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](#)

Westcott's Epistle to the Hebrews *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The Greek Text, with Notes and Essays. By Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., D.C.L. London: Macmillan and Co., and New York. 1889.

J. H. Thayer

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 18 - 22

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993065, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993065

How to cite this article:

J. H. Thayer (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 18-22 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993065

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES UPON LATIN HYBRIDS.

IN 'Ein Beitrag zum Vulgärlatein' (*Philol.* xlvii. p. 45) O. Weise has called attention to the fact that hybrid compounds and derivatives played an important part in the *sermo vulgaris*.

The list which he offers, from all periods of literature, of hybrid words taken from those writings in which so much has already been found that belongs to the language of conversation, can leave little doubt as to the correctness of his position.

The most prolific author in this line is naturally Plautus and the series which Weise gives including such words as *ferritribax*, *pultiphagus* and *hamiota* is representative and exhaustive enough for its purpose, but when he states that only two such formations are to be found in Cicero, viz. *facteon* (*ad Att.* i. 16, 13) formed after the analogy of *φιλοσοφνέον*, which occurs in the same sentence, and *Pseudocato* (*ad Att.* i. 14, 6), he has failed to notice *decemscalmis* (*ad Att.* xvi. 3, 6) made up of *decem* and *σκαλμός*, and *tocullio* (*ad Att.* ii. 1, 12) which the writer believes can be shown to be a hybrid formed from *τόκος* in the same way in which *libellio* (*Varr. Sat. Men.* 256: *Stat. Silv.* 4, 9, 21) is derived from *libellus*. (Comp. also *tripecchio* *C.I.L.* vi. 17857.)

The word *tocullio* is doubly interesting in this connection, in that it seems to have two points of contact with the *sermo cotidianus*, being at the same time a hybrid and a diminutive, for as Wölfflin and Lorenz among others have pointed out, the use of diminutives was one of the most striking characteristics of vulgar Latin.

And in connection with all these words it is worthy of notice not simply that they are found in the letters of Cicero rather than in

his orations or philosophical works, but that they occur in his letters to Atticus, in which Cicero allows himself the greatest freedom of expression; while in the letters *ad Familiares*, in which it is almost always possible to notice a certain care or even anxiety in the choice of words, no such hybrid is to be found so far as the writer is aware.

As additions to the list of hybrids from later writers, which Weise gives upon pages 49-52, the following may be mentioned; *meliofolia* (*Plin.* 15, 14; 15, 52) made up of *μήλον* and *folium*, *monoculus* (*Firm. Mat.* 8, 19; 8, 22) from *μόνος* and *oculus*, with which may be compared *monoloris* (*Vop. Aur.* 46, 6), *diloris* and *penteloris* from the same author.

The following compounds of *quattuor* and *septem* with the Greek substantives γάμος, σῆμα, σῶμα and δρόμος may be added: *quadrigamus* (*Hier. adv. Jovin.* 1, 8), *quadrisemus* (*Mart. Cap.* 9, 981), *quadrisomus* (*Inscr. Rein.* col. 2, 437) and *septidromus* (*Th. Prisc.* 4, 3). There are further found the Graeco-Latin compounds *semipodius* (*Mar. Victorin. de Metr.* 4, 3, 41, p. 166, 28 K), *semisphaerium* (*Boet. Inst. Mus.* 4, 18), and the Latino-Hebraic *semicorus*¹ (*Ambros. ep.* 44, 7 and 8) and *semigomor*¹ (*Ambros. ep.* 9, 76), and finally *protosedere* (*Tert. de Cor. Mil.* 15) and *paraveredus* (*Cod. Just.* 12, 51, 2 and elsewhere) made up of *παπα* and *veredus*, upon which Diez i. p. 232 under *palafreno* may be compared.

FRANK F. ABBOTT.

¹ The Hebraic elements in *semicorus* and *semigomor* doubtless came through the medium of the Septuagint in which both occur.

WESTCOTT'S EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The Epistle to the Hebrews. The Greek Text, with Notes and Essays. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L. London: Macmillan and Co., and New York. 1889.

THE appearance of this volume is significant in its bearing upon Biblical exposition. At a time when the demand for commentaries giving in the briefest form the accepted re-

sults of exegesis, in order to exempt the reader from any effort beyond that of remembering what is told him, is enforcing compliance even from leading German scholars, we are presented with a work containing discussions of an exceptionally wide, varied, and at times recondite character, and presuming on the reader's part a willingness to give it patient and studious attention. Almost every topic of moment which the

exposition starts finds ample treatment by means of 'Additional Notes' appended to each chapter. These 'Notes,' which are forty-two in number, and frequently amount to compendious treatises, discuss not merely the more difficult exegetical problems, the adequate treatment of which would have disturbed the proportions of the running exposition, but handle besides matters of theology, both speculative and Biblical (such as the *τελείωσις* of Christ, the idea of *λύτρωσις*, &c.), questions of 'archaeology' (for example, the prae-Christian idea of sacrifice and of the priesthood—discussions, by the by, especially valuable), of history, of anthropology (for instance, the origin of the soul and the destiny of the race), of philology (such as telic and hypothetical sentences); and the volume closes with an essay of twenty-five pages on the Epistle's use of the Old Testament. Both these more extended discussions, and the volume as a whole, are characterized by admirable condensation, and by the prominence given to the *Biblical* data. The reader is everywhere put in possession of a satisfactory, often a complete, statement of the Scriptural facts, as gathered evidently at first hand. Indeed, the volume is singularly abstinent in its references to other modern commentators. By omitting the recent history of opinion the author gains room for the adequate presentation and enforcement of his own interpretation, and the reader is the more free to judge it on its merits. But Dr. Westcott would have rendered a welcome service had he given us the benefit of his wide reading by cataloguing and characterizing the leading modern exponents, as he has done for example (p. vii. *sqq.*) the patristic commentators. As it stands, however, it would be difficult to find in the whole range of exegetical literature a volume at the same time so comprehensive and so compact as this octavo of five hundred pages. No wonder that 'many years of continuous labour' have entered into its preparation.

