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](#)

Cambridge Texts and Studies. Vol. I. Part I *Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature*, edited by J. Armitage Robinson, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Vol. i. No. I. The Apology of Aristides, edited and translated by J. Armitage Robinson, M.A, Cambridge University Press, 1891. 5s.

A. Plummer

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 10 / December 1891, pp 468 - 470

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179636, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179636

How to cite this article:

A. Plummer (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 468-470 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179636

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

woman named Phue' omits the *μεγάλη*, which is as essential as the *καλή* in the account of Athena's representative (p. 40, l. 5). 'The corrupt practices of modern law courts' does not at all express τὰ νῦν γινόμενα in p. 27, l. 4, which only means the great power of the courts, not their corruption.

Those who are familiar with Mr. Poste's translation of the *Posterior Analytics* will be prepared to find his English at some distance from the Greek. In the translation before us this is noticeable in the modern and not unfrequently stilted language which he employs. Solon is 'interviewed': men become 'millionaires': Cleon makes speeches 'in the garb of a working-man' (*διαζωσάμενος* or *διεζωσμένος*); οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον is 'he would have dissolved society': τῆς πολιτείας μεταδίδοναι is 'to give them a share in shaping the destinies of the nation': παραστρατηγηθῆναι is to be 'made the unwitting accomplice of a fraudulent scheme,' and we have already seen that ὁδοί are 'the precincts of the metropolis.' ἀριστίνδην is more than adequately translated by 'in accordance with the qualifications characteristic of an aristocratic constitution': something simpler would do. The following sentence offends in another way and requires the hand of the emender as much as any passage in the original Greek: 'what is the likelihood that a man, so just and so superior to personal interests that, when he might by bribing the support of either faction have continued (?) tyrant, he dared to offend them both, preferring to personal aggrandisement the glory of saving the state, it is credible that such a man should be tempted to cover himself with dishonour for a paltry pecuniary gain?' Another questionable practice is the habit of introducing explanatory matter into the text instead of putting it, if at all, into notes. κύρβεις, for instance, is translated 'three-faced pyramids revolving on pivots': Μαρωνεία is 'Maroneia or Laurion': κομίσασθαι τὰ χρήματα is 'call in the capital and dispose of it at their

pleasure.' 'Geraestus' becomes 'Geraistos, the south point of Euboia,' and 'Scyllaeum' appears as 'Skullaion, the east point of Argolis.' Into ch. 43 about eight lines of astronomical matter are interpolated, of which there is not a word in the original text.

By way of comparing the two books, it may be said shortly that Mr. Kenyon keeps closer to the words of the Greek and will give perhaps a better idea of the style of the original, while Mr. Poste strays further from it and perhaps gains less often than he loses: that Mr. Poste avails himself more freely of emendations or has brought his work more thoroughly up to date, while Mr. Kenyon can tell us with authority the last readings of the MS.: that Mr. Kenyon states what readings he is translating while Mr. Poste does not: and that Mr. Kenyon furnishes in a well-written introduction and in numerous notes an amount of explanation and comment much greater than is supplied by Mr. Poste's few notes and the explanations introduced without notice into his text.

The German translation referred to above appeared very speedily after the publication of the papyrus and, though the translators used considerable freedom in dealing with the Greek and in some places would appear to have anticipated conjectures since made, it represents a text now so discredited that it must be rewritten before it calls for particular notice. For the time at which it was published it appears to be accurately and skilfully done. The value to foreigners of the Italian translation, which also seems to be accurate, consists chiefly in the greatly improved Greek text which accompanies it, embodying a large number of English and foreign emendations, and furnishing us with something far better than the Museum's second edition. But the Dutch and German editions that have since appeared render this text of comparatively little use.

H. RICHARDS.

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS AND STUDIES. VOL. I. PART I.

Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, edited by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Vol. i. No. I. *The Apology of Aristides*, edited and translated by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1891. 5s.

