

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](#)



Detlefsen on *Pliny's Natural History Untersuchungen über die Zusammensetzung der Naturgeschichte des plinius*, von D. Detlefsen. Berlin, Weidmann, 1899. 2 M. 40.

K. Jex-Blake

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 08 / November 1900, pp 423 - 424
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083475, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083475

How to cite this article:

K. Jex-Blake (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 423-424 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083475

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of his own. He ingeniously connects together *Att. v. 11 fin.* and *Att. v. 4 fin.*, reading *aufers* for *auser* in the former and *nummariam* for the unintelligible Greek letters in the latter, in which he supposes Cicero to be joking about his economy of paper—the numerous letters to Atticus costing him so much (*tu vero aufers ducentos, i.e. nummos*). In *Att. xi. 25* will be found an elaborate conjecture in the puzzling passage about Terentia's will, which is hardly likely to be accepted by scholars. In *Att. iv. 17* the difficult passage about the *judicium tacitum* is explained in a new way which is not very easy to understand: *consilia ... quae erant omnibus sortita* = the panels already allotted to them all (*omnibus* being taken as dative). In *Att. ix. 9*, where the proverb about Dionysius at Corinth is quoted, Mr. Shuckburgh is surely wrong in refusing to allow the identity of the proverb with the story alluded to in *Tusc. Disp. iii. 27*, and in *Fam. ix. 18*. Cicero must be allowed to explain himself here, and what he means is that the Optimates, though practically, like Dionysius, in exile, would not drop their old selfish ambitions on that account. In *Fam. ix. 16*, *7 miniati Iovis* should not appear as *Iupiter Miniatus*, as if *miniatus* were a cult-title of the god.

Lastly, the brief introductions to each

volume are just sufficient to put the unlearned reader in touch with the letters that follow, and they are free from any strong bias or prejudice in dealing with the great political controversy of Cicero's time. It is interesting to note how completely, among scholars at least, Cicero has of late been reinstated in the old position which he occupied before he was dethroned by Drumann's persistent bitterness and Mommsen's unjustifiable contempt. Far too much weight was given to Mommsen's strictures: it was not recognised that Mommsen has never been a sound judge of individual character, and that his transcendent merits as a historian rest on very different grounds. The consequence has been a very strong reaction against Mommsen's judgment both of Cicero and Caesar, and at present we are apt, on the one hand, to make too little of Cicero's weaknesses, and on the other to swallow whole the old Plutarchian myth that Caesar had planned out his *ruparv's* twenty years at least before it came. A translation of the whole Ciceronian correspondence, enabling us to survey it completely in a week, may do something to enable the ordinary reader to correct these errors.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

DETLEFSEN ON PLINY'S NATURAL HISTORY.

Untersuchungen über die Zusammensetzung der Naturgeschichte des Plinius, von D. DETLEFSEN. Berlin, Weidmann, 1899. 2 M. 40.

DR. DETLEFSEN tells us that he has here brought together some of the observations and general conclusions to which he has been led by more than forty years work on Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*. All that he writes is marked by a complete familiarity with every line of his author, and though he sometimes attributes more meaning to small things than can fairly be found in them, his book should be useful as a general introduction to Pliny and also to students of any particular group of books. A good account (pp. 8–20) of Pliny's life and method of work leads on to an analysis of the *Naturalis Historia* itself, and especially to a close comparison of the *indices* with the books to which they belong. Dr. Detlefsen's view is that most writers on Pliny have considered

him too much as the man of learning, the compiler and arranger of extracts from many books, and too little as the imperial officer, whose duties in different parts of the empire gave him wide opportunity for acquiring knowledge at first hand. The part played by Pliny's personal observations he has therefore been specially anxious to disentangle. Taking the books on botany, agriculture, &c., in separate groups, he shows their plan and relation to the chief authorities, and traces any clues that lead to Pliny's own probable contributions. Pliny's boast in his preface, § 17, that he has included much matter not to be found in his predecessors' books—*adiectis rebus plurimis quas aut ignoraverant priores aut postea invenerat vita*—betokens a habit of mind of which frequent signs appear in the later books. Again and again by such expressions as *vidimus, scio, comperimus, postea compertum* (following a citation from Cato) Pliny lays

