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 Essays on the *Old and New Testaments*
Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments. By T. K. Abbott, B.D., Litt. D., Fellow and Tutor, Trin. Coll., Dublin; Professor of Hebrew in the University of Dublin. Longmans, 1891 : pp. 227. 10s. 6d.**

A. Plummer

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 07 / July 1892, pp 313 - 314

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018624X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018624X

How to cite this article:

A. Plummer (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 313-314 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018624X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BYWATER'S ARISTOTLE'S NICOMACHEAN ETHICS.

Contributions to the Textual Criticism of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, by INGRAM BYWATER. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1892. 2s. 6d.

In this pamphlet of seventy pages Mr. Bywater explains and defends the many small changes introduced into the text of the *Nicomachean Ethics* in his recent edition. 'I found it impossible,' he writes, 'within the limits of the book itself, to give an account of the reasons, some of principle and some of detail, which led me to diverge in a great many passages from the text of other editions, the most recent one (that of Susemihl) not excepted.' This is therefore a small supplementary work consisting chiefly of critical notes on the passages in question. He has prefixed some remarks (1) on the commentary of Aspasius as we have it in Heylbut's recent edition, with reference to the light it affords us for the settlement of the text, and (2) on the chief MSS. of the *Ethics*. Giving of course much the highest place to K^b he still argues for the 'great value and importance' of L^b and warns us against allowing our belief in K^b to 'degenerate into a superstition, as it so

easily may do.' He also attaches great value to Γ, the old Latin translation, which 'is practically almost as good as a Greek MS. to us.' O^b and M^b he is inclined to disregard and to trust to the three sources just named. He goes on to add a useful and interesting list of the commoner errors in K^b with many illustrations, which will be of value to textual critics in general and not to students of the *Ethics* only. Then follows the bulk of the small book, consisting of critical notes in defence of the readings adopted, often for the first time, in his text. They are often convincing and always worthy of careful consideration. The changes proposed are not so considerable as they are numerous, and, though numerous, they certainly cannot be taxed with being arbitrary and wanton. Some of the more noteworthy have been pointed out already in this *Review* (April, 1891) and it is unnecessary to recur to them now. For serious students the *Contributions* are an indispensable accompaniment to the text. Will the Delegates of the Clarendon Press now persuade Mr. Bywater to give us a companion text of the *Republic*?

H. R.

ABBOTT'S ESSAYS ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments. By T. K. ABBOTT, B.D., Litt. D., Fellow and Tutor, Trin. Coll., Dublin; Professor of Hebrew in the University of Dublin. Longmans, 1891: pp. 227. 10s. 6d.

THIS valuable collection consists of seven dissertations. 1. The Massoretic Text of the O.T. 2. The Hebrew Text before the Massorettes. 3. N.T. Lexicography. 4. Has *ποιεῖν* in the N.T. a sacrificial meaning? 5. To what extent was Greek the language of Galilee in the time of Christ? 6. On historical evidence and the miracle of the Holy Thorn. 7. Critical notes on passages in the text of the O.T.

Excepting the greater portion of the fifth essay, all these papers have been published before. The first three are known to readers of the *Church Quarterly Review*, but

the third has been augmented from notes published in the *Classical Review* and *Hermathena*. The fourth, which is one of the most useful, appears now for the first time in England: it was published originally in America in the *Journal of Biblical Exegesis*. The sixth is sixteen years old, but is not much the worse on that account; for probably no fresh light has been thrown upon the subject in the interval. It appeared in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* in 1876. The seventh, which is twofold, appeared originally in the *Hermathena*.

The conclusions reached in the first two essays are that the Massorettes made an honest attempt to form a correct text, and did their work with sagacity; but were not aware how corrupt the one text which they possessed really was, owing to the blunders of earlier and less careful copyists; and moreover they lacked the materials for

forming a purer text, and therefore could not have eliminated the errors, even if they had been aware of them. The third essay bestows well-deserved praise of a high kind upon Thayer's edition of Grimm's *Lexicon of N.T. Greek*. 'The book is simply indispensable to the student of the N.T.' It also criticises very justly Dr. Hatch's disappointing fragment on *Biblical Greek*. The result is neatly summed up thus. 'Where Dr. Hatch tries to apply to the N.T. a signification peculiar to the LXX., or ascertained according to the maxims he lays down, he is in no one instance successful. Where he illustrates the N.T. from other writers he is often useful and interesting,' although his citations exhibit a 'want of novelty' (p. 98). In this respect he is contrasted with Dr. Field in his delightful and most instructive *Otium Norvicense* III.

The fourth essay, which will be new to most English readers, is one more nail in the coffin of the craze, which to some minds seems to be so wonderfully attractive, that *ποιεῖν* in the eucharistic formulae in the N.T. has a sacrificial meaning. We have lately had a reviewer in the *Guardian* asserting as a well-ascertained fact that in the LXX. *ποιεῖν* has a sacrificial meaning 69 times (April 28, 1892). People who make this statement rarely commit themselves to so definite a number: they content themselves with an 'often' or a 'frequently.' The statement is not correct; and perhaps there is not a single passage in which *ποιεῖν per se*, i.e. apart from the context, has this meaning. But, even if it were correct, it would not make a very strong case; for there are between 2000 and 3000 passages in which *ποιεῖν* certainly cannot have a sacrificial meaning. In any list of 69 or less, all the texts in which *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα* occurs would probably be included; and *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα* does not mean 'to offer the paschal lamb' but 'to keep the passover,' as is shown by *ποιεῖν ἑορτήν*, a regular phrase for 'keeping a feast' both in classical and Biblical Greek (Exod. xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22; etc.). Comp. *ποιεῖν σάββατον*. Christ certainly did not

sacrifice the paschal lamb in the upper chamber; yet He is said *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα* there (Mt. xxvi. 18). But the crucial test is afforded by the manner in which Hebrew words which *do* mean 'offer' are rendered in the LXX. Is *ποιεῖν* used to translate them? One of them occurs about 80 times, and is never once rendered *ποιεῖν*. Another occurs about as often, and is once translated *ποιεῖν καρπώσεις* (not *κάρπωμα*), i.e. 'make offerings' (Job xlii. 8). The usual translation of these sacrificial words is *προσφέρειν*, *ἀναφέρειν*, and the like.¹ Professor Abbott limits his investigation to the philological side of the enquiry; but it might be worth while adding that the Greek Fathers, who may be supposed to have known their own language and to have been well acquainted with the LXX., uniformly treat *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* as meaning 'perform this action,' even while holding that the eucharist is a sacrifice. Justin Martyr is possibly, but not probably, an exception.

In the fifth and longest of the papers much light is thrown upon the bilingual character of Galilee in the time of Christ from the bilingual character of Ireland at the present day. The author argues strongly in favour of the prevalence of Greek in the one case, as of English in the other, and has some excellent answers to the arguments of Neubauer and others on the other side. Among other telling remarks he points out that the by-standers at the crucifixion, who were presumably Jews of Jerusalem, did not understand the cry *Eli, Eli*, but thought that Jesus was calling for Elias: i.e. they did not understand Aramaic, but did understand Greek. The remaining papers are somewhat more slight and fragmentary; but the collection as a whole forms a really valuable book.

A. PLUMMER.

¹ The ancient liturgies exhibit similar facts, for they do not use *ποιεῖν* or *facere* where bread and wine are offered, but *προσφέρειν* or *offerre*, although *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* is there to suggest the other rendering. See the Third Series of the *Expositor*, vol. vii. pp. 447, 1888.