

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 Collation of the Athos Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas. Together with an Introduction by Spyr. P. Lambros, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Athens. Translated and Edited with a Preface and Appendices by J. Armitage Robinson, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Christ's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1888. 8vo. Pp. xii. 36. 3s. 6d.

T. E. Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 1-2 / February 1889, pp 64 - 66
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194120, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194120

How to cite this article:

T. E. Abbott (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 64-66 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194120

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

were found in the fourteenth district beyond the Tiber, which was not touched by the fire, as well as on the Campus Martius and the Subura, that is in the ninth and fourth districts. But the conflagration first broke out in that part of the town which lies between Mons Caelius and the Palatine, that is between the eleventh and second districts. The Jews, so far from being made by Nero the victims of unjust accusations, possessed considerable influence with the emperor, through Poppaea—one of their proselytes—the actor Aliturus and many other Orientals, who had access to his court. They, 'the real persecutors of Christianity before the destruction of Jerusalem,' may have, as Renan thinks (*Orig. du Christ.* iv. p. 156), suggested to Nero the first idea of offering the Christians as a sacrifice to the anger which the fire had created. The main question however is whether Tacitus, like Pliny and Suetonius, knew Christianity to be a '*superstitio*' distinct and different from that of the Jews. The author points out that the passage in the 44th chap. of the *Annals* is undoubtedly the first in which the historian speaks of the '*auctor nominis ejus, Christus*', but possibly not the last. The lost portion of the *Hist.* which contained the destruction of Jerusalem has formed the source, on which Sulpicius Severus drew in his record of that event. His chronicle shows here, ii. 30. 6 (according to J. Bernays, *Ueber die Chronik des Sulp. Sev.* Berlin, 1861, p. 57), the same unmistakable traces of Tactician diction, which it displays in the passage quoted above. The chronicler states that in the council of war in Titus' camp one of the members expressed his opinion in favour of the destruction of the temple on the ground that not merely the Jewish but also the Christian superstition would thereby be destroyed. '*Both these errors, although contrary to one another,*' he said, '*had sprung from the same authors; the Christians had come from the Jews. If the root were once destroyed, the plant would soon wither.*'

These words appear to be in exact keeping with the knowledge which Tacitus, to judge from his *Annals*, possessed of the new religion. He was at the same time acquainted with the Jewish system; he had no doubt read Josephus (comp. *Hist.* v. 13 with *Jos. Bell.* J. vii. 5, 4), and he knew the conditions on which proselytes were admitted into the Hebrew community (*Hist.* v. 5). There can hardly be any doubt that Tacitus clearly distinguished between the two religions, and that he did not commit the error which Gibbon and Schiller have ascribed to him and which, if true, would contain a serious reflection on his character as a historian.

In the remaining chapters (V, VII-IX) Dr. Arnold discusses the various references to the Neronian persecution found in later writers, and he describes the different shapes which the record of that event gradually assumed in ecclesiastical tradition.

In the summary thus far given we have been obliged to confine ourselves to certain points. It is to one only of these that we venture to take exception. In quoting (p. 58) Renan's remark, that Jews who had '*secret entrées*' at Nero's court had really instigated the persecution, Dr. Arnold justly says that so grave an accusation should not have been brought without sufficient historical evidence against the Hebrew community in Rome. But the evidence which he adduces (p. 62) only shows that Jews may have, as the Christian writers of the second century averred, circulated false rumours about Christians, but not that they abused their influence in the manner indicated. And in the passage (I Clem. Rom. V. VI.) where Clement warns the Corinthian congregation against that jealousy and envy, the fruitful source of calamities as recorded in the Old Testament, and the cause in his

own age of the death of the two great Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul as well as of many saintly women, he evidently refers to divisions which must have taken place within the Christian community, and which found vent perhaps in denunciations.

Altogether Dr. Arnold's treatise appears to us valuable as bringing together all the references found in ancient writers bearing on *Annals*, xv. 44, and throwing light on a passage which is of great importance to the history of early Christianity.

CHARLES MERK.

Die Stellung Augustins in der Publicistik des Gregorianischen Kirchenstreits, von CARL MIBBT, Privatdocent der Theologie in der Universität Göttingen. Leipzig, 1888. Pp. 113. 3 Mk.

