

# 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](#)



---

## Texte und Untersuchungen, IV. 1, V. 2, 3. *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*. Band 4. Heft i. Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos recensuit Eduardus Schwartz. 1888. 3 Mk. 60.

F. H. Chase

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 05 / May 1889, pp 204 - 205

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194788, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00194788](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194788)

### How to cite this article:

F. H. Chase (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 204-205 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194788

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

of metaphor, χαλκῷ ἀπὸ ψυχὴν ἀρύσας and τεμὼν [μιν] ἀτειρεῖ χαλκῷ. These do not sound like parodies, and there is no reason whatever for suspecting them to be other than serious metaphors.

*Frag. Incert.* 9 (the passage quoted by Galen on the natural inferiority of man regarded as a mere animal to other animals). Part of the passage is paraphrased in prose by Galen and two passages quoted in verse. In each case the quotation is introduced by φησὶν: and so in the second passage the verse should begin earlier than Brandt prints it—

αὐτὰρ ἐν ἱστορίῃ πολυπείρῳ  
γράφετ' ὅνος ὅτι παγκράτιον νίκησέ ποτ' ἄνδρας·  
εἰκοστή κτλ.

The date of Matro's Ἀττικὸν δεῖπνον is fixed by Brandt within a few years of 300 B.C. It is written with great spirit and humour: nothing could be happier for instance than the mock-heroic descriptions of the cooks, ll. 11–13, 46, 47, and the description of the dessert, ll. 104–122, is the best and most vivid we possess. The guests wash their hands: a boy carries round perfume of iris-root, and another rose-garlands: the crater is filled with Lesbian wine: pears, apples, pomegranates and grapes are set on the table, with a large sweet cake: then two female jugglers come in to amuse the company.

The difficult l. 90

ἐν δὲ σίναπι  
κεῖτ' ἀγχοῦ γλυκὺ πλείονα χρυσὸς ὢν ἀπερύκων  
is still left a puzzle. Wachsmuth's conjecture,

Κεῖτ' ἀγχοῦ γλυκὺ πνεῖον, ἀτὰρ χέρας οὐκ  
ἀπέρυκον,

is very clever but, as Brandt points out, the shortening of the final *v* in such a position is unexampled, and any satisfactory emendation must retain *χρυσός*. It seems a pity therefore to have placed the conjecture in

the text. In l. 122 (and again in *Frag. Incert.* 8 B) a word of protest must be put in against a tendency to find improper meanings in innocent passages.

The Ἡδονάθεια of Archestratus of Gela (*fl. circ.* 330 B.C.) is a work of a different class from Matro's. It is a didactic poem on eating, probably written rather seriously, and sometimes, as in the pretty description of autumn (*Fr.* xxxvi), going off into fine writing of the usual Alexandrian type. The editor points out that the numerous other names by which it is alluded to, Δειπνολογία, Γαστρονομία, Ὀφολογία, and *Hedynphagetica* in the Latin version of Ennius, arise from the true title being wider than the subject actually treated of. Athenaeus calls Archestratus 'the Hesiod of epicures,' and the work went under the name of 'Golden Words.' From the fragments now collected together, about 335 lines in all, one gets a pretty clear idea of Greek cookery. He is specially strong on sauces. Most of them are comparatively simple: cheese, oil, vinegar, wine, silphium, and minced pot-herbs are the list of ingredients; and there is a strong condemnation (*Fr.* lvii) of the rich sauces 'like glue' that make it impossible to tell a cat from a hare.

In *Fr.* xv. on the fish κάπρος—

ὅσοι μὴ πλεκτὸν ὕφασμα  
σχοῖνον ἐλειοτρόφου κοῖλον χεῖρεσσιν ἔχοντες  
εἰώθασι δονεῖν ψήφους αἰθῶνι λογισμῷ  
ἄρθρων μηλείων τ' ἐπ' ἄγρην δωρήματα βαλλειν—

I was glad to find by a note at the end of the volume that Wachsmuth would read *λογισμῷ*, a conjecture that had occurred to me.

This book will be very useful. But it must be added that it has the faults so common in modern German scholarship—a mass of erudition in the notes which has never been put properly into shape, and a Latin style in the introduction which has all the obscurity of German itself.

J. W. MACKAIL.

#### TEXTE UND UNTERSÜCHUNGEN, IV. 1, V. 2, 3.

*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur.* Band 4. Heft i. Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos recensuit EDUARDUS SCHWARTZ. 1888. 3 Mk. 60.

