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](#)

Gifford's *Eusebius Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis*. Libr. XV. Ad codices manuscriptos denuo collatos recensuit anglice nunc primum reddidit Notis et Indicibus instruxit E. H. Gifford, S.T.P. Oxford Univ. Press, 1903. £5 5s.

H. F. Stewart

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 06 / July 1904, pp 323 - 325
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990449, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990449

How to cite this article:

H. F. Stewart (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 323-325 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990449

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

GIFFORD'S *EUSEBIUS*.

Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis. Libr. XV. Ad codices manuscriptos denuo collatos recensuit anglice nunc primum reddidit Notis et Indicibus instruxit E. H. Gifford, S.T.P. Oxford: Univ. Press, 1903. £5 5s.

THE *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Ἡ Εὐαγγελικὴ Προπαρασκευὴ of Eusebius is the longest and in many respects the most important apologetical work of the early Christian Church. Vast as it is in scope and execution, it is but a portion of a yet larger undertaking: it is only the first volume of a complete Ἀποδείξις Εὐαγγελικῇ. It contains the author's ἀπολογία in the strict sense of the word—his own defence of his belief against hostile charges. His ὁμολογία or confession of faith although it starts up incidentally in the course of the apology is reserved for fuller expansion in the second part, of which some ten out of an original score of books have come down to us. His first business is to clear the way by defending himself and his fellow Christians against the charge of folly and credulity, for this was the weapon of attack which at the beginning of the fourth century had replaced the earlier allegations of atheism and disloyalty to the State. He has to prove that Christians did not embrace their religion without due deliberation. For this purpose a comparison between the old faith and the new was necessary. That comparison had been tried before: Aristides and Justin Martyr, Tatian and Athenagoras, Clement and Origen, had each in turn called attention to what they considered the essential absurdity of heathen religion; but none of them had done so with a wealth of illustration and a width of learning such as were brought to the task by the Bishop of Caesarea. It may indeed be said that his apology differs from that of his predecessors precisely in the rich harvest of a thousand years of Greek literature with which he presents his readers, and which renders the *Praeparatio Evangelica* so valuable a source of information to the classical student of to-day. Fabricius devotes sixteen pages to the list of writers referred to by Eusebius in the work under consideration (see *Bibl. Graeca*, vol. vii. pp. 346–362). Among them are some, such as Aristocles of Messene, Numenius of Apamea, Gentilianus Amelius, Areius Didymus, Boethus of Sidon,

Oenomaus the Cynic, Abydenus and Alexander Polyhistor, who would otherwise be hardly more than names to us, while others, such as Severus and Atticus the Platonists, and Diogenianus the Stoic, would be even less than that if this Christian father had not made mention of them or quoted from their writings. The *Praeparatio Evangelica* has the further merit of preserving unknown fragments of Plutarch, Plato, Porphyry, Plotinus, and Aeschylus.

The work is divided into fifteen books, the first three of which contain an indictment of heathen mythology, the next three an account of oracles, sacrifices to demons, and the doctrine of Fate. In books seven, eight, and nine the author contrasts the Hebrew with the heathen oracles and adduces in favour of the former the evidence of many heathen writers. Books ten to thirteen are taken up with the well-worn attempt to shew that the Greeks were plagiarists of the Hebrew scriptures and that all they had of good was borrowed from Hebrew sources. In the last two books Eusebius passes to philosophy; he examines the conflicting theories of the Greek thinkers and tries to expose their errors and falsehoods especially as they are seen in the peripatetic, Stoic, and various materialistic systems—οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς αἰτίας εἰς φανερόν τεθείσης, δι' ἣν τὰ τῶνδε ἀποστραφέντες τὰ Ἑβραίων Λόγια προτετιμήκαμεν, τὰ μὲν τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς Προπαρασκευῆς ἐν τούτοις ἡμῖν περιγεγράφθω. *Praep. Ev.* xv. 856.

There is probably no book in existence that better deserved careful and complete re-editing; there are not many editions of ancient authors which for completeness and care can rival the monumental work of the Cambridge Scholar which the Oxford Press has recently brought out; and there are assuredly very few editors that have the knowledge, experience, and patience necessary for dealing with the vast material to the same extent as the veteran theologian and humanist who was Senior Classic in 1843. The record of Dr. Gifford's achievements in learning and in the practical application of learning to life is now fitly crowned by the successful accomplishment of an undertaking which has appalled many younger men, 'chacun ayant reculé devant la longueur et les difficultés de la tâche.'

The work now presented to us is in five

solid volumes; two of text, two of English translation, and one of notes.

