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](#)

St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: with a critical and grammatical Commentary, by Charles J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Longmans. 1887. Pp. xxiv. 344. 16s.

A. Plummer

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 04 / April 1888, pp 115 - 116
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192443, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192443

How to cite this article:

A. Plummer (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 115-116 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192443

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the word, I would suggest *πικνύς*. Such a word comes naturally after *πολλὰς* and it is applied to trees in Xenophon's *Anab.* iv 8 § 2, and elsewhere.

Or. 16, *pro Mantitheo*, § 7. ἐμὲ τοίνυν οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀποδείξειεν οὐτ' ἀπενεχθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν φυλάρχων οὕτε παραδοθέντα τοῖς συνδικοῖς οὕτε κατὰστασιν παραλαβόντα. Weidner prints the last word *καταβαλόντα*, ascribing the alteration to Bake; but it might have been stated that that critic himself withdrew his suggestion in favour of *λαβόντα* (*scholicia hypomnemata*, v 163). In § 15, we have the well-known description of Thrasybulus, τοῦ σεμνοῦ Στειρίως τοῦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις δειλίαν ὠνειδικότος. The MS has τοῖς πασιν, whereupon Weidner prints τοῦ τὸ τ ε...ὠνειδικότος, but surely, after τότε, we should in this passage naturally expect, not the perfect, but the aorist. The text is therefore better left as it stands.

Or. 19, *de Aristophanis bonis*. In § 23 we have a good emendation: μηδενὸς ἀπορήσειν ἐκεῖ, προσρηγμένον for μηδενὸς ἀπορήσειν ἐκ Κύπρου, ῥηγμένον. In § 62, the MS has: οὐ μόνον ἵππους ἐκτίσαστο λαμπροὺς ἀλλὰ <καὶ Cobet> ἀθλητὰς ἐνίκησεν Ἰσθμιοὶ καὶ Νεμέα. Reiske (followed by Scheibe) inserts οἷς after ἀθλητὰς, while Taylor and Bake (followed by Westermann, Rauchenstein and Froberger) simply alter ἀθλητὰς into ἀθληταῖς. Weidner needlessly changes this into ἀθλοφόροις, which occurs in the *Iliad* (ix 124) as an epithet of a racehorse, but is apparently never found in prose. On the other hand, ἵππος...ἀθλητής is supported by Plato, *Parmenides* 137 A, which is sufficient to defend the text as hitherto printed, and to prove (in addition to general considerations) that the word must not be rendered 'athlete,' but 'race-horse.'

In *Or.* 23, *contra Panceleonem*, § 3, the MS has τοὺς Ἑρμασινᾶ οἱ Δεκελεῖς προσφοιτῶσιν. Weidner accordingly prefers τοὺς Ἑρμῆας οἱ to the usual text, ἵνα οἱ. My examination of the critical notes to four other speeches (*Or.* 22, 24, 30, 32) does not suggest any special remarks.

The book closes with an extract from Xenophon's *Hellenica*, ii chaps. 2-4, giving his account of the tyranny of the Thirty and the restoration of the Democracy, which may be conveniently read together with the speech of Lysias against Eratosthenes. Here again we have several interesting emendations. Thus in II 4 § 36, where the MSS have ἀμφοτέροις τῆς [μετὰ] Πεισάνδρου γνώμης ὄντες μάλλον ἢ [τῆς] μετὰ Αυσάνδρου, Weidner improves the text by discarding the words placed in brackets.

J. E. SANDYS.

Index Thucydideus. *Ex Bekkeri Editione stereotypa confectus* a M. H. N. von ESSEN Dr^c Hamburgensi Berolini apud Weidmannos, 1887. (12 Mk.)

THIS index will be of essential service to the student of Thucydides. It is not a lexicon, giving explanations or context, but an index pure and simple, and as an index it seems perfect. I have tested it carefully in several places, and not found the slightest error or omission.

As an example of its completeness, the several cases of δ take up thirty-one large octavo pages with double columns; τ takes seven columns.

Changes of accent or breathing are not passed over; thus ἀπό, ἀπὸ, ἀπ', ἀφ', are arranged under separate headings, and the same principle is followed throughout. The whole number of pages is 457. The gratitude of all classical men is due to Dr. von Essen for his work of labour and love.

C. E. G.

Aristotelis quae feruntur Oeconomica. Recensuit FRANCISCUS SUSEMİHL. (Teubner.) 1 Mk. 50.