THIS essay starts from the 'indisputable fact' that Luther and Augustine are the two men who have exercised the most influence upon the development of the Christian Church. A scientific investigation of this influence in the case of Augustine is still a desideratum, and the essay is a contribution towards supplying the want. It consists mainly of an analysis of the literature of the second half of the eleventh century, with a view to estimating the influence which the writings of Augustine had upon both sides in the great controversy between the Papacy and the Empire. The analysis is worked out in a very thorough way, and the results are tabulated in a convenient summary. This summary shows a very large number of quotations from S. Augustine's works, and from a great variety of them: quotations from his *Epistles*, *Sermons*, the *City of God*, the *Tractates on St. John*, and the treatise on *Baptism against the Donatists*, being specially abundant. But, of 371 citations, only 222 are given with a correct reference to the source, 29 being given with a false reference, and 120 with no reference at all. Not only the same treatises, but the same passages, are frequently quoted. This fact, coupled with the frequent absence of references, tends to show that *collections of extracts* were in use, and that the controversialists rarely drew directly from the works of Augustine. Great as was the desire of both parties to have him as an authority for their own side, few of them were at the pains to study him for themselves. The only Father who is quoted as frequently as Augustine is Gregory the Great. But that does not prove that his influence was equal to that of Augustine; for Gregory was much more of an ecclesiastical politician than Augustine, and therefore frequently treats of the subjects so hotly debated in the eleventh century, where Augustine is entirely silent about them.

A. PLUMMER.

A Collation of the Athos Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas. Together with an Introduction by SPYR. P. LAMBROS, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Athens. Translated and Edited with a Preface and Appendices by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Christ's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1888. 8vo. Pp. xii. 36. 3s. 6d.

THIS book adds another to the remarkable list of documents illustrative of early Christian history discovered within the last few years. Its history partakes of the character of romance. Some of our readers may require to be reminded that the book called the *Shepherd of Hermas* is a work of the early part of the second century, and contains a series of visions followed by a series of 'Mandata,' or preceptive discourses, and a series of similitudes.

Until about thirty years ago the *Shepherd* was known only in a Latin version. A second Latin version from a Palatine MS. in the Vatican was edited in 1857, and three years later an Ethiopic version was published. But a short time previously, viz., in 1855, what purported to be the original Greek text of almost the entire work was offered to and purchased by the University of Leipsic. The vendor was Constantine Simonides. To our younger readers the name Simonides carries no associations except those connected with the poet of Ceos. But to us of an older generation it calls up the vision of a dignified and imposing gentleman with a long beard and plausible manners, having also great knowledge of old manuscripts, and good store of interesting documents for sale, including such things as biblical papyri of the first century, some books of Homer's *Iliad*, written B.C. 87 and Boustrophedon, the whole history of which moreover was said to be traceable.

He had also palimpsests, of which that of Uranius was the most famous, as it possessed the singular peculiarity that the obscure writing, or what professed to be the original, appeared to be written over, not under, the blacker text. It was this MS. that was made the ground of a criminal charge against him, as he was prosecuted in Germany on the double charge of having stolen the MS. from some library unknown, and of having forged it. We are not concerned to defend the logic of this double accusation. Certain it is, however, that some of his MSS. were genuine, but that others, and those the most interesting in their alleged character, were forged. Considering the extent and variety of his work, Simonides is perhaps the most remarkable forger on record.

At the time that he sold the copy of the *Shepherd* to the University of Leipsic, his character was not as well known as it soon after became. The copy consisted of three leaves of a paper MS. from Mount Athos in a fourteenth century hand, and a copy of six other leaves of the same MS. which he had not been able to bring away with him. The text was immediately edited by Anger and Dindorf, who promised to add a volume of critical materials. This volume, however, never appeared, and for a good reason. Simonides was arrested on the charge above alluded to, of forging or stealing the MS. of Uranius. His papers were seized (a circumstance of which his friends made great complaint), and amongst them was found another copy of the *Hermas* MS., very different from that which he had sold to the Leipsic Library. This Simonides accounted for by saying that they were made from different MSS., and Hilgenfeld has lately expressed his substantial agreement with this. But the general opinion has been that the second copy (that found by the police) was a genuine copy of the Athos MS., the other having been constructed from it by alterations due to Simonides himself. In fact, these alterations actually appeared on the second copy, some in pencil and some in ink. It may be asked what was his object in thus falsifying the text when he possessed a correct copy. The answer is found in the fact that he also produced what professed to be a palimpsest of the *Shepherd*. It was doubtless with a view to the construction of this palimpsest that he kept back his real Athos copy, so that it might present a different and what might appear to be a more ancient form of text.

Another Greek text of part of the *Shepherd* was discovered by Tischendorf in the Sinaitic MS. Although this was only a fragment, yet by its substantial agreement with the Athos MS. it was sufficient to prove that the latter was actually the original Greek, not, as Tischendorf had himself suggested, a middle age translation from some Latin version (different

however from both those above mentioned). Nevertheless the bad faith of Simonides made it impossible to place full reliance on his copy.

Now comes the discovery alluded to, namely that of the original of Simonides' apographon in the monastery of St. Gregory on Mount Athos. The discovery was made by Dr. Spyridon P. Lambros, who was engaged in cataloguing the MSS. of the Athos libraries. The exact correspondence of the Leipsic leaves with those in Athos leaves no room for doubt that they are part of the same MS., even if we had not the confirmation given by the tradition of the monks that the three missing leaves were abstracted by 'Minas Minoides,' who also they say made certain annotations now appearing on the margin of the MS.

