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](#)

A Translation of the Peshito-Syriac Text and of the Received Greek Text of Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, and 1 John, with Introduction, by William Norton. London, 1889.

G. H. Gwilliam

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 07 / July 1889, pp 311 - 312

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195502, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195502

How to cite this article:

G. H. Gwilliam (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 311-312 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195502

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

still it is satisfactory to think that probably in the near future no one will have the hardihood to impugn these particular poems.

S. G. OWEN.

Die Ursachen der Verbannung des Ovid. Von J. HUBER, Stadthof [1889 ?].

THE author of this 'Programm' has originated an ingenious if somewhat complicated theory as to the cause of Ovid's banishment. He thinks that Ovid was connected with a court cabal set on foot by Lucius Paulus the husband of the younger Julia (thus explaining Suet. *Aug.* 19), the object of which was to hinder the banishment of Julia. He assumes the publication of a second edition of the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris* at the end of 8 or beginning of 9 A.D., contending with some plausibility that in the first edition there were three books of the *Remedia* corresponding to the three books of the *Ars Amatoria*, for traces of a division into more books than one are found in MSS. and old editions, especially in the codex Parisinus. Julia was banished A.D. 9: Augustus then availed himself of Ovid's connexion with the cabal, which though no real conspiracy was purposely so regarded by him, in order to get rid of the obnoxious Ovid. The republication of the offensive poems according to this view is the real cause of the banishment. The hypothesis is worked out with great skill, and certainly explains Ovid's frequent assertions that his poems brought him into trouble. But the evidence for the existence of the cabal in question appears scanty; and Ovid's allusions to his having seen something (*T. II.* 103-108) compromising can hardly be interpreted as meaning merely 'I noticed the formation of the cabal and so was drawn into it.'

S. G. OWEN.

Iuli Frontini Strategematon Libri Quattuor edidit GOTTHOLDUS GUNDERMANN. Leipzig, Teubner, 1888. 1 Mk. 50.

DR. GUNDERMANN bases his new text mainly on the Harleian MS, 2666, which has never been used before, though it is the only complete representative of the better class of MSS. Of the inferior class, which cannot by any means be neglected, the editor takes the Parisian 7240 as the best specimen.

Iuli Valeri Res Gestae Alexandri Macedonis. Collatio Alexandri cum Dindimo: Epistola alexandri ad Aristotelem. Recensuit BERNARDUS KUEBLER; Leipzig, Teubner, 1888. 4 Mk. 80.

text is based largely on a new collation of the Harleian palimpsest, unjustly despised by Mai and ill-treated by Peyron's chemicals in consequence. The other MSS chiefly used are the Ambrosian, on which Mai based his text, and the Parisian 4880.

H. N.

A Translation of the Peshito-Syriac Text and of the Received Greek Text of Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, and 1 John, with Introduction, by WILLIAM NORTON. London, 1889.

It is gratifying to Semitic scholars to note the increasing interest felt in England in the literature and the dialects of Syria. Mr. Norton's modest and unpretending book is more significant in this respect than the larger and more profound treatise of a professional writer. It does not appear that the author is a graduate; he writes for the unlearned; and indeed sometimes supposes a degree of ignorance hardly credible, as when in Sec. xii. [*Words in the Common Version not well understood by some, in*

words more familiar] he gives other terms for 'idol,' 'alms,' 'ado,' 'nay.' But he is an *amateur* in the fullest sense; and, with a humility not too common, invites 'well-considered opinions and criticisms on the contents of this little work.' If there is a lack of scholarly discernment, there is evidently a true scholar's desire to learn.

The design of the work is declared on p. 71 'to aid in defending the true text of God's Word by means of the Peshito-Syriac.' It pursues somewhat further the design of an earlier essay, 'The Revised English Version of the Old-Covenant Scriptures.' The present essay commences with a long 'Introduction,' which occupies more than half the book; only, why does Mr. Norton so inconveniently number its cxxiii. pages in *roman* numerals? The introduction is followed by a translation 'in every-day English,' of the Greek and the Syriac of Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, and 1 John. We cannot say that this new translation is satisfactory. The attempt at literalism is not sustained consistently. Nor do we endorse the author's opinion, that 'to use in any translation [of the Scriptures] forms of speech which differ from those in common use, is to distort and disfigure God's Word.' That our Lord and his followers lived, dressed, spoke as their contemporaries, who denies? But in our representation of his words and his life, a pretension of realism, even if possible, tends towards irreverence. The archaisms of our Authorized Version are not so obscure to the multitude as Mr. Norton imagines. Every attempt to dilute its old-world beauties to the feebleness of the diction of our modern scribblers is to be deprecated most emphatically.

There is much in Mr. Norton's book which will be useful to those who have not the time or the ability to make use of many and original authorities. He has brought together with much industry, from a large number of the standard works, an important collection of opinions and traditions relating to the history of the Peshitto Version. He has also given a collation (it seems exhaustive, and occupies 40 pages) of the Peshitto text, with the readings adopted by the Revisers of 1881. The results are given in English, and therefore of much less interest and value to the scholar than they would have been had the Greek been quoted. The author justly insists (in our opinion) on the importance of the Peshitto-Syriac; but he is led into exaggeration of its value from a misconception of its relation to the original writings of the New Testament; or, as he prefers to term it, 'The New Covenant.' We fear he is not the only Bible student who supposes that the Syriac, as we have it, represents inspired teaching more exactly than does the Greek. He is right, *pace* Drs. Abbott and Roberts, that our Lord spoke a Semitic dialect. It may be that this was not unlike the language of Edessa. But the Peshitto is a *translation*, as appears not only from internal evidence, but from the terms of the subscriptions to some of the books. Even St. Matthew is not represented as the original of that apostle's teaching, but it is said that 'he preached in Hebrew (ebroith),' a term surely never used for the language of the Peshitto. Yet we fully admit that the Peshitto may be of the greatest assistance in the attempt to recover the *ipsissima verba* which underlie the Hellenistic clothing of the words of the Saviour.

