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](#)

Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum, Canones Apostolorum Ecclesiastici Ac Reliquae Doctrinae De Duabus Viis Expositiones Veteres. Edidit Franciscus Xavbrius Funk. Tübingen: Laupp (London: Trübner), 1887. 3 Mk. 60.

Charles Merk

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 10 / December 1887, pp 302 - 303

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184227, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184227

How to cite this article:

Charles Merk (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 302-303 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184227

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

On p. 8 an extremely clever emendation of Rohde is mentioned in the notes, but has not been adopted in the text. The MSS. have *ὁ μέντοι Τιμαίος ὡς φωρίον τινὸς ἐφαπτόμενος, οὐδὲ τοῦτο Ξενοφῶντι τὸ ψυχρὸν κατέλιπεν*. Now the point is not that Timaios plagiarised, but that what he plagiarised was frigid and tasteless; therefore *φωρίον τινὸς* requires correction. Rohde reads without changing a letter, *φῶρ ἰοῦ τινὸς*. A thief stealing poison is just the simile required.

Perhaps the most provoking passage in the whole treatise is the last sentence of the 10th chapter, which Vahlen prints thus (p. 23): *λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ δλον ὡσανεὶ ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποιοῦν τὰ μεγέθη συννοικονομούμενα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσει συντετελεχισμένα. ἐμποιοῦν τὰ ἐς Vahlen's emendation for ἐμποιοῦντα (P), and he explains his reading by ὡσανεὶ ψύγματα ἐμποιοῦν τὰ μεγέθη λυμαίνεται. This is not satisfactory, for there is nothing to go with ἐμποιοῦν: the insertion of *τι* before *τὰ* would be an improvement. The general sense of the passage is quite clear. The superfluities (*φλοιῶδες ἢ ἄσεμνον ἢ σχολικόν*) signified by *ταῦτα*, which spoil the grand whole, are compared to ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα whose insertion in an edifice built of massive stones mutually supporting one another would spoil the effect. Perhaps the simplest change that will produce a satisfactory sentence is ἐμποιοῦμενα τὰ, the participle agreeing with ψύγματα and τὰ μεγέθη being an accusative after λυμαίνεται understood from the first clause; but palaeographically the emendation is not very neat. ἐμποιοῦντα may be a corruption of some participle of meaning similar to λυμαίνεται.*

It is to be regretted that in an edition professedly designed *in usum scholarum* some of the difficulties of interpretation are not dealt with. For example a note would have been very acceptable on the difficult word *ἀδρεπήβολον* in cap. viii. The writer enumerates five sources of lofty style (*ὑψηγορία*). The first and best of these is *τὸ περὶ τὰς νόσεις ἀδρεπήβολον*; the second is *τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος*; these two are natural sources of sublimity, in contrast with the rest which are artificial, namely, the *σχημάτων* πλάσις, the *γενναία φράσις*, and the *ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ διάρσει σύνθεσις*. He treats of each of these in order, but he does not again designate the first by the same phrase; he calls it *τὸ μεγαλοφύες* or *μεγαλοφροσύνη*. Perhaps some explanation of *ἀδρεπήβολον* was given in the missing part of cap. ix., but it is certainly a most strange substitute for *μεγαλοφύες*. The word *ἀδρός* in the sense, 'compact, close, concentrated,' might be intelligibly used of the *σύνθεσις τῶν ἐμφερομένων* (c. x.), in illustration of which the ode of Sappho is cited.

Another example of a difficulty which deserved a note is the remark at the end of cap. xxix. (p. 44), that passion participates in sublimity to the same extent that moral character participates in pleasure, *πάθος δὲ ὕψους μετέχει τοσοῦτον ὅσῃον ἦθος ἡδονῇ*. The remark is made *à propos* of the effects of artifices of style (*σχηματα*) in producing pathos. In what respect the relation of *ἦθος* to *ἡδονή* resembles the relation of *πάθος* to *ὕψος*, it is difficult to perceive; one critic considers the sentence spurious. It is perhaps the marginal note of a reader, to whom it occurred that every pleasure depends on certain subjective conditions of the sentient individual, which he loosely termed *ἦθος* (the character), and who, infelicitously conceiving that this fact was a suitable illustration of the dependence of *ὕψος* on *πάθος*, expressed his conception in equally infelicitous terms.

JOHN B. BURY.

Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum, Canones Apostolorum Ecclesiastici Ac Reliquae Doctrinae De Duabus Viis Expositiones Veleres. Edidit FRANCISCUS XAVERIUS FUNK. Tübingen: Laupp (London: Trübner), 1887. 3 Mk. 60.