THIS volume is a companion to Susemihl's *Nicomachean Ethics*, his *Politics*, and various other Teubner texts of Aristotle, the character of which is well enough known to need no description here. In his introduction Susemihl gives his assent to the view that no part of the *Oeconomica* is the genuine work of Aristotle himself. He holds the first book on the one hand to be mainly made up out of the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon and the *Politics* of Aristotle, and on the other to take up some position inconsistent with those of Aristotle himself in the *Politics*. With some hesitation and apparent leaning towards Eudemos as the author, he is yet not prepared to reject the statement (which is at least as old as the time of Philodemus) that this first book should be ascribed to Theophrastus. As to the list of notable devices for raising money, which constituted the second book, there is of course no question now as to its non-Aristotelian origin. Susemihl has collected in a long note what he thinks the reason for regarding it as 'labentis graecitatis memorabile documentum'. A third book existed for us only in two Latin translations, which are here placed face to face. The Greek text of the two first books is printed with Susemihl's usual care and judgment and supplemented as usual with a full statement of various readings and conjectures. Good separate indices for the two books are added. In an appendix the editor has collected for the benefit of Aristotelian scholars a supplementary list of conjectures on all the Aristotelian treatises as yet published in the Teubner series. They are especially copious on the *De Anima*, the *Metaphysics* and the *Rhetoric*.

H. R.

St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: *with a critical and grammatical Commentary*, by CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Longmans. 1887. Pp. xxiv. 344. 16s.

MOST English students of the Greek Testament have worked with one or more of Bishop Ellicott's earlier *Commentaries* on Epistles of S. Paul. The present *Commentary*, which follows the latest of its predecessors after an interval of a good many years, is very similar to the others in form, the only change of much moment being the omission of a continuous translation. 'The reason why it has been omitted is the very simple one that a far better translation than any one that I could produce is now in the hands of the Christian reader . . . the revised version of the N. T. . . . Of the version itself, to which I thus gladly give place, I do not, from the nature of my connexion with it, feel it either necessary or desirable to say more than this:—First, that I have gone over it in this Epistle in the closest manner, as a fair and unbiassed critic, and as one who has allowed no predilections or reminiscences of the past in any degree to influence his present judgment. Secondly, that the sum and substance of this review of it has led me conscientiously to regard it as the most accurate version of this Epistle that has ever yet appeared in any language.'

The Greek text is the result of independent consideration of the material supplied by Tischendorf and Tregelles, and approximates closely to that of Westcott and Hort, from whose decisions Dr. Ellicott only occasionally dissents (*e.g.* i. 1, 14; ii. 1; v. 2, 5; vii. 9, 15, 17), and in some of these cases with much hesitation. The labours of Westcott and Hort 'must be admitted by every fair-judging scholar to have at length placed N. T. criticism on a rational

basis, and to have demonstrated to us with singular force and cogency the true critical value of the numerous witnesses.'

The *Commentary* is rightly described on the title-page as 'grammatical.' The details of S. Paul's constructions are worked out with great care, and sometimes with great minuteness; and in such matters (as readers of his earlier *Commentaries* are aware) Bishop Ellicott can put a very fine point on a question of grammar. The present work will in this particular be of great service to the student who wishes to advance in Greek scholarship *pari passu* with knowledge of the N. T.

Another marked feature of the volume is the care bestowed upon the ancient Versions and the Greek expositors of the Epistle, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Eusebius, and others. 'They really form the backbone of this *Commentary*.'

With a conciseness, which almost rivals that of Professor T. S. Evans, the Bishop dismisses in less than ten pages the subjects usually treated of in the Introduction. In spite of recent assaults made by one or two critics of the extreme Dutch school, he does not condescend to discuss the genuineness of the Epistle. He merely gives nine or ten references to the passages in which the earliest mention of it occurs, and leaves them and the Epistle itself to settle the question. Nor can this method be much blamed. The critic who questions the genuineness of 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians, succeeds in proving nothing so clearly as his own want of critical insight.