AN English series of publications analogous to *Texte und Untersuchungen* is very welcome, and this first instalment augurs well for its quality. It gives English students full opportunity of judging for themselves of the value of the document which was published in 1878 (*S. Aristidis, philosophi atheniensis, Sermones duo*, St. Lazare) by the

Armenians of the Lazarist monastery at Venice, as an Armenian translation of the first part of the *Apology* of Aristides. In his *Église Chrétienne*, p. vi., Renan confidently denied the authenticity of this interesting fragment. But there seems to be little doubt that he has been too hasty; and it remains to be seen whether he will retract or modify the opinion which he expressed in 1879. The present volume gives us a great deal more, viz. a Syriac translation of nearly the whole of the *Apology*, which was discovered by the editor in the convent of S. Catharine on Mt. Sinai in 1889. Till 1878 we knew little more of Aristides than the very meagre notices of him in the *Ecclesiastical History* and *Chronicon* of Eusebius, who tells us that Aristides addressed a defence of the faith to Hadrian, and that this defence had been 'preserved by many people down to the present day'; which scarcely implies that Eusebius himself had read it. At any rate he does not quote it: and it appears that he was mistaken in supposing that it was addressed to Hadrian. In the translation of what seem to be the opening words of the original we read ... 'Caesar Titus Hadrianus Antoninus, Worshipful and Clement, from Marcianus Aristides, philosopher of Athens,'—words which clearly indicate Antoninus Pius, the successor of Hadrian, who bears the name Hadrian by adoption. Either Eusebius or his informant has read the title carelessly, and scores of writers since his day have copied his statement. This independence in reference to Eusebius, the addition of the name Marcianus to Aristides, and the extreme simplicity of the *Apology* itself, are all in favour of the genuineness of the document. Another characteristic which is in favour of its antiquity is its friendliness towards Judaism: and yet, in spite of this friendliness, in the traces of a primitive creed which are found in it occurs the clause 'He was pierced by the Jews,' without the words which became common afterwards 'under Pontius Pilate.' The editor is right in comparing with this clause the words of S. Peter in Acts ii. 36, 'Whom ye crucified,' but not those of S. James in his Epistle, v. 6, where 'ye have killed the righteous one' is probably a general statement and has no direct reference to the death of Christ (comp. Wisd. ii. 10–20). But the words of S. Peter in Acts iii. 14, 15, and of S. Stephen in Acts vii. 52, might be added as parallel.

The nucleus of a creed which is found in the *Apology* runs thus: 'He was pierced by the Jews; He died and was buried; After

three days he rose again, and ascended into heaven.' It is probable that other doctrinal statements which occur in the appeal are *dissecta membra* of the same symbol; viz. that God is the Maker of heaven and earth, and that Jesus Christ is to come to judge; perhaps also that He was born of the Virgin Mary.

There is some reason for believing that Celsus had read the *Apology* of Aristides, and that some of his criticisms, as quoted by Origen, were directed against it, or at least suggested by it. The argument is a cumulative one, and (with one exception) none of the items taken singly amount to very much. The exception is this. Aristides 'expresses the remarkable opinion that the Jewish ritual is rather an adoration of angels than a worship of God. The expression is the more remarkable because Aristides affects to reason throughout as the philosopher rather than the Christian, and he forgets himself and introduces the angels without even an explanation to the emperor, as to what beings are intended. What shall we say then when we find Celsus affirming that the Jews worship angels? And Origen is so puzzled as to ask "where in the world did Celsus find in the Mosaic writings instruction in the worship of angels" (*C. Cels.* i. 26). It is certainly curious that we find the missing link supplied by the *Apology* of Aristides.'

When the Armenian translation is compared with the Syriac in that portion which is common to both, it is seen that on the whole the latter is much the more faithful rendering. There are exceptions, but as a rule it is the Armenian translator who takes liberties in both directions, sometimes interpolating and sometimes condensing. It is he who speaks of Christ's Mother as the Theotokos, an expression which Renan pronounced to be among the things which were fatal to the authenticity of the document. In the Syriac there is no such expression, and we may be confident that it was not found in the Greek original.