THIS is a complete and exhaustive commentary on the Teaching of the Apostles. The author gives in the Prolegomena an account of the discovery by Philotheus Bryennius, in 1873, of the first complete MS. of the *Didache*. He proceeds to discuss the manner (Prolegg. chapters iii. and iv. pp. 4—22), in which the *Didache* was used by the early Fathers; he cites in full the quotations from, and the references to, that book, which are found in the patristic literature of the first five centuries. He next examines the text of the original book, 'The Two Ways,' which appears similarly in the Ep. Barnab. (xviii.—xx.), the *Didache* (i.—vi.), the Ecclesiastical Canons, and the viith book of the Apostolical Constitutions (Prolegg. chap. v. and vi. p. 23—36), and he concludes with an enquiry into the time and place, in which the *Didache* was written, the references which it contains to books of the New Testament, as well as the parallel passages in the Ep. Barnab., Eccles. Can., and Apostol. Constitut. (Prolegg. chap. vii.—xi. pp. 38—46).

The author has adopted the plan of placing immediately after the text of the *Didache* that of the Ecclesiastical Canons, the viith Book of the Apostol. Constitut., Ep. Barnabas (xviii.—xx.), as well as the Latin fragment, recently discovered, and containing the first two chapters of the *Didache*. The references in the text of the *Didache* to the Bible, as well as the references, which are found in the Ecclesiastical Canons and the other books, bearing on the *Didache*, are marked by different type, and render it easier to compare the several texts. The comments on the text of the *Didache* are very full; and at all the important passages the various explanations hitherto offered are taken into account. In several cases I am unable to accept the view which the author adopts. Chap. vi. 2 (p. 18, 19), *εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι* (scilicet *βαστάσαι* δλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου) δ δυνῇ, τοῦτο ποιεῖ. Funk explains "*ζυγός, ut connexus docet, praecepta significat, de quibus in parte antecedente sermo est,*" and he adds, "*Auctor annuit, non omnia mandata . . . vere praecepta et omnino omnibus servanda esse.*" The preceding chapters, however, contain the 'way of life,' the moral laws; they are partly an enlargement of the Sermon on the Mount, the Decalogue, and the Prov. The last (the fifth chapter) speaks of the *φόνος, μοιχεία*, etc. . . *ῥυσθελίητε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων*. Surely these are '*mandata omnibus servanda.*' The *ζυγός* (Acts xv. 10; also Matt. xi. 29, 30) refers to a modified ceremonial law; this is rendered probable by the *περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως*, which follows immediately. To chap. ix. 4, p. 26, *τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαβίδ*, the parallels given are John xv. 1, and Matt. 26, 29. But I agree with C. Taylor that the origin of this simile must be traced in the *ρίζα Δαβίδ* (Isaiah xi. 1, 10, and perhaps in Gen. xlix. 9—11). At any rate the remarkable explanation of Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 32) of those two passages should be quoted. In chap. xvi. 6, p. 48, there appears to be no reason to suspect a copyist's error—*σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως* for *σ. ἐπιφάσεως* (= *ἐπιφανείας*), or to derive the word, as Bryennius does, from *ἐκπέταμαι* or *ἐκπετάμαι* (avolo). The true explanation may be possibly obtained from a comparison of Justin Dial. 817 D, 819 A. with Ep. Barnab. xii.: Moses was spreading (*ἐκπετάσας*) or stretching out his hands crosswise. The *σημεῖον* is, then, that of the cross, appearing in the heavens, one of 'the three signs,' which announce the advent of

Christ. The value of Funk's work is not so much in his having thrown fresh light on the hard sayings of the *Didache*, as in the fact that he has carefully collected the explanations hitherto offered, and has furnished the reader with all available material for the study of the book.—CHARLES MERK.

NEMESII EMESENI libri περί φύσεως ἀνθρώπου versio latina. E libr. ms. nunc primum edidit et apparatus critico instruxit CAROLUS HOLZINGER. Lipsiae, Freytag; Praga, Tempsky. 1887. 8vo. pp. xl, 176. 6 Mk.

To Hermann Usener belongs the credit of suggesting the publication of this book, which gives a text founded on two MSS. (B. i.e. Bamberg, 67; P. i.e. Prague, Metropolitan Library, L 94, a transcript of B.) both of the thirteenth century. Both contain in addition, Sen. n. q. and the Asclepius.

P. has no title, but Usener from a short description recognised in it a Latin Nemesius, and informed the editor of the discovery of the other copy B. Seven chapters (35–38, 42–44) are wanting in both MSS., and the Greek order, after c. 19, is several times deserted.

The translation appears to be different from that ascribed to Joannes Burgundius, a jurisconsult and judge of Pisa († 1194). It is slavishly literal, retaining many Greek words in Latin characters. Often a Greek word has been confused with another of similar form; thus ἐσθής appears as *sensibilitas*, *πρὸς σκούσας* as *obundientes*, *κῶνον* as *pulverem*. Many interpolations and *lacunae* in the Greek text may be corrected by aid of the Latin. The spelling has been corrected throughout, the Greek terms set side by side with the Latin in the *apparatus criticus*; a Latin index of seven pages closes the book.