It remains to give some specimens of the details of the *Commentary*. In the following instances the results arrived at will meet with the approval of many who have studied the questions for themselves. 1. The number of the factions is determined as four. The parties of Paul, Apollos, and Peter called out a fourth party, which in disavowing all human leaders became probably the most intolerant of all, while it assumed as a party cry the sacred name of Christ (pp. xix. 17). 2. There is reference (v. 9) to a lost Epistle prior to the two which have come down to us (pp. xix. 90). 3. 'Use it rather' (vii. 21) refers to the slavery rather than the emancipation (p. 125). 4. The 'spiritual rock accompanying them' (x. 4) is a figure suggested by the knowledge that the not yet incarnate Word was present with the Church in the wilderness, and not by the 'grotesque Rabbinical tradition' that a mysterious fountain followed the Israelites during their wanderings (p. 176). 5. 'Because of the angels' (xi. 10) is taken literally. There must be decency at public worship out of respect to the unseen beings who are then present (pp. xxiii. 205). 6. Two distinct forms of the gift of tongues are recognized: the power of speaking in languages known to the hearers, but unknown to the speakers (Acts ii. 4; Mark xvi. 17), and ecstatic utterances of prayer and praise in sounds not generally intelligible (1 Cor. xiv.). 7. The common interpretation of being 'baptized for the dead' (xv. 29)—that it refers to baptism of living proxies for those who had died unbaptized—is maintained (p. 309), but with diffidence. An explanation that can command general assent has yet to be found.

One note deserves to be quoted almost in full, viz. that on *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* (xi. 24). 'Do this (present; i.e., continually thus take bread, give thanks, and break it) *in remembrance of me*; the possessive pronoun being here taken objectively, 'in memoriam mei,' but without any implied emphasis (Edwards): comp. xv. 31, Rom. xi. 31, xv. 14, and Winer *Gr.* § 22.7. If any special emphasis had been designed, the personal pronoun would obviously have

been repeated in its full form, and placed at the end of the clause. . . . To render the words 'sacrifice this,' in accordance with a Hebraistic use of *ποιεῖν* in this sense in the LXX. (Exod. xxix. 39, Lev. ix. 7, *al*; see Schleusn. *Lex. Vct. Test.* s.v.) is to violate the regular usage of *ποιεῖν* in the N. T., and to import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them' (p. 216). In short, to quote this text in support of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is only in degree less unwise than to quote the passage about the Three Heavenly Witnesses in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. Supposing that S. Paul and S. Luke did *not* mean to suggest any sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than *ποιεῖν*?

The *Commentary* will be very helpful to many students of the N. T.

A. PLUMMER.

La Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini. Par PIERRE DE NOLHAC. Pp. xvii + 483. Paris. 1887.

THE library formed by Fulvio Orsini (a name unnoted by Hallam) ranks as the finest collection of the sixteenth century. A member of the illustrious Roman family whose name he bore, his desertion by his father at an early age would probably have effectually precluded the lad's attention to letters, had he not happened to attract the notice of Delfini, a learned and excellent canon of Rome. Delfini's good offices introduced him in turn to the brother cardinals, the two Farnese. Eventually, Orsini became a member of the household of Alessandro Farnese, and under his guidance the costly collections of books and antiquities which adorned the cardinal's country seat at Caprarola and the Palazzo Farnese in Rome were to a great extent formed. Under the roof of his august patron, Orsini became acquainted with many of the foremost leaders in art and in learning, and notably with Michel Angelo and with Cardinal Granvelle. It was the latter eminent patron of learning who defrayed the expense of printing, at Plantin's press at Antwerp, Orsini's first publication—his *Virgilius illustratus*, a work devoted to the illustration of Virgil by passages gleaned from other writers of classical antiquity. Although Orsini was himself a dignitary of the Church and a representative of that more sober spirit which characterised learning in Rome subsequently to the Tridentine era, it is singular to note that not a single patristic writer appears in the long array of his splendid collection. Whenever it so chanced that a copy of a Greek or Latin Father came into his possession, he hastened to present it to one of his friends. The most valuable portion of the library which he brought together by his life-long labours was that represented by the collections which had formerly belonged to Cardinal Bembo, who died in 1547. And the entire collection, which before Orsini's death in 1600 was held to be superior even to that enshrined in the Vatican, when added to the latter by his bequest, formed in turn the most valuable part of the Vatican Library itself, and may be looked upon as inaugurating those successive important accessions in the seventeenth century which went so far towards making the Vatican Library what it now is. In this most interesting volume, M. de Nolhac, after a series of chapters devoted to an account of the life of Orsini and of the process by which he accumulated his treasures, gives us the original catalogues of both the Greek and the Latin manuscripts and books, a real boon to the scholar now that the volumes themselves are rendered comparatively accessible by the removal of the former restrictions. J. BASS MULLINGER.