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](#)

Klostermann's *Onomastikon* of Eusebius *Eusebius*, *Onomastikon*. Herausgegeben DR Erich von Klostrrmann. Hinrichs: Leipzig, 1904. Pp. xxxvi, 207. M. 8.

R. G. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 01 / February 1905, pp 61 - 62

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991315, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991315

How to cite this article:

R. G. Bury (1905). The Classical Review, 19, pp 61-62 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991315

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

taining not to the first but to the fourteenth century, and its meaning at that time may be best illustrated by its use to signify the change of substance in the Eucharist.

The causes contemplated in the tract are largely the formal—as opposed to the material and efficient; but without an analysis, section by section, it is almost impossible to give a comparative sketch of the thought; for these distinctions exist in thought only, and cannot well be demonstrated objectively. Moreover the very terms themselves changed in more than shades of meaning, from the first century to the times of the schoolmen. And herein

lies another kind of interest in this little book—that to which I alluded in the first paragraph of this notice—namely, in the ways in which Greek thought is converted, as a perusal of this edition makes evident enough, into the terms of the scholastic philosophies of the fourteenth century. It is difficult to say whether the substantial identity of human thought in divers epochs or the dissolving views of its re-emergent forms are the more curious. For even such ontological controversy as this can never lose its interest as a chapter of the long history of ideas in the human mind.

T. CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

KLOSTERMANN'S *ONOMASTIKON* OF EUSEBIUS.

Eusebius, Onomastikon. Herausgegeben von DR. ERICH KLOSTERMANN. Hinrichs: Leipzig, 1904. Pp. xxxvi, 207. M. 8.

THIS volume forms one of the series of Greek patristic texts published under the auspices of the 'Kirchenväter-Commission' of the Prussian Academy of Sciences. The material for this geographical dictionary of the Bible, as one might call it, is naturally drawn mainly from the Septuagint and Hexapla; but, as the editor points out, Eusebius is probably indebted also to official maps and route-books, such as must have been procurable at the provincial capital, Caesarea, as well as to private sources of information and his own personal observation: occasionally, too, he makes reference to Josephus's *Archæology*. For the constitution of the text the chief authority is a Vatican Codex of the twelfth century, of which Vallarsi (1735) was the first editor to make use, previous editors having relied solely on the Paris cod. 464 (sixteenth century), which is merely a late copy of the Vatican. In addition to these and some minor codices we have to take account of a considerable number of extracts from the *Onomastikon* in writers such as Procopius of Gaza; and above all, of the Latin translation by Jerome. Jerome's rendering is especially valuable in that it enables us to supply the substance of a number (circ. 46) of lacunæ in the Greek.

In the printing of the text Dr. Klostermann, like the older editors, sensibly puts the Greek and Latin in parallel columns, or rather pages, instead of adopting the clumsy

fashion set by his immediate predecessor, Lagarde (ed.¹ 1870, ed.² 1887), of placing the Latin under the Greek. Thus we are enabled to see at a glance where the two authorities differ. A comparison of the two shows us that Jerome frequently adds explanatory glosses of his own, which the editor generally marks by italics. In some cases, however, this convenient practice is omitted. Thus, it is not obvious why part of the Latin account of *Gedud* (p. 73) should be italicized, while equally plain glosses in the note on *Ger*, on the same page, are not so printed. So too with the statement 'Rabbath Moab, id est grandis Moab' (p. 125, l. 15), where the last words are an etymological gloss of the regular kind. It is also a matter of regret that the editor generally withholds all comment on minor points where the Latin deviates from the Greek. We find, for example (p. 33, l. 10), 'est hodieque villa' over against καὶ ἔστι κώμη, whereas the usual equivalent would be καὶ <εἰς ἔτι νῦν> ἔστι κ. So too (p. 168, l. 29) καὶ οἱ Ὁ' ἀλλαχοῦ 'τοῦ λαξεντοῦ' is rendered by 'sed et Septuaginta interpretes Fassa in quodam loco excisum transtulerunt,' which raises two questions, (1) is *in quodam loco* intended for ἀλλαχοῦ, and (2) does not 'sed et' imply δὲ καί, or the like? These are but specimens of phenomena which probably occur on every other page; and they seem to demand a thorough investigation in order to determine how far such deviations are due merely to carelessness on the part of the translator and how far they may be taken to indicate corruption in the Greek