In the Appendix Mr. Robinson shows that we have a third authority for determining the contents of the *Apology* of Aristides. This is contained in the Greek text of the famous romance of 'Barlaam and Josaphat,' which is printed in Migne's edition of John of Damascus, but which, although connected with his name since the eleventh century, is of much earlier origin, and is an adaptation of the Indian legend of Buddha. In the story, Josaphat, the son of an Eastern King, is converted to Chris-

tianity in spite of his father's precautions, who had been warned by astrologers at the child's birth that he would become a Christian. The father is distressed and enraged; but Barlaam, who had converted Josaphat, has disappeared. The following scheme is then laid to reconvert the prince. Nachor, an old man who resembles Barlaam, is put up to defend Christianity in open discussion and is to allow himself to be easily refuted, so that the prince may see how worthless a religion he has adopted. But Nachor is made to bless where he had intended to curse, and delivers such a speech that he himself and the king and the people become Christians. *The speech which he delivers is the Apology of Aristides*, with just such modifications as are necessary to make it fit the surroundings. So that here we seem to have the Greek original, with comparatively slight alteration; and as it is a good deal shorter than the Syriac, there is reason for believing that the latter has been freely interpolated. Those parts of the *Apology* which would not suit the story would of course be omitted; but that fact will not account for all the differences.

In marked contrast to the writings of Justin Martyr, the *Apology* of Aristides contains very few references to canonical books, although there are passages which are coloured by N. T. language, especially from the Epistle to the Romans. But some of these references may have been inserted by the author of 'Barlaam and Josaphat,' for they are either less clear in the Syriac or do not appear there at all. Beyond implying a written narrative of Christ's life the *Apology* throws no light upon the Canon. This also is in favour of its authenticity and early

date. Aristides in arguing as a philosopher would not be likely to make much use of Christian writings, and in his time many of the canonical books were not widely diffused.

Mr. Robinson is specially to be congratulated on his identification of Nachor's speech in 'Barlaam and Josaphat' with the much desired Greek text of the *Apology* of Aristides. It has been open to any scholar to make this important discovery ever since Boissonade published the Greek text of the romance in vol. iv. of his *Anecdota* in Paris, 1832; but the glory has been reserved for Cambridge and Mr. Robinson. Boissonade made very inadequate use of the materials which lay ready to his hand, confining himself to four, or indeed mainly two, out of seventeen MSS. which are in the Library at Paris: and there are others elsewhere, amounting to about sixty in all, which Zotenberg has catalogued. Boissonade's faulty text has been reprinted (with fresh blunders) in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, tom. 96, in the third vol. of John of Damascus. Mr. Robinson has now given us a newly edited text, with a large number of variants from MSS. which he has collated. As he points out, nothing has been attempted as yet in the way of a genealogical classification of the materials: but whoever undertakes that laborious work will be largely indebted to the present editor for his pioneering.

It is little exaggeration to say that the first volume of 'Texts and Studies' deserves to rank with the *Didache* and *Diatesaron* as among the most important of the many precious recoveries which have been made during the present century.

A. PLUMMER.

DYER'S STUDIES OF THE GODS IN GREECE.

Studies of the Gods in Greece, at certain Sanctuaries recently excavated. By LOUIS DYER, B.A. Oxon, late Assistant Professor at Harvard University. Macmillan & Co. 8s. 6d. net.

How did the average Greek citizen think of his relation to the gods, and what fruit had his religion in his daily life? There is nothing more difficult, even for mature students of Greek thought, than the attempt to answer such questions as these. Young scholars who have completed their course at the university may well feel wholly at a

loss when confronted with them. And no wonder. The religion of the Romans, in spite of all its obscurities, presents no such difficulties; however deeply overlaid by importations from without, it was in the main the religion of a single community, and of a people gifted neither with fancy nor speculative power, who moreover at an early period allowed it to come under the control of a powerful political priesthood. But the religion of the Greeks is like the halcyon's plumage, always changing hue in varying lights; we cannot now reduce it to a system, simply because it never was system-