stress on points on which he pretends to fuller information than his forerunners. An analysis of the chapters on art in books xxxiv-xxxvi shows clearly the framework in which Pliny arranged his excerpts. Dr. Detlefsen believes in the direct use of a Greek writer on art for the bulk of these sections. To the use of numbers in the indices Dr. Detlefsen attaches importance. These numbers, as they appear in the MSS., can sometimes be corrected by comparison with the passage to which they refer: e.g., the index to xvi., 26 reads *aceris genera X*. Five only can be found in the text (§ 66 f.), and the index should be emended accordingly. In other cases varying methods of reckoning must have been employed: the total of 64 islands given in the index to book iii. is reached by counting each group of islands as one, while in book iv. each island of a group is reckoned separately. A suggestion that in the index to book vi. the sum total '*res et historiae et observationes MMCCXIII*' refers to the whole contents of the geographical books iii.-vi., defies verification: the clue is lost in the corruption of the number given in the text. One argument on which Dr. Detlefsen lays weight seems unsatisfactory; he believes that the addition of numbers to

some *lemmata* in the indices, while they are omitted with other very similar ones, is in itself significant, and an integral part of Pliny's design of contrasting his own performance with that of earlier writers. Facts derived from Pliny's own experience are therefore to be looked for particularly in the *lemmata* with numbers. For instance, in the index of xiii., 23, we find (*papyri genera VIII*). When they are described, § 74 ff., no author is quoted in the text, and it is certain that Pliny's service in the east gave him opportunity to investigate the matter for himself. So in many other places a coincidence between opportunity for personal knowledge on Pliny's part and the occurrence of numbers in the indices can be shown. This proof is insufficient, however, when numbers in the sections of the indices can again be found where Pliny is certainly following another author, as in xvi., §§ 62-4, where the facts are drawn from Theophrastus. The use of numbers, like that of alphabetical lists, is frequent but irregular in Pliny, and is the natural outcome of his way of working, by tabulating and recasting the memoranda and excerpts which filled his note-books.

K. JEX-BLAKE.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ON THE FESTIVAL EPIDAURIA AT ATHENS.

THE account of the Eleusinian Mysteries in the new edition of A. Mommsen's *Heortologie* (*Die Feste der Stadt Athen*, 1898) presents two striking innovations. The Eleusinia, i.e. the Eleusinian games, are entirely separated from the Mysteries proper and made a separate festival; and secondly, the Epidauria are practically identified with the Lesser Mysteries in such a way as to change our whole conception of the *curseus* of the Mysteries after 400 B.C. The first point has received all the attention it deserves from the pen of Prof. Robert in the *Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeiger* (July 8, 1899, S. 538 f.); the second may perhaps be considered a little more in detail.

Mommsen's argument as to the Epidauria (*Feste der Stadt Athen*, S. 216-222) may be summarized as follows:—Philostratos (*Vita Apollon*. iv. 18, p. 72, 6) says that Apollonios arrived in Athens on the day of the Epi-

dauria, and, contrary to expectation, desired to be initiated in the Mysteries. The hierophant, however, refused to bring out the *hiera* and open the gates of Eleusis to one who dealt with spirits. Now the Lesser Mysteries opened the gates of Eleusis, therefore (p. 220) the Epidauria were the equivalent of the Lesser Mysteries. Mommsen finds this position confirmed by two or three inscriptions which say that the mysteries at Agrai (i.e. the Lesser Mysteries) were celebrated twice in certain years. The second celebration he identifies unhesitatingly with the Epidauria. Moreover, since the Epidauria date from the coming of Asklepios to Athens, the practice of celebrating the Lesser Mysteries twice in the year goes back to the end of the fifth century B.C. (S. 220, l. 8).

The attempt to make the Epidauria equivalent to the Lesser Mysteries from 400 B.C. on, suggests difficulties at once. These difficulties affect each element in the argument:—(a) the inscriptions which