codices. We need to arrive at some general principle which will guide us in deciding, e.g., whether or not we should insert in the Greek text *πρὸς ἀνατολὰς* to correspond to 'ad orientem vergens' (p. 97, l. 11), or *πρὸς νότον* for 'contra australem plagam' (p. 35, l. 19; 99, l. 27); but I cannot find that the present editor anywhere attempts to supply us with such a principle. It may be suggested, further, that students of the text would have welcomed a hypothetical restoration of the Greek in the case of larger lacunae where the Latin supplies the sense. One such restoration, by Villarsi, is worth quoting: the Latin (p. 153, l. 15) is 'Segor, quae et Bala et Zoara, una de quinque civitatibus Sodomorum, ad preces Lot de incendio reservata,' for which V. writes *Σεγὼρ ἥτις καὶ*

Βαλὰ καὶ Ζοορά, τῆς πενταπόλεως Σοδόμων, ἣ δὲ εὐχόντος (!) σωθεῖσα. Here, besides correcting the grammar, I should propose the insertion of *μία* before *τῆς* (comparing the notes on 'Αδαμά, p. 8; Γομορρά, p. 60; Ζογερρά, p. 94); and I should question whether 'ad preces...reservata' is anything more than a Hieronymian gloss.

These, however, are but minor criticisms on a piece of editing which is marked by a high degree of erudition and care. In addition to full indexes of names and Biblical references, the correctness of which I have tested, the volume is furnished with an excellent map of Palestine, to correspond to the *Onomasticon*. The only misprint I have observed is on p. 169, l. 17, 'quaedem.' R. G. BURY.

A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE *THEOPHANIA* OF EUSEBIUS.

Eusebius, Theophanie: die Griechischen Bruchstücke und Übersetzung der Syrischen Überlieferungen herausgegeben von Dr. HUGO GRESSMANN. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1904. Pp. xxx+272. M. 9.50.

THE *Theophania* of Eusebius, one of the chief works of the great Church historian, was intended as a more or less popular commendation of Christianity to the heathen world. It was long supposed to be irrecoverably lost, but a Syriac translation turned up among the Nitrian MSS now in the British Museum, and this was edited by Dr. Samuel Lee in 1842. About the same time Cardinal Mai discovered some extracts from the original Greek embedded in a Vatican *Catena* on S. Luke and on the Epistle to the Hebrews. These extracts Dr. Gressmann has now re-edited, together with a German rendering of the whole *Theophania* from the Syriac.

The Syriac version must have been made not very long after the publication of the original, for our MS is actually dated 411 A.D.¹ The version is slavishly literal in style, so much so as to be frequently quite incomprehensible. But this quality of literalness is of course extremely useful when we try to reconstruct the Greek

original, a process which is often possible owing to the method of composition which Eusebius habitually adopted. In fact, as soon as the Syriac came to light it was recognised that we had to do with an old friend in a new dress. Eusebius had no scruple at all about repeating himself, and fully half, if not more, of the *Theophania* is to be found word for word in one or other of his erudite and voluminous works. Thus of the five books of the *Theophania*, nearly all the fifth is taken from the third book of the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, and large portions of the first three books are identical with the second part of the theological Oration known as *De Laudibus Constantini*. It is therefore possible by means of these extensive parallels to gauge the accuracy and to tabulate the methods of the Syriac translator, so that we can obtain a fair idea of what he read before him in those parts where no Greek parallel is now extant. Dr. Gressmann has quite justifiably attempted to give in his German translation a reconstruction of the original rather than a mere echo of the Syriac, e.g. in *Theoph.* v. 48 (p. 254).²

With regard to the question of the chronological order of the various Eusebian writings, Dr. Gressman raises in his Introduction, pp. xiii-xx, a question of some

¹ The concluding leaf of B.M. Add. 12150, containing the colophon, was missing when Dr. Lee wrote, but it is now bound up in its place, as Dr. Gressman ought to have known (Wright's *Catalogue*, p. 633a).

² On pp. 195, 197 (*Theoph.* iv. 20) it is surely a mistake to emend *baddiḥh dam'ḥitta*, i.e. 'suburbs,' in the face of the example cited in Brockelmann's *Lexicon*, p. 36.