Professor Lambros' collation¹ of the MS. has proved that Simonides' copy was not only inexact, but even unscrupulous, as indeed his other performances would lead us to expect. A man accustomed to alter and emend MSS. cannot be trusted to copy correctly. An eminent scholar of a former generation, who was employed to read the proof-sheets of an edition of Demosthenes, could not refrain from introducing his own conjectures into the text without giving any hint that he had done so. Simonides did the same, though in a coarser manner. Where there were gaps in the MS. he did not always mark them, but filled them up. So that we may say that now for the first time we have the Greek text of the *Shepherd* with the exception of the last leaf, which must have been lost when Simonides discovered the codex, otherwise he would have copied it or else carried it off.

But here we meet his handiwork again. He was not to be defeated by a difficulty so trifling as the loss of a leaf of the Greek text. Four years after the sale of his corrupted copy to the Leipsic library he printed along with other tracts what purported to be the missing Greek conclusion. As by that time his character was irretrievably lost, no one would look at his publication. But lately this document has been reproduced by Draeseke, who regards it as genuine, and Hilgenfeld, adopting this view, has taken the opportunity of publishing 'for the first time' a complete Greek text.²

Mr. Robinson's discussion appended to the present volume establishes beyond all doubt that this pretended conclusion is a paraphrase of the old Latin version. Fortunately we are able to compare with it a quotation of the original found in the Homilies of Antiochus, a monk of the seventh century. One passage may suffice to show how Simonides' work was done.

'Sin autem aliquid ex his dissipata invenerit (vulg. pecus aliquod ex talibus invenerit dissipatum) vae erit pastoribus; quodsi ipsi pastores dissipati 'reperi' (om. ed. vulg.) fuerint, quid respondebunt ei pro

¹ It does not seem correct to say that the collation is 'with the text ascribed to the apographon of Simonides in the edition of Gebhardt and Harnack.' Where these scholars had the Sinaitic MS. before them, the collation is generally speaking with their text. This is important to notice, otherwise it might be supposed for example that the MS. reads in Vis. III. 3, p. 36, 13, *παυόργος εἰ περὶ τὰς γραφὰς* after *καὶ τὸ πρότερον*, or, immediately after, *ἐκζητήσεις* and *εὐρήσεις* instead of *ἐκζητεῖς* and *εὐρίσκεις*, or on p. 38, 9, *διαφορὰν* for *ἔξεδον*. Or we might suppose that Simonides read in p. 2, 2, *πέπρακέν με ῥόδῃ τινί*, not *πεπρακέναι καὶ ὁδὸν τινα*, or again in 2, 4, *μετὰ χρόνον τινα λουομένην*, and not *μετὰ χρόνον πολλοῦ ὁμιλεῖν*.

² *Hermas Pastor. Graece integrum ambitu pri-mum*. Edidit Adolfus Hilgenfeld. Lipsiae, 1887.

pecoribus 'his' (om. ed. vulg.)? Numquid dicent a pecore se vexatos? non credetur illis, incredibilis enim res est pastorem pati posse a pecore.

Antiochus has:

ἔαν δὲ εὐρεθῇ τινα ἐξ αὐτῶν διαπεπτωκότα, οὐαί τοῖς ποιμέσιν ἔσται. ἔαν δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ ποιμένες εὐρεθῶσιν διαπεπτωκότες, τί ἐροῦσιν τῷ δεσπότῃ τοῦ ποιμνίου; ὅτι ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων διέπεσαν; οὐ πιστευθήσονται. ἀπιστὸν γὰρ πρᾶγμα ἔστιν ποιμένα ὑπὸ προβάτων παθεῖν τι.

Simonides gives us:

καὶ γὰρ εἰ πρόβατόν τι ἐκ τῆς ὄλης ποίμνης ἀποπληνῆθῃ, λύπη ἔσται τοῖς ποιμέσι μεγάλη, εἰ δὲ καὶ οἱ ποιμένες αὐτοὶ διασπαρώσι, τίνα λόγον δώσουσιν οὗτοι τῷ κυρίῳ ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων; ἐροῦσιν ἕνα ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν προβάτων ἀπεβλήθησαν; ἀλλ' οὐδέποτε πιστευθήσονται οὗτοι ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἔστιν ὅλους τοὺς ποιμένας ἐκβληθῆναι τῆς μάνδρας ὑπὸ τῶν προβάτων, ἢ τι ἕτερον κακὸν παθεῖν αὐτοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶν.

A moment's comparison will doubtless satisfy the critical reader that in the last quotation we have a translation from the Latin.

We may, after Mr. Robinson, note a few particulars.

