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](#)

Text of the New Testament *Der Textdes Neuen Testaments*: Neue Fragen Funde und Forschungen der neutestamentlichen Textkritik. Von Rudolf Knopf. Giessen: Topelmann, 1906. 8¼" × 5½" Pp. 48. M. 1.

T. Nicklin

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 08 / December 1907, pp 247 - 248

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00180448, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00180448

How to cite this article:

T. Nicklin (1907). The Classical Review, 21, pp 247-248 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00180448

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

general rule. He was thus able, by reference to his tables of multiplications, to pick out the factors which produced a certain result; and, if the divisor and dividend which he desired to use appeared in his factor tables, he could write down his quotient. He had reached that stage when, as Plato says, 'every divisor' was 'a gift from God.' It must then have seemed to him that there was at the end of his list a Grand Unity, as there was a unity at the beginning, into which all numbers would divide; or rather, as he soon perceived, all such numbers as had about them a peculiar nature. As his scale of notation was the sexagesimal, in which 60 , 60^2 , 60^3 , 60^4 were each represented by the sign used to denote 1, only written in larger form or in a separate place, he must have regarded this high number, of which alone factors could easily be tabulated without overhanging units or broken numbers, as a peculiarly perfect number.

Plato, and the Pythagorean philosophers, juggle with the same elements of arithmetic as the Babylonians did, but we do not know that all played the same tricks. Suffice it to say that nearly every number which Dr. Adam finds in Plato's speculations, Professor Hilprecht finds significantly placed in his Nippur mathematical tables. Professor Hilprecht's interpretation of the 'Law of Harmony' which he finds in Plato, treated as a commentary on Babylonian arithmetical cosmography, differs from Dr. Adam's 'Law of Change' which he sees in Plato's words.

Professor Hilprecht is undoubtedly right when he brings out so fully the significance of the 12,960,000 days, or 36,000 years, which, as Berosus told us of old, was a Babylonian cycle and shows that the same number must somehow control the life of man. Plato's hundred years would give 36,000 days, and a day in the life of man answers to a year in the life of the Universe.

We see now that the Babylonians had at their command a notation which they actually used to express 195,955,200,000,000, though what they wanted with such a number one can hardly say.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Der Text des Neuen Testaments: Neue Fragen Funde und Forschungen der neutestamentlichen Textkritik. Von RUDOLF KNOPF. Giessen: Topelmann, 1906. $8\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 48. M. 1.

THIS is an excellent little book. It provides an ideal introduction to the textual criticism of the New Testament as it is to-day. The author not only puts his subject clearly but has a serviceable knowledge of the work others are doing and have done for its elucidation. It would be unfair to sketch the course of his lecture—it is to be hoped that many will be induced to buy it for themselves—but this much may be said. He outlines the characteristics of the three or four great groups of texts for the New Testament: he notices that, as Nestle said, the year 1903 saw the passing of the old *textus receptus* (the British and Foreign Bible Society substituting in the next year a new eclectic text): he states the position of Westcott and Hort; and finally discusses the effect of the new evidence and new investigations, which have modified our estimate of their work and led many to deny its finality. Throughout the author exhibits learning and sanity of judgment. He is neither led away by the vehemence of Dean Burgon's school nor dazzled by the great names of the two Cambridge scholars, nor enticed by the will-o'-the-wisp vagaries of some at least among the new 'western' school. He distrusts Dr. F. Blass' hypothesis of two holographs of St. Luke's writings, because similar variants between 'western' and 'neutral' (or 'Alexandrian') texts occur in the other gospels. Nor will he give himself up unreservedly to the dictation of Codex Bezae, and still less to the sporadic peculiarities of single manuscripts which exhibit the *vetus latina* or other versions. In an appendix he enumerates a very useful selection of passages in which the broad differences between the great types of text can be observed. The beginner will find this worth working through, and, if he carefully studies the indications the writer gives of the directions in which fresh work must be done to supplement our materials for coming to a decision, he will be tolerably

prepared for independent study. It is very properly insisted by the author that the evidence of the Fathers from 150-400 A.D. must play a great part in the final solution of the problems he has outlined. Meanwhile an eclectic text, drawn from the consent, not of editors in the last fifty years, but of good and early representatives of the 'Alexandrian' and the 'western' traditions, would be useful to the rank and file of New Testament students. It was only the other day that a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus supplied new confirmation of the value which the 'western' text has. The Greek original of a passage in Irenaeus was recovered, and was found to agree with Codex Bezae. Although Prof. Knopf does not refer to this, he is aware of the change in the position of the question, and his little book can be warmly recommended and commended.