THIS edition of Tatian's *Oratio* is the first-fruits of a larger scheme proposed to themselves by Gebhardt and Schwartz in refer-

ence to the Greek Apologists. This volume contains the text, carefully constructed, with little or no reference to previous editions. The documentary evidence is of two kinds. (1) There are three principal MSS. (of which later MSS. are but copies), two of which were collated by Gebhardt as well as Schwartz. (2) There are quotations in the *Praeparatio*

and the *Historia* of Eusebius. Here praise-worthy care has been taken, Schwartz having examined for this edition six MSS. of the *Historia* and four of the *Praeparatio*. A subsidiary help is found in the study of Tatian's style. On this are based conjectural emendations which are not however inserted in the text. Schwartz holds that Tatian, a *malleus rhetoricum*, was yet the slave of a rhetorical eccentricity in the avoidance at all costs of an hiatus. It is in his application of this opinion to the text that most exception will perhaps be taken to Schwartz' work. Thus to a sentence in the somewhat obscure but important passage in ch. v.—*καθὸ δὲ πάντα δύναμις ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων* [*αὐτὸς ὑπόστασις*] *ἦν σὺν αὐτῷ, τὰ πάντα σὺν αὐτῷ διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως αὐτὸς* [*καὶ ὁ λόγος, ὃς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ.*] *ὑπέστησεν*—Schwartz appends this note: '*αὐτὸς ὑπόστασις* ditto-graphiam censeo, *αὐτῷ ὑπέστησεν* hiatus intolerabilem praebet, καὶ ὁ λόγος—*αὐτῷ* ex superiore fide interpolata esse mihi probavit Wilamowitz.' A study of the context shows, if I mistake not, that *αὐτὸς* and *ὑπόστασις* are both required. As to the rejected words at the close of the sentence, they are read and commented on in the Scholium which bears the name of Arethas, and which, whoever its author, seems from its constant reference to Arianism to be of early date: they seem also postulated in what appears to be a reference of Tertullian to this passage (*adv. Prae.* v.), '*habebat enim secum quam habebat in semet ipso, rationem suam scilicet.*' An editor must be content with Tatian's style as he finds it. But some of the conjectures are happier, e.g. *ἀράχνας* for the pointless *ἀράπαις*, p. 4, l. 2.

A useful *Index Graecus* is added which gives, e.g. under *οικονομία*, a valuable collection of illustrative passages.

F. H. CHASE.

Ditto. Vol. V. Parts 2 and 3. Leipzig, 1888. (Part 2, 6 Mk.; Part 3, 4 Mk. 50.)

THE first of these two instalments contains a discussion of the dates of the various treatises of Tertullian by Professor Noeldechen, and also a small collection of new fragments attributed to Papias, Hegesippus, and Pierius, and derived from hitherto unknown citations from the Ecclesiastical History of Philippus Sidetes. The former is a very useful piece of work, although many of the conclusions are from the nature of the evidence only tentative. The latter, which is contributed by Dr. de Boor of Bonn, is some-

what startling. New fragments of Papias and Hegesippus are in themselves a surprise: and in some cases the contents of the fragments are also of considerable interest. It remains to be seen whether they will stand the criticism which no doubt they will before long receive.

These fragments come from a series of extracts in Codex Baroccianus 142. The compiler of the extracts names Eusebius as his source; but they contain portions which are not in our copies of Eusebius. Had the compiler a more complete copy, and have ours been seriously garbled? Or does the additional matter come from another source? Dr. de Boor decides for the latter alternative, and believes the source to be the voluminous *Χριστιανικὴ ἱστορία* of Philip of Side, of which only a few fragments remain. It ended with the year 428, and therefore was probably finished about that date. If this is correct, there is no improbability in the quotations being genuine quotations from the works of Papias and Hegesippus.

The fragment of the latter's work may be soon dismissed. It tells us that the names of the two sons of Jude, the brother of the Lord, who were brought before Domitian, were Zocer and James. It also states that Domitian abstained from further persecution, because he recognized the virtue of the men; which is much less probable than the Eusebian account, that he recognized their insignificance and treated them with contemptuous clemency.

The fragments which are given as from Papias are of more importance. They are to this effect. (1) Papias in his second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were murdered by Jews. (2) The above-mentioned Papias recorded on the authority of the daughters of Philip, that Barsabas surnamed Justus was put to the test by the unbelievers, and in drinking serpent's poison in the name of Christ was preserved unhurt. (3) And he records other marvels also, and especially the one about the mother of Manaim (? Manaen), who rose from the dead. (4) Respecting those who were raised from the dead by Christ, that they lived to the time of Hadrian. Of these four, only the last is entirely new. In 1862 Nolte published the first, which he had found in the chronicle of Georgius Monachus. If Papias really made such a statement, he cannot have meant that the two brothers were slain at the same time, but that, just as Jews caused the death of James, so years afterwards they caused the death of John. To what this refers it is impossible to say.