1. The weak *λύπη μεγάλη* instead of *οὐαί*.

2. The form *ἔσεται*. An easy mistake for a modern Greek who never uses the future forms in conversation.

3. The absence of any word corresponding to 'reperit,' which is in the old Latin and represented in the Palatine Latin as well as in Antiochus, but is significantly absent from the editio vulgata.

4. The difficulty Simonides found in translating 'dissipari,' used both of the shepherds and the flock, as he missed the word *διασεῖν*, which is also the original of 'vexari,' where the Latin translator saw that 'dissipari' would not be suitable. Simonides has three different words.

5. The repetition of the pronouns; a characteristic of modern language.

6. *ὅλους* for *πάντας*, a regular modern Greek use. Hilgenfeld emends, reading *ὅλας*.

7. *μάνδρα* twice occurring in this Simonides fragment, although not elsewhere in the *Shepherd*. The word is in use in modern Greek.

There is a second appendix dealing with Professor Rendel Harris' recent paper on *Hermas in Arcadia*.

T. K. ABBOTT.

Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen. Erster Band, Drittes Heft. De vi atque indole rhythmorum quid veteres iudicaverint. Scripsit GEORGIUS AMSEL. Breslau. 1887.

THE author of this treatise has in about a hundred pages for the first time collected and arranged the various passages in Greek and Latin writers bearing on the nature and effect of rhythm. It will be sufficient to give a short analysis of the subjects treated. After an introduction on the sources from which the material is drawn, Book I. gives the statements of ancient authors on rhythm in general—its origin and nature, its application to dancing, poetry and oratory, the pleasure derived from it, its connection with and effect upon character, its educational value, the impression produced by change of rhythm. Book II. deals with the different kinds of metre, the subjects being as follows: the effect produced by long and short syllables, or by feet composed of them, e.g. dactyls and spondees, and the fanciful analogies connected with different kinds of feet; the effect of

rising and falling rhythms, of catalexis, of the three genera of rhythms (i.e. those in which the two elements of the foot are in the relations of 2 : 2, 2 : 1, 3 : 2), and lastly of logaoedics. Incidentally the meaning of some difficult passages is discussed, or new interpretations are suggested. Thus e.g. there is a detailed examination of Dionysius *De Comp. Verb.* c. 4, where Dionysius illustrates the importance of metrical form by showing how the effect of some lines in Homer would be spoilt by arranging the words in some other metre; and there is a lengthy, though inconclusive, discussion of an obscure passage in the *De Sublimitate* (c. 39), referring to the peculiar excellence of the rhythm in a famous sentence in the *De Corona*.

An Appendix contains contributions to the textual criticism of some Greek writers on music and metre, which have been communicated to Dr. Amsel by L. Cohn and W. Studemund. The most important are those which deal with Aristides Quintilianus and pseudo-Plutarch *De Musica*. They consist of accounts of MSS. and a number of various readings.

C. B. HEBERDEN.

Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets with renderings in English Verse, by F. A. PALEY, LL.D. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 4s. 6d.

Is it pure accident, which has preserved for us so many plays of Aristophanes, while the poets of the middle and new comedies are only known to us in fragments? Dr. Paley may be supposed to have culled the choicest passages from Meineke's Collection, and however witty and pointed they may be, however well adapted for imitation by the Latin Comedians, this very neatness and elegance contrasts forcibly with the broad humour, which, like that of our own Shakspeare, reflects the grandeur as well as the coarseness of his age. When Dr. Paley complains in his preface that the Old Comedy 'had become an incentive to unrestrained vice,' he is unconsciously transferring to the Athenian population at the time of the Peloponnesian war the sentiments which nineteen centuries of Christianity have produced in the modern world. Aristophanes does not incite to vice, he is no preacher of immorality: he satirizes the infamous not with scathing moral reprobation, but with derision and contempt; if he ridicules Socrates it is because he forebodes a decay of public morals as the effect of the Socratic Scepticism: and he inveighs against the restless ambition and venality of the Demos as a conservative patriot, who had no sympathy with the statesman called by Dr. Paley in a note the G.O.M. of Athens.

The later comedians may 'rarely offend against decency,' but their imitators at Rome do not convince us of this fact, and at any rate they lived in a less strenuous age, and depicted a more frivolous society. When we come to analyse the contents of the present volume, the main point which strikes us is the inordinate appetite for fish which characterizes all members of the community. Eating and drinking are the staple subjects of the extracts, and the philosophy is of a cynical and Epicurean cast. There is one exception (perhaps two) to this general rule; for while Menander supplies a few finer touches, Philemon is by far the most attractive writer, judging from the fragments here presented: he is no mere retailer of commonplace witticisms; and there runs through his work a serious though not sententious vein of thoughtfulness.

Dr. Paley has adopted Meineke's text with few exceptions. He has made at least one good correction