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](#)

Abbott's *from Letter to Spirit From Letter to Spirit*. By Edwin A. Abbott. London: A. and C. Black. 20s. net.

T. Nicklin

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 07 / October 1904, pp 357 - 360

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990589, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990589

How to cite this article:

T. Nicklin (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 357-360 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990589

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the genitive, but the penalty in the ablative, e.g., *capite damnare*. Yet no such distinction can be properly made; Cicero has both *capitis damnare*, *Quinct.* 32, and *capite damnare*, *Verr.* V. 109. In § 617 Prof. West retains the old rule that the unreal present apodosis *errarem* is changed in indirect discourse to the periphrasis *erraturum esse*. This use of the present periphrastic is, however, recognized by Gildersleeve-Lodge as almost entirely hypothetical, and the evidence that the perfect periphrastic, *—rum fuisse*, was used instead is well summarized by Riemann, *Syntaxe Lat.*, p. 437. A curious slip confusing the quantity of vowels and syllables occurs in § 688; § 227 *nōlō* should be given as a contraction of *nevolō* rather than of *nōn volō*; § 244 the accent *quibūscum* should, according to the Latin grammarians, be *quisbūscūm*; § 439 *utrique* more frequently means *both parties* than *both*. On the important question of the use of moods in relative clauses Prof. West contents himself with the rule, § 586, that relative clauses have the same use of moods as the corresponding kinds of conjunctive clauses. This statement contains a general truth which will scarcely be called in question, but it is too vaguely expressed to be very helpful in concrete cases. For example, Prof. West treats the mood of causal relative clauses by referring to the rule that conjunctive causal clauses take the indicative or subjunctive, according as the introductory conjunction is *quandō*, *quod*, etc., or *cum*. This statement may seem to agree with Prof. Hale's well-known

teaching that causal *qui*-clauses may take either the indicative or the subjunctive, but in reality goes considerably beyond that teaching. For Prof. Hale has been careful to point out that the indicative *qui*-clause is only a *tacit* causal clause, while the subjunctive is an *explicit* causal clause and brings the causal relation into especial prominence. 'The indicative clause conveys the causal relation without expressing it, while the subjunctive clause expresses the relation' (*Cum-Constructions*, p. 104). We are not surprised to find that in practice Prof. West limits himself to explaining the use of the *subjunctive* mood in these clauses, since, with one exception, all the examples which he cites illustrate this mood.

As has already been suggested, sufficient care has not always been exercised by Prof. West in the selection of his examples, e.g., § 659 *nē flē*, § 356 *mille passurum*,—the latter scarcely a model example of the use of the partitive genitive for young students. In the marking of long vowels some omissions and some inconsistencies have been noted, as § 644 *pontem*, but § 245 *mōntem*, etc. Among the too numerous misprints we may mention § 564 *videor* for *videar*, § 559 *parva* for *parvī*.

ROBERT S. RADFORD.

Elmira College.

[*Note.*—As Prof. Radford has directed his observations almost exclusively to the *Syntax* of Prof. West's Grammar, it is proper to add that its *Accidence* also stands in need of revision.—Ed. C.R.]

ABBOTT'S FROM LETTER TO SPIRIT.

From Letter to Spirit. By EDWIN A. ABBOTT. London: A. and C. Black. 20s. net.

THIS is the third volume of Dr. Abbott's *Diatessarica*. It aims at reconstructing from the variant narratives and references of the N.T. and extra-canonical-sources an original account—written or oral—of certain particulars in the Gospel-story. Incidentally Dr. Abbott gives us a most valuable dissertation of 43 pages on Bath Kol, i.e. Voices from Heaven in Jewish Tradition, reprinting in an Appendix Pinner's collection of examples from the

Talmuds and Targums; he gives us a useful restatement in another Appendix of the reasons for believing that the so-called Second Epistle of St. Peter is a forgery, and in yet another a convincing review of Eusebius' promise to record the evidence accessible to him that bore on the canonicity or authenticity of Christian writings. He demonstrates anew the correctness of Bishop Lightfoot's interpretation of that promise.

The particulars in the Gospel-story selected for discussion in this book concern the Baptism, the Transfiguration, The Voice from Heaven in St. John, The Lord's Prayer, especially the clause 'Thy Will be

done'; but the writer also raises important questions in regard to the original form of the precept about 'taking up the cross,' and of some details of the Crucifixion-narrative, besides proposing some new translations of the sacred text.

