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](#)

Neumann on Eustathios *Eustathios als kritische Quelle für den Iliastext; mit einem Verzeichnis der Lesarten des Eustathios*. Von Max Neumann. Teubner: Leipzig. 1893. Mk. 5.

Walter Leaf

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 03 / March 1894, pp 110 - 111

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187621, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187621

How to cite this article:

Walter Leaf (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 110-111 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187621

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

again some of the 'word-groups' are natural enough in themselves (Mr. Lindsay well compares *fortis-vir* with *gentleman*), or are established by the usage of Plautus or the express testimony of the grammarians. But of others Mr. Lindsay can only say that they are 'strange.' If we can take *Ulixī cor* or *mare māgnū* as a word-group carrying but one accent, it is hard to see what limits can be set to this licence.

It is not possible to lay much stress on the Saturnian lines which may perhaps be embedded in some passages of Livy. With all the ingenuity of M. Havet and Mr. Lindsay we cannot feel confidence in a method which after conjectural transpositions gives us such a foot as '*tūm tū aīdax*.' Mr. Lindsay rightly admits that most of these lines lack the true ring of Saturnians. In his suggestions as to the origin of the Saturnian verse and its possible relations to primitive metres in the languages, Mr. Lindsay is on still more slippery ground. We have at last arrived at an explanation of the metre on the basis of the accentual system in use when extant specimens were produced. But we know that there was an earlier system, not bound by the law of the penultima, which does not furnish a satisfactory explanation of Saturnians as we have them. It seems undue caution for Mr. Lindsay to say that it is equally impossible to affirm or deny with certainty the hypothesis that quantity alone supplied the rhythm to the earlier Saturnians. I should have thought that this hypothesis was one which could have been discarded with as much certainty as is ever possible in speaking about things of which no specimen is in existence. If anything is clear about the history of Italic metre it is (more than ever after the publication of Mr. Lindsay's papers) that accentuation furnished its earliest basis, that metres regulated by quantity came in through Greek

influence and thrust the native metres into the background, and that ultimately the principle of accentuation gained the upper hand again, modifying even the quantitative metres and determining entirely the form of those of popular origin. To assume that quantity may have been in primitive Italic times the regulating force seems to me to ignore the course of history. There is much that is attractive in Mr. Lindsay's suggestion as to the possible course of development of the Saturnian; but it does not explain how what he calls the B type, which according to him represents the earlier form (*x'x, x'x, x'xx*), is so much less common than the A type (*x'x, x'x, xx'x*). It is hardly sufficient to say that the former was disliked, because it maintained the falling accentuation throughout the hemistich. Why was this natural rhythm disliked? But the suggestion is put forward merely tentatively, and Mr. Lindsay recognises the need of fuller information from specialists as to the primitive metres of various Indo-European nations, before any trustworthy conclusions can be drawn. It is perhaps worth while putting in a plea for refraining from premature identification. In view of the range of possibilities offered by metre, it is certainly rash to assume that all varieties must have had a common source, although it is highly interesting to establish this wherever it is possible.

An apology is due to the readers of the *Classical Review* for offering what is rather a summary than a criticism of papers so easily accessible, and confined within the modest limits of some sixty pages, so that they make no heavy demands upon the students interested in the subject. My excuse is, in the first place, the request of the editor; in the second, my own sense of the high value of Mr. Lindsay's methods and results.

A. S. WILKINS.

NEUMANN ON EUSTATHIOS.

Eustathios als kritische Quelle für den Ilias-text; mit einem Verzeichnis der Lesarten des Eustathios. Von MAX NEUMANN. Teubner: Leipzig. 1893. Mk. 5.

