to admit that any one is contrary to any other, though they may very probably be derived from different original documents.

HENRY A. REDPATH.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. III.—DR. GIFFORD'S "EUSEBIUS."[1]

THIS remarkable work will rank with the few really great editions of patristic literature produced by our generation. In point of thoroughness it may justly be compared with Lightfoot's "Ignatius"; and if in the historical reference it is inferior to Lightfoot's epoch-marking volumes, this is due to the fact that, primarily, the editor's object was simply to give an accurate rendering of the "Præparatio Evangelica" into English. We are glad that Dr. Gifford's first scheme became changed as his work went on, for, as he is careful to explain, the further his translation advanced, the more imperative he felt it to revise the original text. We owe it, perhaps, mainly to Dr. Sanday of Oxford that Dr. Gifford was induced to gird himself to the task of producing a fresh recension of the Eusebian text. That his work in this direction should have resulted in the writing of a commentary is not surprising, though it is surely a matter in regard to which scholars may feel just satisfaction. It is certainly safe to assert that one of the most valuable and interesting literary monuments of the fourth century has, at length, been dealt with in so sound and masterly a fashion. Scarcely any valuable contribution to the understanding of Eusebius's work, whether made in England or on the Continent, will be sought for in vain within the pages of this sumptuous edition. While it is never safe to predicate finality for any work of the kind, we may be pretty well within the mark in saying that Gifford's "Eusebius" will hold its own for the next century as the one indispensable edition.

Before proceeding to give a brief account of the contents of this *magnum opus*, a word or two may not be out of place as to Dr. Gifford himself.[2] Graduating at Cambridge in 1843

[1] "Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicæ Præparationis," libri xv.: ad codices manuscriptos denuo collatos recensuit Anglicè nunc primum reddidit notis et indicibus instruxit E. H. Gifford, S.T.P., olim archidiaconus Londinensis. Tom. I.: Textus, libr. i.-ix.; II., libr. x.-xv.; III., IV., libr. Anglicè redditi; V., Notæ. Oxonii: E typographeo Academico, 1903. Price £5 5s.

[2] I am indebted to Professor J. E. B. Mayor, of Cambridge, for courteously sending me a valuable note (reprinted from the *Cambridge Review*, October 29, 1903) relative to Dr. Gifford, both as man and writer.

(the year when Adams was Senior Wrangler) as Senior Classic (bracketed)—he was one of Kennedy's pupils at Shrewsbury—he first took a mastership at his old school; becoming, later on, Headmaster of King Edward's School, Birmingham (1848 to 1862). He was Rector of Much Hadham from 1875 to 1886, being succeeded by Dr. Stanley Leathes; and from 1884 to 1889 was Archdeacon of London and Canon of St. Paul's. His major works include an edition of the "Romans" in the "Speaker's Commentary" (next to Westcott's "St. John," this edition ranks as the most noteworthy of the contributions to that unequal work), a translation of Cyril's "Catechetical Lectures," and (in 1897) an admirable work on the Incarnation.

On October 9, 1903, "more than sixty years after his election to a foundation fellowship, Dr. Gifford was, by a unanimous vote of the college Council, elected to an honorary fellowship of St. John's. Thus, on this higher roll, as on the lower, his name will be associated with that of his friend and contemporary, J. C. Adams." *Sed hæc hactenus.*

Let us now turn for a moment to these five massive volumes, issued from the famous Clarendon Press. The first and second volumes contain the (critically revised) text, the third and fourth the translation (with marginalia), and the fifth the commentary. The entire work occupies nearly 3,000 octavo pages. When one considers all that is involved in the preparation of such a book, one is somewhat at a loss to estimate adequately the labour and time spent; our admiration is certainly not diminished as we reflect that the work is that of a man already past his eightieth year.