The validity of many of Dr. Abbott's conclusions¹ stands or falls with the soundness of his theory of an original Hebrew or Aramaic Gospel-story, the translations of which no one with a knowledge at firsthand of the Gospel-facts remained alive to correct or contradict when our gospels took shape. It is impossible here to argue the question,² but it will be well to state what results the writer has attained which seem tolerably certain to be correct.

(1) In S. Mark i. 7 *ἀπὸ τοῦ μου* = 'one of my followers or disciples'—a sense missed by the other synoptists, but paralleled by S. John i. 27.

(2) *Perhaps* S. Luke iii. 22 *σωματικῶς ἔδει* = 'in His plenitude,' cf. S. Paul *Coloss.* i. 19 and ii. 9, 1 *Thess.* v. 22.

(3) 'Deliver us from the Evil One' was not an original clause of the Lord's Prayer, but an interpretation of the preceding clause.

(4) *ὅσα ἐπεριτεράν* does not mean, in the account of the Spirit's descent, that this visible form was assumed, but that our Lord was the Spirit's home, and abiding-place. Exactly how this sense is to be deduced, is disputable: in § 736 variations are quoted in a story about R. Hillel, which seem to make unnecessary the postulation of a Hebrew original misunderstood.

(5) All supposed quotations of Deut. xviii. 15ff. in the Ante-Nicene Fathers are really drawn from S. Luke *Acts* iii. 22ff.

(6) *Perhaps* in S. Mark only ix. 4 the true translation is 'and he appeared to them Elijah with Moses; and they (i.e. the disciples) were conversing with Jesus. And Peter answered, etc.'

(7) In 1 *Cor.* xi. 23 we should translate 'the same night that he was delivered up (for our sins)' and cf. *Rom.* viii. 32, and so perhaps in Mk. xiv. 41 and Mt. xvii. 22, xx. 18, xxvi. 45 and more certainly in Mt. xxvi. 2.

(8) The expression 'take up the cross' must mean 'wear the yoke' of the *furcifer* preparatory to crucifixion: it may disguise

'take on the yoke of Christ's service' (cf. S. Matthew xi. 29), analogous to the regular Hebrew 'the yoke of the Law, of the Kingdom of Heaven.' Dr. Abbott seems not to quote S. John xix. 17. Was *ξύλον* avoided because of Deut. xxi. 23? It is used in S. Luke *Acts*, S. Paul *Galat.* and 1 S. Peter.

(9) In Jn. xii. 27 'why should I say, "Father, save me from this hour"? Nay, for this cause came I, etc.'; and in Jn. xviii. 11 probably 'Put up the sword into the sheath. The cup that the Father hath given me, I shall (forsooth, according to thy will) not drink.'

One general intention runs through the book—to vindicate the spiritual, if not historical, superiority of S. John: and there can be little doubt that the more searching criticism to which the Synoptists have been of recent years subjected makes such a position more and more tenable. Dr. Abbott is at the opposite pole to those critics who found in the Synoptists a more human and therefore a more credible Christ: he will have no weakness of the flesh (§§ 923, 958, 988), no strong crying and tears, no 'Thy Will be done,' and seeks to correct the other three Gospels so that they may harmonize with the picture presented in the Fourth.

To refer to one detail of the arrangement before passing on to suggest oversights and blemishes, the printing in full of all the authorities in two Appendices is a laudable custom, which would that more writers would follow!

Dr. Abbott would probably prefer that instead of vague commendation definite points for reconsideration should be mentioned. Such would be these.

(1) Justin's 'fire kindled in the Jordan' (and its congeners) is traceable to the traditions preserved in S. Luke xii. 49, 50 and S. Matt. iii. 11 = S. Luke iii. 16. (Cf. also 978b.)

(2) In view of S. Matt. ii. 23 a re-examination of the O.T. quotations in this Gospel should show whether the writer knew any Hebrew at all. (Cf. §§ 787, 830.)

(3) 'Luke relates the whole [descent of The Spirit]... as a fact' (p. 51). The Oral hypothesis, as restated by Dr. A. Wright, has not been disproved and might explain this divergence.

(4) In § 614 the invocation of Greek corruption, failing Hebrew, is very unconvincing. In § 832 why must everything a writer says be derived from an earlier

¹ e.g. § 639.