THE materials for a critical edition of the *Iliad* are slowly, very slowly, accumulating; the present work is a useful, but not a

vital addition to them. It is certain that any editor would require such a fresh survey of the critical remarks embodied in the *παρεκβολαί*, as La Roche's citations in his apparatus criticus are notoriously inexact and incomplete. Needless to say that I have not attempted to check the new collections of the various readings of

Eustathios now given by Neumann; but a rough examination convinces me that it is far more complete and trustworthy than any we yet have. It is not perfect; at least I should have expected to find in it an intimation that Eustathios may fairly be quoted as an authority for $\nu\alpha\iota$ instead of $\nu\acute{\alpha}\upsilon$ in II 99. But I do not think that there can be many omissions on important points, to judge from an imperfect list of Eustathian readings which I once made out for another purpose.

Neumann does not come to any conclusions which would raise our opinion of the critical value of Eustathios. He shows that the sources from which the good bishop drew are mostly accessible to us: the collection of Apion and Herodoros in the scholia A, and another compilation, containing a great deal of Porphyrios, in the scholia B, T, etc. And where we can control the use which Eustathios made of his authorities, we have no reason to rate his acumen very high. Still he had certain sources of information which are unknown to us, so we cannot afford entirely to neglect him. It must be added however that when we have a fuller knowledge of the MSS. these unknown sources will be

considerably diminished. I may give as an instance the reading $\kappa\nu\acute{\nu}\alpha\mu\nu\iota\alpha$ for $\kappa\nu\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\iota\alpha$ in Φ 394. This is at present quoted from Eustathios only; but in the MSS. which I have personally examined it is a rather commoner reading than $\kappa\nu\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\iota\alpha$, and Eustathios' source is merely the vulgate. As for the MS. which Eustathios used, Neumann concludes that it was a copy of the vulgate nearly allied to L. But it must be observed that Eustathios very rarely gives any of the really important peculiar readings of L. It seems to me clear that he really did compare several MSS. of the vulgate, and give a selection of readings from them; at least the number of variants that he gives is far larger than, judging from MSS. which we possess, were ever given as marginal variants in any single copy. On the whole, the final conclusion which I should draw from this essay is that, though it is a piece of work which had to be done, and has been done well, it cannot lead to any improvement of the text of the *Iliad* at all comparable to what may yet be gained from a more complete collation of the MSS.

WALTER LEAF.

LOOFS ON THE SACRA PARALLELA.

LOOFS, DR. FRIEDRICH: *Studien über die dem Johannes von Damascus zugeschriebenen Parallelen*. (Halle, Niemeyer, 1892. Pp. x. 146.—5 Mk.)

THIS masterly investigation of a most intricate critical problem fulfils in part the promise which accompanied the writer's volume on Leontius of Byzantium (*Classical Review*, 1888, p. 73). It brings us within measurable distance of that reconstruction of the original form of the $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$, or so-called 'sacra parallela,' which shall make them safely available for the criticism of the numerous authors on whom they draw.

The whole credit of this result is due to Dr. Loofs, although Bishop Lightfoot as early as 1885 had divined in part the direction from which light would come (*Ignat.* i. §10). But on the whole, Dr. Loofs found the problem of the 'Parallels' much as it was left by Le Quien, over 500 of whose folio pages (*Joh. Damasc. Opp.* vol. ii.) are occupied by their *rudis indigestaque moles*.

They consist of extracts from the fathers, and some from Philo and Josephus, grouped under titles, which again are arranged alphabetically. The whole is preceded by a full $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\varsigma$, with abundant $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$ (cross references) at the end of each letter. There are also two prefaces. From the second or longer, which is clearly the preface of the whole, we learn that the author called his collection $\tau\grave{\alpha} \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ simply ('sacra parallela' was a compromise adopted by Le Quien in deference to the traditional title 'Parallela'); also that the whole was disposed in three separate alphabetically arranged books, the first containing the topics relating to God, the second those relating to man, the third virtues and their opposed vices. That the author himself 'telescoped' the three books into one is a mistake, due to Billius, the first editor, which no one seems to have detected before Dr. Loofs. The shorter preface turns out to be the original preface to the 'parallela' proper, i.e. to the third book, in which virtues