Dr. Gifford has availed himself to the full of all the help of other labourers in the same field from Robert Estienne (one regrets to find Dr. Gifford giving his sanction to the bad habit of distorting the name Estienne into Stephens, *e.g.* in Notes, p. 426) who issued the *editio princeps* in 1544 to Thomas Gaisford whose edition appeared in the very year that Gifford took his degree. The Oxford Professor, although his work is marked by all his usual brilliance, was content for commentary and explanation to reproduce the Latin notes and translation of the Jesuit scholar Viger (1628), and while to Gaisford is due the great credit of the first critical edition of the *Praeparatio*, his knowledge of the MSS. was superficial and one important codex (O) had not come to light in 1843. Dr. Gifford on the other hand has had the advantage of the best advice and the most careful collations in constructing his *apparatus criticus* as well as of the very skilful classification of MSS. made fourteen years ago by Dr. J. A. Heikel (*De Praeparationis Evangelicae Eusebii edendae ratione*, Helsingfors, 1888).

Gifford in general closely follows the guidance of the Finnish scholar but he differs from him in the higher value which he sets on A, the great Paris MS. (Bibl. Nat. 451). This, the earliest extant codex of the *Praeparatio*, was written in 914 A.D. for Archbishop Arethas of Cappadocian Caesarea. It contains the first five books complete, and can be controlled by H, the eleventh century Venice MS. (Marc. 343) which is a copy of A or of their common original.

Of other MSS. containing the whole work the most important are B (Paris Bibl. Nat. 465, thirteenth century) which although imperfect gives valuable independent readings; I (Venice Bibl. Marc. 341, fifteenth century) and O (Bonn. Bibl. Univ. 3643, early thirteenth century) to which latter document attention was first drawn by Dr. Ed. Schwartz. Gifford reproduces two folios of this beautiful MS. in collotype. The relations of I and O to each other and to B are complicated and interesting in the extreme. They are described at length by the Editor in his Preface and summarized with admirable clearness by Dr. E. Schürer in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* of 24 October, 1903, pp. 596-7. In the same article Schürer gives a list of readings from *Praepar.* Book IX in which according to his opinion Gifford presents a better text than Gaisford. Gifford's text is based on the five MSS.

above enumerated; the rest, although he mentions six more in his *Index Codicum*, are not included in his *apparatus* because they all are ultimately derived from I or O. In Heikel's monograph there is a *stemma* which shows clearly the age and relation of all the MSS.

In dealing with the numerous passages from other writers quoted by Eusebius Dr. Gifford has not, where a better reading is known to exist, adhered slavishly to the text of Eusebian MSS. Like Gaisford he has in several instances deliberately altered his text by admitting a better, and a known reading. There is a certain risk attending on this procedure, for the question of course is not what the true text of a particular passage quoted may be, but what Eusebius had before him when he made his quotation. However I think we may be sure that in this matter Dr. Gifford has acted with needful caution. The same may be affirmed of the conjectural emendations none of which are inserted in the text without a pair of brackets < > drawing attention to them.

The translation appears to be most careful and accurate. It is the first complete English rendering of the *Praep.* (though notice should be made of the version of passages which Mr. Street published in 1842) and Dr. Gifford is to be congratulated on the skilful course he has steered through Eusebius's lumbering sentences. Good instances will be found in Book IV 140 b¹-d⁸, Book VII 333 a-b⁹.

The editor has as a rule translated afresh the extracts from other writers given by Eusebius, though in some instance *e.g.* Book XIII 647a¹-690 b⁴ he has had recourse to the help of Davies and Vaughan or Jowett, while for Herodotus he has sometimes used Rawlinson, and for Homer he frequently employs Lord Derby's verse translation.

I have already remarked the easy solution adopted by Gaisford of the difficulty of expounding the text, viz. the simple reproduction of Viger's commentary. It need hardly be said that notes which passed muster in 1628 and even in 1843, demanded additions and alterations in 1903. Dr. Gifford has accordingly supplied a whole volume of separate and original annotations which display an erudition of Eusebian *i.g.* encyclopaedic compass. Language and textual criticism subject matter and literary history—*nihil tangit quod non ornat*. In his Introduction to vol. iii he says 'To do full justice to so large a compilation from all