In the current number (xlii 2 p. 276–285) of the *Rheinisches Museum*, H. von Arnim prints in parallel columns parts of Nemes. de nat. hom. c. 3 and the Latin of Prisciani solutiones ad Chosroën (ed. Bywater, Suppl. Aristot. i 2 p. 558). The title of the article, Sources of the tradition respecting Ammonius Sakkas would not necessarily attract a student of Nemesius.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus De Sacerdotio libri sex. Mit Anmerkungen neu herausgegeben von Carl Seltmann, Domcapitular in Breslau. Mit Genehmigung des Fürstbischöflichen Ordinariats zu Breslau. Münster und Paderborn, 1887. 2 Mk. 50.

The object of this edition is to supply a handy text of the *De Sacerdotio* with explanatory notes, to help theological students in the reopened seminaries to count the cost before entering upon the priesthood, and to help the clergy to fulfil the duties which they have undertaken. The book is well printed; and the notes, when they go beyond an alternative reading or the translation of a sentence, are mostly of a practical nature, giving examples out of the editor's own pastoral experience. They are moderate and sensible in tone.—A. P.

Essais de Métrique grecque, par A. E. CHAIGNET. Paris. 1887. 6 fr.

THE first part of this book (eighty pages) deals with the general principles of Greek metre, the second (pp. 81–265) is a study of the iambic metre in its various forms. There is also an appendix of a dozen pages on *asynartete* verses. M. Chaignet treats the subject from a purely metrical point of view. His

position is that the long syllable always = two short syllables; he does not admit that it ever = three short syllables or more, and is totally opposed to the rhythmical treatment of metre adopted e.g. by Westphal and Christ whom he constantly criticises. He does not, however, appear to contribute anything new of importance to the argument against the rhythmical doctrine. Moreover, there are serious defects in his book. (1) He does not distinguish the relative importance of the different writers on Greek metre and rhythm, e.g. sources of such different value as Aristoxenus, Hephaestion, and the various Scholia on Hephaestion. (2) The weakness of the metrical, and the strength of the rhythmical point of view cannot be seen without taking into account the entire range of Greek metres, lyrical as well as non-lyrical; the introduction on the general principles of Greek metre leaves the former too much out of sight, and the result is therefore misleading. (3) The book shows a want of accuracy, and contains a number of mistakes. The quotations are often given in a careless manner. Thus e.g. Marius Victorinus is quoted by the paging sometimes of Putschius, sometimes of Gaisford, and the change is made from one paging to another even within the limits of the same note, without any indication of the edition used. The quotations are not always correct, and the meaning is missed because the words are separated from their context. Thus the term *ἐπιπλοκή* is apparently applied (p. 39) to a verse in which all the feet are pure, e.g. all dactyls, or all iambs, though the Schol. on Hephaestion quoted in the note, when taken in connection with the context, shows that it means a union of different species of verse in one genus, e.g. of iambs and trochees in the *ἐπιπλοκή τρισημῶς*. The term *ἐπιάνθετον* is applied (p. 68) to a verse in which are united *κῶλα* of different species, e.g. trochees and iambs, though the passage quoted from the Schol. to Hephaestion shows that it means a verse in which are united *κῶλα* of different genera, e.g. trochees and dactyls. In a book on metre mistakes in quantity are particularly out of place. Some of these are merely misprints, but this cannot be said of the following. The line *λέοντες Ἕλληνας δύο δίδωμι* is quoted (p. 157), as an iambic trimeter brachycatalectic, and attention is called to the *anapaest* in the 4th foot. The line *Διόνυσος ὀντίκει παθ' ἢ Κάδμω κῶρη* is said (p. 181), to begin with a *tribrach*. The lines—
λεῦκιπτοι ξυνομαίμονες ὄλβισαν ὄλβισαν
τὸ πρόβ' ἐκ δόμων δ' ἐνόμισαν θεοὶ σ' ἐμοῦ

are quoted (p. 158) as iambic trimeters catalectic! In his treatment of the iambic trimeter M. Chaignet advocates restoring to the Greek tragedians the *anapaests* in 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th feet which Porson expelled. He is more convincing in his argument against the symmetry which some scholars have fancied they discovered as a frequent element in the iambic trimeters of Greek tragedy. His criticism of Westphal's view that verses are *asynartete* if they have internal *catalexis*, shows that he does not altogether understand Westphal's meaning. His own conclusion is that *asynartete* verses are those in which the feet of the combined *κῶλα* differ from one another in genus or species ("il faut que les pieds qui composent la première série ne soient ni de même grandeur, ni surtout de même rythme que les pieds de la seconde, et qu'ils leur soient même contraires sous ce double rapport"). Both Westphal's view and M. Chaignet's involve difficulties. The latter has to exclude from the class of *asynartetes* some verses which are stated by Hephaestion or Scholia to be *asynartete*, and owing to a hasty reading of