The introduction to the text (vol. i., pp. i-xlvii) is written in Latin, and gives us a brief yet sufficient account of the various manuscripts employed by the editor in the task of recension.[1] The index codicum enunciates eleven of these manuscripts. Three codices—A (Parisiensis, tenth century), I (Venetus, fifteenth century), and O (Bononiensis, thirteenth century)—have been specially collated for the present edition, for they (together with H, Codex Marcianus 343) are to be regarded as of fundamental authority. The rest of the critical material, as well as the different versions, have been duly examined and weighed, and a concise *conspectus lectionum* is exhibited at the foot of each page of the text as constituted by Dr. Gifford; who, further, has not neglected to insert

[1] The oldest and best manuscript of the first five books of the "Præparatio Evangelica" was written in the year 914 for Arethas, Archbishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocian. See an interesting note by Dr. Gifford in the *Classical Review* for February, 1902.

necessary references, that the reader may be enabled at a glance to detect every Biblical allusion as it occurs in the course of Eusebius's work. References are also given for all quotations from classical writers. This is no inconsiderable gain, and the careful student will be proportionately grateful.

The commentary, while not exhaustive, supplies all the material needed for forming a sound judgment upon the many and varied questions that naturally crop up in perusing an author so discursive as Eusebius. Exegetical in the main, the notes afford a large number of illustrative citations and parallel passages, collected from a host of authors, ancient and modern. Dr. Gifford modestly disclaims any special knowledge of archæology, philosophy, and the like; but, to judge from his commentary, he is equally apt in his quotations, whether they be from Plato, or Plotinus, or Lotze; and he rarely, if ever, slurs a real difficulty. Of how many commentators can we say the like?

In short, nothing that could usefully illustrate Eusebius's argument, or enable the reader to appreciate the exact bearing of his literary or philosophical allusions, seems to have been overlooked. The following may be taken as a fair specimen of Dr. Gifford's method as a commentator. It will also serve to indicate the scope of the commentary (the passage under discussion occurs in Book VIII., chapter vii., *μυρία δὲ ἄλλα ἐπὶ τούτοις, ὅσα καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγράφων ἐθῶν καὶ νομίμων, κἂν τοῖς νόμοις αὐτοῖς. ἅ τις παθεῖν ἐχθαίρει, μὴ ποιεῖν αὐτόν*: which is thus rendered by Dr. Gifford: "There are countless other rules besides these, all that either rest upon unwritten customs and usages, or are contained in the laws themselves. *Let no man himself do what he hates to have done to him*"):

"**ἅ τις παθεῖν ἐχθαίρει.** *Cf.* Tobit, iv. 15, ὃ *μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς*. In Matt. vii. 12 and Luke vi. 31 the negative precept is converted into the positive and stronger. *Cf.* Resch, *Agrapha*, 95, 135, 272; C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 37, note; Isocrates, *Nicocl.*, 39 C, ἃ *πάσχοντες ὑφ' ἑτέρων ὀργίζεσθε, ταῦτα τοῖς ἀλλοῖς μὴ ποιεῖτε*, quoted by Gibbon, *Rom. Emp.*, liv., note 36, as occurring 400 years before the publication of the Gospel."

A good example of his historical or general notes occurs on p. 550 (*à propos* of the Great Year, *τὸν μέγαν ἐνιαυτόν*, xv., 54, c. 6):

"The Great Year is a term employed in several senses: (1) It means the period in which the commencement of the solar and lunar years were made nearly to coincide by means of an intercalary month or months. *Cf.* Smith, *Dict. Gk. and R. Antt.*, 'Calendarium,' 122 *b*. (2) 'The year which Aristotle calls *the Greatest* rather than *the Great*, is that in which the sun, moon, and planets all return and come together in the same sign of the zodiac from which they originally started. The winter of this year is the *Cataclysm*, or Deluge; the summer is the *Ecpyrosis*, or Conflagra-

tion of the World' (O'Brien in the *Manual of Geogr. Science*, i. 40). *Cf.* 415 *d* 4. (3) 'Censorinus (*De Die Natali*, c. 18) attributes to Aristarchus the invention of the *magnus annus* of 2,484 years' (Smith, *Dict. Biog.*, 'Aristarchus'). (4) Hippolytus, *Refut. Hær.*, iv. 7: 'They affirm that a configuration of the same stars could not return to a similar position, otherwise than by the renewal of the Great Year, through a space of 7777.' This is the same number which is given by Plutarch in the text. Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. Math.*, v. 105, says that 'the restoration of the Great Year takes place at intervals of 9977 years.'"