Encomiums on the Peshitto will, however, fall flat on the ears of those who disbelieve its antiquity. When the Clarendon Press issues the new critical edition of the Peshitto Gospels, which is being prepared upon the evidence of some forty MSS., most of high antiquity, it will be seen how far the oldest readings lead us towards the type of text exhibited

in Dr. Cureton's solitary fragment. But we must go behind the MSS. and determine what version was employed by the earliest extant Syriac writers. Little thorough work has been done in this direction. A specimen was afforded in an appendix kindly added by Mr. Woods to my paper (No. viii.) in the *Studia Biblica*, 1885. Perhaps Mr. Norton has the leisure to devote himself to the examination of quotations in all available extant works, or fragments of works, of early Syriac writers. We commend this to his careful consideration. He could not make a more important addition to the literature of his favourite study.

G. H. GWILLIAM.

De Coincidentiæ apud Ciceronem vi atque usu.
H. LUTTMANN. Göttingæ, 1888.

IN these days of laborious specializing when scholars can be found who think a life well spent on elucidating the uses of *cum*, one need not be surprised at a book of 116 pp. on 'Coincidence' in Cicero; and a short summary of its contents may be found interesting.

As some scholars may not know even the meaning of the word, a short history of the discovery of this new grammatical species is first given, then a definition follows. When two or more clauses come together [e.g. *cum dico me, te, Brute, dico; quidquid vult valde vult; deficior ego si quis meorum deficitur*] either identical in meaning or one contained in the other (like a minor in a major premiss), they are as it seems called 'coincident.' If 'coincident,' each clause must be coincident in time and so must have the same tense, or what is practically the same tense; but this 'congruence' of tenses which occurs also in 'non-coincident' clauses must be carefully distinguished from 'coincidence' of meaning.

Further as we make no practical progress by repeating identical propositions such as 'when eggs are eaten, eggs are eaten,' practically, coincident clauses must differ somewhere in form of expression, e.g. in subject or in predicate (e.g. by help of adverbs) or in object, sometimes in all three. Forthwith all conceivable forms of these variations are classified under four great genera and 12 species with still

more subdivisions, all duly tabulated in the Index at the end. Even the number of times (in Cicero) that *si, quod, cum, &c.* are used to connect these clauses are laboriously registered.

Then, in chapter III, the variations of the related tenses in coincident clauses are similarly classified at still greater length. Congruence of tense being necessary for coincidence (though not peculiar to it or partaking of its essence), the apparent exceptions to the law are explained: e.g. the congruence of perfects with historic presents, of present-perfects with presents: of imperatives and futures, of futures simple and future-perfects, and here it is pointed out that the future-perfect was often used merely to distinguish a *non-continuous* future action from the continuous action of the simple future (cf. p. 69). So too the congruence of indicatives with subjunctives, of present participles and the gerundive (treated suggestively here as a present participle) with finite (imperfect) tenses, of the past participle with perfect and pluperfect tense or *futurum exactum*, of *posse* &c., and pres. infin. with present perfect and future tenses, are illustrated and explained. Lastly dependent infinitives present past and future, and their congruence in coincident clauses with finite indicative and subjunctive tenses, are examined and classified. The whole subject is worked out elaborately and in a scholar-like way, and occasionally some fairly interesting points of grammar crop up: e.g. on pp. 101-2 it is shown that the perfect infinitive in certain cases owing to its collocation with some main future tense has the force of a future-perfect indicative or of a subjunctive, e.g. *omnia a te data mihi putabo si te videro; arma qui non habuerint eos inermes fuisse vinces*, where also he notices by the way the indiscriminate use of fut. perf. and perf. conjunct. Generally in establishing these practical congruences and coincidences not enough account is taken of the freedom with which a passing change of thought changes the intended regularity and symmetry of a sentence before it is completed. On the whole, though the results are not great or adequate to the labour spent, the book is worth the attention of scholars and teachers as it suggests a somewhat new and sound view of the phenomena of compound sentences.

J. E. NIXON.

ON THE STUDY OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES.

To the EDITORS of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

YOUR February number contained a survey of the general conditions under which classical studies are pursued in the United States. Among the aids to these studies and more especially to classical archaeology, the growing interest in which is regarded by American scholars as a most hopeful indication for the future of classical philology, collections of casts deserve, it would seem, a prominent place; and it may not be amiss to consider a very praiseworthy effort recently made to enlarge our present opportunities in this respect. There exists a curious lack of accord among our professors of the classics as to the supreme educational value of plaster-casts; the difficulty and expense of procuring a large number of representative casts has led some of them to substitute stereopticon views of the best examples of statuary, and to claim for these views as decided merits for purposes of instruction as the casts possess. But these slides, however excellent in themselves, fail to

reveal to the student the actual size of the object and the details of texture and treatment, in which the eye must be aided by the sense of touch; furthermore, a prolonged comparison between two art-types in which the eye should be able to wander constantly between the two objects is not feasible by means of the stereopticon.

A visit to the Slater Museum, which has been recently given to the Free Academy of the little town of Norwich, Connecticut, would I think, suffice to convert every admirer of stereopticon views. Noteworthy as an example of well directed private munificence, this museum is equally suggestive by reason of the selection and arrangement of the casts, and may therefore serve as a stimulus to similar educational enterprises.

The most evident advantage of this collection lies in its perfect adjustment to the allotted space. There is no overcrowding; for each period a smaller number of representative works is preferred to a congeries of material which baffles study. Many an