² It may be asked whether the original would not be Aramaic, not Hebrew; and whether, except S. Paul, any one was likely to Targumize in New Hebrew or even perhaps understand it. If not, are not all the solutions from New Hebrew out of place?

source? Surely Justin and Tertullian may independently hit on the same argument.

(5) The testimony of S. Paul's Epistles to early traditions is ignored: e.g. *Rom.* vi. 3, 4 throws light on S. Mark i. 10.

(6) The whole question of the relation of the LXX to MT. needs re-sifting before many of Dr. Abbott's arguments can be accepted. If the MT. has been revised since the LXX was made, or re-adjusted to meet Christian controversy, much that he says will at least be modified, e.g. §§ 629, 666a, 927.

(7) Surely (§ 630a) our Lord's custom of praying is likely enough for S. Luke to be correct in recording it even if other evangelists do not, without resorting to the hypothesis that he has misunderstood some Hebrew word.

(8) Is not the true translation of S. John i. 51 'Ye shall see that the heavens have been opened (at the Baptism), and are open, and that the angels do ascend, etc.'? And is not the meaning that our Lord, they will see, is—a Beth-el i.e. the thought is the same as in S. John ii. 21. As to the 'falling down' before our Lord (§§ 656-8) I have been in the habit of associating S. Luke ii. 34 with S. John xviii. 6 and a passage in the Gospel of Peter.

(9) Far-fetched explanations seem to be offered in §§ 649, 660a, 943 (where S. Luke's 'standing up pray' (xxii. 46) is thought to conceal that the three 'pillars' (cf. *Gal.* ii. 9) were to pray!), 946, 958, 964a, 985a, 986a.

(10) If LXX is generally superior to MT, in Isaiah xi. 2 (§ 669a) may not πνεῦμα τοῦ (ἢ τοῦ) θεοῦ be 'a judge's Spirit'? And in xi. 3 does ἐμπλήσει receive any light from Jer. iv. 12 quoted 674a?

(11) The special use of each N.T. writer needs separate investigation as regards his use e.g. of prepositions ἐπί, εἰς, just as much as the different books of the LXX do not necessarily observe the same use. Dr. Abbott throughout treats O.T. and N.T. too much as units. On p. 104, his own example from the LXX seems to show that εἰς and ἐπί were used indifferently by some. (Cf. §§ 677a and 850: also § 879b and p. 186 where this expectation of invariable uniformity reappears.)

(12) Has 'Ben Zoma's view' of the 'dove' been otherwise expunged from Rabbinic literature because to do so made against the Christians?

(13) In § 738b Dr. Abbott ignores the best known instance of THEY=God, viz. S. Luke xvi. 9.

(14) In Mt. xi. 25=Lk. x. 21, if the introductory words to the λόγια are not simply different because supplied by the Evangelists themselves, may not an Aramaic original = ἐξομολογέσθαι (as in *Rom.* x. 10) reconcile them?

(15) Keim years ago took Mt. xxvi. 41 to refer (in part at least) to our Lord (§ 941a).

To take broader issues, the writer seems not to give sufficient weight (e.g. §§ 608, 673, 907) to a consideration he formerly urged himself in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, viz. the impossibility of successive storytellers keeping exactly to what they have heard, or of two eyewitnesses telling precisely the same story. Hence he wants to see in every divergence an offshoot from some Hebrew original mistranslated; and the invariable success with which this original is discovered throws discredit even on what probably are sound suggestions.

Again, if a particular corruption or mistranslation has been made in the LXX, is not that, by the law of probability, a reason for *not* expecting the same mistake but others similar to it to be made again in the N.T.? Dr. Abbott thinks otherwise but does he find that the same mistranslation recurs in the LXX? Is not his method (of collecting known mistakes, to trace them again in unknown regions) unscientific? At least, palaeographical errors except in very common words are not so expected to reappear.

And has he made his account with the fact that the LXX is not a uniformly executed translation, done at one time, but piece-meal? Just as e.g. *cruse* was only used by the English translator of Samuel and Kings, do not words and constructions occur in the LXX in strata? Is not this why throughout Isaiah 'the spirit of the Lord' is rendered so differently from elsewhere?¹ Moreover, he does not pay nearly sufficient attention to the results of recent Egyptian discoveries.² For him, the only Greek available for an Evangelist is bounded by the corners of the LXX (see § 885a): but even the MT of Daniel—two

¹ §§ 669a and 675.

