

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](#)



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

A. P.

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 10 / December 1887, pp 303 - 303
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184240, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184240

How to cite this article:

A. P. (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 303-303 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184240

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

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*, προσκοῦσας 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' ἡ Κάδμω κόρη* is said (p. 181), to begin with a *tribrach*. The lines—
λεῦκιπποι ἐνομαίμονες ὄλβισαν ὄλβισαν
τὸ πρόβη' 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