T. NICKLIN.

PARALIPOMENA SOPHOCLEA.

Paralipomena Sophoclea. Supplementary Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Sophocles. By LEWIS CAMPBELL. London: Rivingtons, 1907. Cr. 8vo, pp. xv + 287. 6s.

THIS book represents the matured opinion of a Sophoclean editor on disputed points in the text and interpretation of Sophocles, especially those where he has expressed opinions in his earlier commentaries from which Sir Richard Jebb differed. Professor Campbell now takes the opportunity of stating whether or not he has been converted to Jebb's views. Often he confesses to conversion, but his attitude is somewhat that of Alcmena to Zeus:—

Ζεὺς ἐξ ἐμοῦ μὲν οὐκ ἀκούσεται κακῶς,
εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ὁσιος αὐτὸς οἶδεν εἰς ἐμέ.

With his great admiration for Sir R. Jebb as an interpreter of Sophocles, he seems to feel that views of his own have been dismissed too summarily as 'harsh,' 'untenable,' or 'impossible.' In several instances he has vindicated his position by giving satisfactory reasons, as, e.g., on *O.T.* 902, where he proves the intransitive use of

ἀρμόττω in the parallel passage quoted from *Plat. Soph.*, and on *Phil.* 1207, where he quotes from the *Ajax* a similar instance of 'prothysteron.' But there are instances in which he has dismissed Jebb's views with equal curtness: e.g. on *Ant.* 637, where he makes no reply to Jebb's objections to the reading ἀξίως ἔσται, but merely says: 'there is no sufficient reason for reading ἀξιόσεται (fut. pass.),' or again on 1102 when, dismissing Jebb's δοκεῖ as tautological, he restates the view of δοκεῖς which Jebb had condemned. He has further taken the opportunity of adding fresh illustrations for certain passages, many of which are helpful, though at times the parallelism is not very close: it is difficult to see why *Herac.* 863 is quoted as a parallel for *Ant.* 325: on *Ant.* 1238 the quotation from *Agam.* 1389 is at least as good evidence for ῥοήν as for πνοήν: in *Ajax* 917 καί (=even) can hardly be paralleled by the use of καὶ μὴν, and the use of ἐξ ἐμοῦ in *O.T.* 997 is not very close to the frequent use of ἐκ with verbs of destruction. Among further criticisms it might be questioned whether there is a difference between the use of ἄν ἦκοι in *Ajax* 186 and ἄν ἐξήκοι in *O.T.* 1182, or whether χρόνον is the necessary word to supply in *El.* 1075, if we retain the reading, instead of supplying, with Wilamowitz, στόνον, the noun which is most easily supplied from the verb. But though there are many suggestions open to criticism, the book is worth attention as showing the independent judgment of a scholar with a strong love of Sophocles and a strong feeling for Sophoclean style: where he has let us into his confidence as to the reasons for adopting certain views, as on *Ajax* 405 and *O.T.* 1526, he is interesting. A few misprints may be noted: p. 11 ἄρ' for ἄρ': p. 16 πατράς for πατρός: p. 17 χῶρις: p. 27 οὐ for σύ: p. 27 ἄνθρω: p. 27: *It is* for *Is it*: p. 31 Θνητῶν for θνητῶν: p. 33 ἦν for ἦν: p. 39 παρῶν: p. 42 πλευράς: p. 58 ἡμαρ: p. 196, 45 is a wrong reference: p. 266 κακως (unaccented): p. 267 τῶν: p. 268 πλέονας. On p. 157 it would be better to supply Ἡρακλέα than Ἡρακλῆ (see Jebb, *ad Trach.* 233), and there is rather loose English on p. 284: 'εἰ is easily changed to ἐν, as Jebb does.'

A. S. OWEN.