

his subject. He very properly sets forth upon his investigation with the timely remark that 'ever since the days of Augustine or Jerome, not to say earlier, the mutual resemblances of the first three Gospels have been observed, and the problem thus created for the biblical scholar has been discussed.' Then follows a statement of every conceivable hypothesis—with a diagram for each—and a brief discussion clears the ground for the view which Prof. Burton advocates. Here is, perhaps, the one weakness in the work. The arguments used for dismissing hypothesis M (as its diagram is numbered), *i.e.* the hypothesis of an oral tradition issuing in our three Gospels, are not as convincing as they ought to be for the author's purpose. He states that 'it fails to account for the large amount of close verbal agreement which exists between the Gospels'—this must be discounted by the fact that where oral repetition or teaching is greatly used, as in the East, it attains an accuracy inconceivable amongst us and comparable to Lord Macaulay's memory. 'It very unsatisfactorily accounts,' he continues, 'for the remarkable agreement between the Gospels, especially between Mark and Luke, in order of section': the same criticism is applicable. 'It furnishes no explanation of the relatively small amount of agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark in threefold matter'—a sound