In order to give my readers a specimen of Dr. Gifford's skill and care as a translator, I select, pretty well at random, this passage from chapter vi. of Book III., where Eusebius is arguing that Christians are fully justified in withdrawing from any merely physical theory of the Divine power, preferring, as they do, a truer theology:

"Must not the Gospel of Jesus our Saviour, our Christ and God, be great and admirable, as teaching all mankind to worship with befitting thoughts the God and Lord of sun and moon, and Maker of the whole cosmos, who is Himself high above and beyond the universe; and to celebrate in hymns, not the elements of bodies, but Him who is the sustainer of life itself and dispenser of all good things? For that Gospel teaches us not to stand in awe of the visible parts of the cosmos, and all that can be apprehended by fleshly sense, as they must be of a perishable nature; but to marvel only at the mind which in all these exists unseen, and which creates both the whole and each several part; and to regard as God one sole Divine Power, pervading and ordering all things, being in its nature incorporeal and intelligent, or rather impossible to describe and to conceive; which shows itself through all things whereby it works, and incorporeally pervades and traverses them all without intermixture; and, throughout all things—not only in heaven, but also upon earth—both the universal elements and the several parts, exhibits the perpetual mighty working of the Godhead; and presides over all in a manner which our sight and sense cannot perceive, and governs the whole cosmos by laws of ineffable wisdom."[1]

Of Eusebius's work as a whole it is not too much to say that its main value lies in its *collections* rather than in the original matter contributed by the good Bishop himself. Eusebius does not shine as a profound thinker; his strength lay rather in the historic than the philosophic faculty. But he knew and valued the works of his predecessors, Christian or pagan, and his erudition was immense. Hence his work, as we have already indicated, is a perfect mine of quotation and extract. A glance at the index to the present edition will at once reveal how wide was his acquaintance with the polemical and apologetic literature, not only of his own, but equally of an earlier epoch.

[1] If we could suppose Pope ever to have read the "Præparatio Evangelica" we might conjecture that this chapter inspired him to write the famous passage in the "Essay on Man" beginning: "All are but parts of one stupendous whole."

Before closing this brief notice it may be as well—for not every theological student has been at the pains to read through the "Præparatio Evangelica"—to offer a short summary of the contents of the book and to indicate the object its author had in compiling it.

At the very outset Eusebius remarks that his purpose is (1) to show the nature of Christianity to those that are ignorant of its meaning; and (2) to prove that Christians, so far from having adopted their faith without inquiry or sound reason, have actually the best of all reasons for abandoning the worn-out teachings of paganism. Next he goes on to give in detail confutations of the inconsistent theology of the ancients, roundly arguing that "dæmonism" lay at the root of the system. When casting aspersions on pagan systems of theology Eusebius is evidently enjoying himself. He returns again and again to the attack. No doubt he was more than justified in his denunciations. By his time, the whole of these religious systems of antiquity were tainted, if not utterly corrupt.

What constitutes the chief value of the book in the eyes of the modern student is, of course, the fact that the author, in his refutation of ancient theologies, draws such abundant material from the actual writings of the best and most learned advocates of paganism themselves. The writings of Porphyry, for example, are thus largely utilized. Eusebius had certainly timed his book to appear at the "psychological" moment. Constantine was on the imperial throne; the persecutions (initiated in A.D. 303 under Diocletian) had ceased; and the longed-for period of repose (the "times of refreshing" of which the Apostle had spoken) had followed upon the fierce outburst of fanaticism that had marked the close of Maximin's reign. Nevertheless, though persecution had failed to exterminate Christianity, other weapons were available. "The old charges of atheism, apostasy, and hostility to the State, though often refuted, were constantly renewed." The enemies of the faith had changed their tactics; that was all. It was at this critical juncture that Eusebius stepped into the breach, and flung down the gauntlet in challenge of his opponents.

We may divide the contents of the fifteen books of the "Præparatio" roughly into five groups:

Books I. to III.: Discussion of the great systems of heathen theology.

Books IV. to VI.: Description of the Oracles, followed by an account of the opinions of Greek philosophers on Fate and Freewill.