² In Mk. xiv. 36, e.g., Dr. Abbott seeks to demonstrate that the only right translation must be 'it is no question what I will, but what Thou wilt,' arguing from late Greek authors. But all these authors exhibit some tinge of Attic diction, style, and construction: S. Mark surely does not. Dr. Moulton's examples therefore in the April number of this *Review* (p. 154) justify the A.V. This example may show how much distrust must be felt of commentaries built on a knowledge of classical Greek only, or united even to a knowledge of the LXX.

centuries earlier—shows that Greek was making way in Palestine: and in Galilee a considerable influx of Greek must have taken place by 50 A.D. It has always seemed to me that the same confined idea underlay many of W.-H.'s list of O.T. quotations in the N.T., and many lists of supposed quotations of the N.T. in the Fathers and Apocryphal Books (*e.g.* perhaps 897a).

Again, it is reasonable to suppose that the first efforts to express the Gospel in Greek were the most barbarous, and that smoothness came with time. As it seems to me, S. Mark retains strong traces of these¹ first uncouth attempts, while certain set forms like the Lord's Prayer might be expected to be worse than even the bulk of his narrative. (The development of the English liturgy would be analogous to this process.) Thus I suppose ἐπ-ιούσιος to be a particularly barbarous form, and Dr. Abbott might supplement his list of S. John's paraphrases of Synoptic words (*cf.* p. 312) by an identification I have suggested of ἄρτος ἐπ-ιούσιος with ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (vi. 33).² Similarly S. Mark has ἐπιβαλὼν (as if 'slamming'³ out of the house') ἐκλαίει, where S. Matthew even reaches ἐξελθὼν ἔξω. So I doubt not S. Mark's σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς is to be explained, without reading into it any of the deep design suggested in § 642.

Another fallacy which infects the writer like most others who have written on the subject is this. If two accounts disagree, and a third account equally detailed exist, it must almost always, even if its writer knew nothing of the other two accounts,

¹ Thus I should doubt if he knew (§ 945) the nice Greek use of κάθημαι = 'remain doing nothing,' and am not fully satisfied with the argument on xiv. 36 παρένεγκε.

² The ἐπ- = κατά may reassure Dr. Abbott in regard to the harmony of Mk. i. 10 and its parallels.

³ Perhaps such a vulgar use misunderstood gave rise to S. Luke ix. 62 if Dr. Abbott is right in making this resemble Acts ix. 5.

side with one or the other. When the spurious Gospel of Peter was found, it was amazing to observe how little this law of probability was recognized. Dr. Abbott observes (§§ 656, 974) that 'in almost every case where Luke omits or entirely alters an important statement of Mark, John intervenes to clear up some obscurity or corruption.' This sort of observation needs to be supplemented by others, showing how often he obscures—by giving a new view—important statements common to SS. Mark and Luke, and so on.

In conclusion, it ought to be said that the temper of Dr. Abbott's writing is worthy of his subject, and, if some of his theories appear fanciful, for others, as has been said, he deserves the thanks of all readers of the Bible, for he has shown us the true significance of unregarded words. With his plea for more frequent study of Targums and Talmuds and Hebrew thought all sober students must heartily sympathize; and no less with his insistence on the study of Plato and Philo if we are to understand S. John. Unfortunately a portion of a Latin Father is the uniform diet given to diocesan examinees.

But it is shown once more by this work that these N.T. problems will never be solved until a group of scholars undertakes the work. And for some reason this is the more necessary since the study of Rabbinical learning seems to have the same deflecting power over the logical faculties that the pursuit of mediaeval scholasticism or Celtic *origines* has.⁴ A group of scholars could not only carry out with one purpose a multitude of necessary investigations subsidiary to a final solution, but could criticize, correct, and stimulate each other's work.

T. NICKLIN.

⁴ Dr. Abbott derives from Sabach(thanei) variously understood no less than nine distinct Gospel statements.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ZEUS, JUPITER, AND THE OAK.

(Conclusion.)

Etruria.

PROF. RIDGEWAY rightly lays stress on the tradition that, before the advent of the

Etruscans, Pelasgians from Thessaly had settled in N. Italy and made common cause with the kindred tribe of the Aborigines.¹ He further advances the attractive and indeed brilliant hypothesis that the quasi-Greek works of art (bronzes, scarabs,

¹ *E.A.* i. 231 ff.