branches of ancient literature the editor himself should be historian, poet, philosopher, archaeologist, astronomer, ethnologist; and I am certainly none of these.' The first sentence is undoubtedly true, the second is all too modest. But the whole passage provides a wholesome warning against presumption in a reviewer. Doubtless students of the special branches of knowledge with which Dr. Gifford disclaims familiarity will find opportunity for enlarging references and extending the list of authorities. For instance the archaeologist and comparative mythologist will add a whole library on the Eleusinian mysteries and will go to Roscher and Pauly-Wissowa in cases where Dr. Gifford has been satisfied with Preller or Smith's Dictionaries, while the historian will make mention of Müller's *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*; but on the whole the range of learning displayed in the notes is astonishing and the soundness of judgement is worthy of the highest respect. It is only to be regretted that the editor did not in-

crease the reader's debt to him by adding a separate index to his notes. But he has given us so much in this as in other respects that it were ungracious to ask for more. He has an index of authors quoted by Eusebius, an *index nominum et rerum*, a list of scripture passages, and one of Greek words. It is to the first of these, the *index scriptorum*, that readers of the *Classical Review* will probably turn first and they will rise from a perusal of it with respect for the fourth century Father and gratitude to the scholar and disciple who in a later day has striven so successfully to make his meaning clear.

There seem to be very few misprints which have finally escaped the notice of the editor and the lynx-eyed readers for the Press. It may be useful to add the following trifling *corrigenda*. For Athenaeus read Athenaeus (Notes, p. 329); for Λέσ Βέτυλες read Les Bétyles (*ib.* p. 49); for Θανάτων πύλαις read π. ἄδου (*ib.* p. 9); for Book VI read Book VIII (headline, *ib.* p. 285).

H. F. STEWART.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ZEUS, JUPITER, AND THE OAK.

(Continued from p. 89.)

Sicily.

PANOFKA¹ and W. GRIMM² long since pointed out that the three-eyed Cyclops of Sicily³ bears a striking resemblance to the three-eyed Zeus of Argos.⁴ Max Mayer⁵ arrived independently at a similar conclusion, viz. that the original Cyclops was identical with the three-eyed Zeus of Argos, who in turn is strictly comparable with the three-eyed Argus Πανόπτης,⁶ the three-eyed guide of the Heraclidae,⁷ and the various heroes named Triops or Triopas.⁸ It would appear, then, that the three-eyed Cyclops is but another form of the three-eyed or triple Zeus. This squares well with

Polyphemus' boast that he was the peer of Zeus,⁹ and with Nonnus' description of the Cyclops Brontes as 'a bastard Zeus.'¹⁰ Hesiod too speaks of the Cyclopes as 'resembling the gods';¹¹ and the names that he gives them—Βρόντης, Στερόπης, Ἄργης—recall the titles of Zeus—Βροντῶν,¹² στεροπηγέτης,¹³ ἄργης.¹⁴ But, if we thus equate the Cyclops with the Argive Zeus, and further accept Pausanias' statement that the latter was at once sky-god, sea-god, and earth-god, it follows that the Cyclops should have the same threefold character. Was this the case?

The ancients recognised three types of Cyclopes:¹⁵ (1) 'those of the sky,' who are

⁹ *Od.* 9. 275 f., *Eur. Cycl.* 320 f.

¹⁰ *Dion.* 28. 199.

¹¹ *Theog.* 142.

¹² *C.R.* xviii. 79.

¹³ *Il.* 16. 298, cp. *C.R.* xviii. 80.

¹⁴ *Emped.* 56 K.

¹⁵ Schol. Hes. *theog.* 139 Ἑλλάνικος δὲ τοὺς Κύκλωπας φησὶν ὀνομάζεσθαι ἀπὸ Κύκλωπος υἱοῦ τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ· Κυκλώπων γὰρ γένη τρία· Κύκλωπες οἱ τὴν Μυκλήν τευχίσαντες, καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν Πολύφημον, καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ θεοί, cp. schol. Aristid. 52. 10 τρία γὰρ γένη φασὶν εἶναι Κυκλώπων, τοὺς κατὰ τὸν Ὀδυσσεύα, Σικελοὺς ὄντας, καὶ τοὺς χειρογαστορας, καὶ τοὺς καλουμένους οὐρανίους. Both passages are cited by Mayer *op. cit.* p. 110.

¹ *Arch. Comm. zu Paus.* 2.24, p. 30 f.

² *Abhandl. d. Berl. Akad.* 1857, 'die Sage von Polyphem', p. 28.

³ Roscher *Lex.* ii. 1685. The Irish Cyclops *Ingcél* had one eye with three pupils! (Rhys *Hibbert Lectures* 1886 p. 135)

⁴ *C.R.* xviii. 75 ff.

⁵ *Die Giganten u. Titanen* p. 110 ff.

⁶ *C.R.* xviii. 75.

⁷ *ib.* 87.

⁸ *ib.* 76 f.