Books VII. to IX.: Reasons for abandoning ancestral religions and preferring the doctrines of the Jews.

Books X. to XII.: Arguments to prove that what was good in Greek theology was borrowed from the Jews.[1]

Books XIII. to XV.: Comparison instituted between Plato and Moses.

From the nature of the method adopted, not much scope is afforded Eusebius for exercising the graces of literary style. Indeed, he appears rather in the position of an editor than an original author. The title of his book might almost be "Selections from Pre-Christian Writers on the Divine Government of the World, with Illustrative Comments." Certainly the book, though quite invaluable as an armoury of quotations—many of them from writers whose works have been lost, and whom we know solely through this medium—is not attractively put together. There is a lack of cohesion about it, scientific method is often conspicuously absent, and the quoted passages (especially in the later books) frequently do not seem very relevant. The perusal of a number of long passages, sometimes but remotely bearing on the point Eusebius wishes to elaborate, is apt to become wearisome.

He does not seem, one must admit, always scrupulously just to opponents, though his admiration for Plato is evidently sincere. Frequently we miss any really adequate appreciation of the problem of religion in pre-Christian ages; there is a tendency to sweep all religions together (the Jewish alone excepted) as so much tares and darnel, without a whole-hearted effort to get at the real residuum of truth underneath. At least, that is the impression left upon my mind after attentively reading the entire work. It is also sufficiently obvious that the collections of passages from previous writers have *for us* rather a linguistic, or historical, or antiquarian than a strictly apologetic interest—so wide is the gulf that separates us, in the theological reference, from the early days of the fourth century.

I had marked a number of passages, presenting points of varied interest, that I had hoped to touch upon in the course of this notice—for example, the criticism of Aristotle in Book XV.; the attempt to square Platonism with Mosaism in Book XI. (see especially chapter xxiii.); the remarks on Fate and Freewill in Book VI., chapter vi.; and the very noteworthy chapters on the primitive theologies of Egypt and Phœnicia in Book I. But the reader who desires to hear further on these subjects will naturally turn to the book itself. It remains but to ask, What is Eusebius's place in

[1] And, as Eusebius almost implies, was "spoiled in the process." The less prejudiced and better informed scholarship of modern times has shown the untenability of this hypothesis.

history? First, in the "Ecclesiastical History" he has given us a work which is (to use Westcott's words) "the last great literary monument of the period it describes." That he should have written such a book argues many things; among them this, that he was a man of wide knowledge and varied attainments. As a matter of fact, he was not only an eminent scholar, but an accomplished "man of the world" in the best sense of the term. We may safely discount Gibbon's careless sneers at the honesty of the historian, when we remember the verdict of Bishop Lightfoot. It is certainly a noteworthy fact that, though Eusebius was suspected of unorthodoxy amid the confusions of the Arian controversy, and despite the odium attaching to him in consequence, no historian for nearly 200 years after his death attempted to rewrite the history of the Ante-Nicene Church and improve upon the work of the Bishop of Cæsarea.

We cannot close this notice of Dr. Gifford's great edition of so celebrated a work as the "Præparatio Evangelica" without cordially thanking him for this contribution to English scholarship. The need of new editions of patristic works is a crying one.[1] The Germans are content with monographs on various writers or critical editions of the texts. This is not all that is required. Who will undertake editions of the Letters of Jerome, of Augustine's "De Civitate Dei," of the Hymns of Prudentius, of the major works of Tertullian, to name but a handful? The harvest is ready; the labourers are indeed few. That the noble example of Dr. Gifford may stimulate our younger scholars to the work of investigation in the vast field of patristic literature, must surely be the earnest wish of every sincere student of antiquity.

E. H. Blakeney.

Borlase, Marlow.

Art. IV.—THE CONCENTRATION OF EFFORT.

FOR many months during last year there appeared each week in the *Daily News* the results of a census of those attending all the various "places of worship" in a particular district in London or the neighbourhood upon the preceding Sunday. These figures, together with certain chapters upon the conditions of religious work in the different parts of both "Inner" and "Greater" London, have recently been

[1] Something has been done of late; Hort and Mayor's edition of the fifth book of Clement's "Stromateis" is a case in point.