

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](#)



***From Schola to Cathedral.* By G. Baldwin Brown. D. Douglas: Edinburgh. 7s. 6d.**

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 2-3 / April 1887, pp 75 - 75

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00182897, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00182897

How to cite this article:

(1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 75-75 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00182897

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

followed by Clem. Al. in the *paed.*; his relation to Epictetus; his cynicism (comparison of Lucian's Cynic to the *paed.*); the relation of the essays of Musonius to the *paed.*; the *λόγοι* of Musonius as source of Clement, of Pseudo-Musonius,¹ of Justin (or Pseudo-Justin),² of Tertullian, of Plutarch. It is shewn that Clement's authority lived at Rome. In an excursus an attempt is made to restore the text of Musonius from one chapter of the *paed.* (III 6, on the paradox the sage alone is rich). The author displays a familiarity with the philosophy of the empire which reminds one of Gataker. His work will be of great service to future editors of Seneca, Epictetus, Plutarch, Clement, Justin, Tertullian, and appears to have proved that Clement used, not the fragments of Musonius preserved by Stobaeus, but in all probability the very *λόγοι* ascribed to Musonius by Suidas.

J. E. B. M.

M. Iuniani Iustini epitoma historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi ex recensione FRANCISCI RUEHL. *Aecedunt prologi in Pompeium Program ab* ALFREDO DE GUTSCHMID *recensiti.* Lipsiae, Teubner, 1886. cr. 8vo. pp. lxii., 315. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana). 1 Mk. 50.

RUEHL has collated the chief MSS. and gives in the preface the principal various readings and conjectures. Several scholars, as Böhrens, A. v. Gutschmid, Theod. Nöldeke, Edwin Rohde, L. Müller, and L. Jeep (not Justus Jeep, the editor of Teubner's former edition) have supplied corrections and rendered other help. Ruehl no longer scents so many glosses in the text, as he did in 1872, and gives a more conservative text than he would do, if he could have added a complete apparatus. The (historical) index is new.—J. E. B. M.

DECIMI MAGNI AUSONII BURDIGALENSIS *opuscula.* *Receusit* RUDOLFUS PEIPER. Lipsiae 1886 (Bibl. Teubneriana). pp. cxxviii 556. 6 M. 60 Pf.

The works of Ausonius, with the exception of the *Mosella*, have been strangely neglected till of late. Haupt noticed a few of his quotations from classical poets, but most scholars for two centuries have treated him with silent contempt. Now we have two excellent editions, Schenk's and Peiper's, appearing at an interval of three years.

The preface gives (1) an account of the MSS. pp. v—lxxxviii, and (2) a chronological table, followed by pedigrees and a supplement to the first index.

Before the publication of Schenk's edition Peiper had treated at length of the manuscript evidence for the text of Ausonius ('Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Ausonius' in *Jahrb. f. class. Philologie*, Suppl. xi 191—353, Leipzig, 1879), and had proved that some 36 of the epigrams are the work of Italian scholars of the fifteenth century, and that several other pieces (*periochae Homeri Iliadis et Odysseae, septem sapientum sententiae, de rosis, nomina Musarum, de signis caelestibus*), though ancient, are ascribed to Ausonius without authority. Lexicographers and commentators should revise their works by the light of this discovery.

The more important parallels are cited under the text; others in ind. i 'auctores et imitatores' (pp. 437—499). The second index 'nominum et rerum'

¹ The author of the letter ascribed to Musonius.

² The author of the letter 'ad Zenam et Serenum.'

fills pp. 500—544. Ind. iii and iv give tables in which the pages and numbers of the new edition are compared with the Delphin, Bipont, and Schenk's arrangements.—J. E. B. M.

M. Minucii Felicis Octavii. Emendavit et praefatus est AEMILIUS BÄHRENS. Lipsiae 1886, 1 M. 35 Pf. (Bibl. Teubneriana).

To Augustine's City of God, Commodian, Dracontius, Eusebius (h.e., p.e., d.e.), the *Christus Patiens*, Iosephus, Iuvenius, Nonni paraphr., and the N. T. of Buttmann, the enterprising publisher here adds for the benefit of theological students what Halm calls the 'aureus libellus' of Minucius. The preface is dated Groningen, June 1883, but a postscript dated Nov. 1885 informs us that it was not sent to press for more than two years later. Böhrens makes the author a contemporary of Hadrian and Fronto, born at Rome and there educated under Trajan. He holds that Ebert has demonstrated that Tertullian borrowed from Minucius, an opinion not so generally held now as two years ago, and defines the years A.D. 162, 163, as the date of the Octavius. With regard to the dogmatic convictions of the author Böhrens says: 'sic igitur statuo, Minucium aliquatenus praecessisse Straussianos nostros Renanosque.' A selection of emendations is given below the text.—J. E. B. M.

From Schola to Cathedral. By G. BALDWIN BROWN. D. Douglas: Edinburgh. 7s. 6d.

THE main contention of this learned and ingenious contribution to the history of Christian architecture admits of being briefly stated. The 'schola' or meeting-house of a trade or other guild or corporation suggested, thinks Professor Brown, the earliest form of the Christian church. This is a sense of the word which is not familiar to the student of classical Latin, though it is akin to a classical usage; but it is found in the Jurists and in inscriptions. Every one will acknowledge the force of the author's argument when he urges that a community which was often persecuted by the State, and commonly the object of popular suspicion or hatred, must have had its places of worship of a very humble kind, suited for concealment rather than display. In after days, when Constantine had given the imperial recognition to Christianity, the stately *basilica* would naturally be the model of the church, indeed, would often be converted to the purposes of the now established religion; but in earlier times we should expect to find buildings of a very different kind utilized and imitated. Professor Brown finds a significant illustration in an edict of Alexander Severus, in which that Emperor, a great patron of trade-associations, decides in favour of the Christian community a dispute relative to a piece of land between it and the *popinarii*, on the ground that 'it was better that God should be worshipped in that place in any sort of way than that it should be given over to tavern-keepers.' The Christians wanted the place, then, for purposes of worship; and it is at least a probable conclusion that 'whatever building they erected on the ground thus secured would have been considered a *schola*, and would have had the form and architectural character of those buildings.' Further we cannot follow Professor Brown, and indeed it would scarcely be possible to do so without the aid of illustrations. But we have fulfilled our object if we have commended his very interesting volume to the notice of our readers.