Notwithstanding the noteworthy expositions of this difficult Epistle which have appeared in our time from such experts as Weiss, Keil, Kurtz and the rest, running back to the monumental work by Bleek, Dr. Westcott's volume possesses characteristics which will command for it the permanent attention of scholars. Conspicuous, for instance, is its careful treatment of words. In lexical research it surpasses Bleek, if possible, and in the comparison of kindred terms it shows a delicacy of discrimination which indeed is not without its perils (of which

more presently), but which makes it very fresh and suggestive. A list of synonyms treated would be a welcome supplement to its index. The words peculiar to the Epistle, and the debated terms, such as *αἰῶνες* (i. 2; xi. 3), *ἀπαύγασμα* (i. 3), *παραρρεῖν* (ii. 1), *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* (ii. 16), *τελειοῦν* (ii. 10), *θυμιατήριον* (ix. 4), *εὐπερίστατος* (xii. 1), *διαθήκη* (ix. 15), *τραχηλίζειν* (iv. 13), and the rest receive careful and in the main satisfactory treatment. Yet in the case of *τραχηλίζειν* it does not appear how the notion of 'prostrate,' to which Dr. Westcott seems to incline, is made to evolve that of 'manifest,' which in the case occurring (iv. 13) he admits to be clearly its sense. And as respects *διαθήκη* (ix. 16, 17), after acknowledging the full weight of the philological facts adduced, one cannot feel satisfied with Dr. Westcott's conclusion. The contextual evidence overbears lexical probabilities made to rest merely on Biblical usage. Those probabilities, surely, are nothing like so strong as they are, for example, in the case of the 'key-word' *πνεῦμα* in John iii. 8. And why should Biblical usage be the decisive criterion in the case of a writer whose phraseology, however largely influenced by the Septuagint, is also exceptionally non-Biblical? Moreover, with the meaning *covenant*, the reasoning becomes intelligible only on the assumption of an identification of the maker of the covenant and its ratifying victim, which, recondite and even debatable as it is, could hardly be tacitly taken for granted and used, without a hint of explanation, as the warrant for such bold and bald statements as *ὅπου διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μὴ τότε ἰσχύει ὅτε ἤν' ὁ διαθέμενος*. In truth, however, the two senses lie much nearer together in Greek than 'covenant' and 'will' do in English, which indeed Dr. Westcott frankly admits in citing the well-known passage from Philo where the word is used of God in both senses in the same context. To the primitive readers perhaps the cross-play hardly seemed more difficult than, for instance, in the case of *παιδεία* in xii. 6, 7, 11.

Nor is this commentary less attentive to grammatical niceties than to lexical. The reader is reminded constantly of the delicate shadings of thought due to changes of tense, mood, number, and the like. Not that here, again, Dr. Westcott's discriminations always command assent. For example, that there is a rhetorical difference between *ἀμαρτία* in the singular and in the plural—the singular having often an abstract or a collective force, while the plural is individualizing or semi-

concrete—no one would be disposed to deny. But that by *θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* in x. 26 the author of the Epistle intends a contrast to *προσφορά περὶ ἁμαρτίας* in verse 18, and ‘appeals to individual experience,’ many of Dr. Westcott’s readers will feel less confident than he seems to be. Again, *ἐγένετο βέβαιος* (ii. 2) is held to differ from *ἐβεβαιώθη* (ver. 3), not merely in rhetorical explicitness, but by suggesting the idea that ‘there is in the divine law a self-executing power.’ In ix. 23 *τὰ ἐπουράνια* differs from *τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* in the same context by designating ‘not simply those things which are in the heavens, but those things which have their proper sphere in the heavenly order.’ In ii. 9 the perfect *ἡλαττωμένον* (not *ἡλαττωθέντα*) is thought to warrant the comment, ‘The human nature which Christ assumed he still retains.’ But in general, as respects the use of the perfect in this Epistle, it may be doubted whether our commentaries, Dr. Westcott’s included, have yet quite hit the mark. The latter says, to be sure, in connection with the partial catalogue of instances given on p. 177, that ‘In every case its full force can be felt’; and apparently in vii. 6; xi. 5, &c., he accepts the view of those who regard the tense as marking the fact of record: ‘It stands written in Scripture as having a present force.’ But this explanation is inadequate in examples like those of ch. xi. vers. 17 and 28; for all the intermediate historic instances, though cited in the *aorist*, are as truly matters of record as these. Furthermore, why should the Epistle exhibit so many peculiar instances of the perfect that need explanation? One can hardly repress the conviction that we have here, if not a rhetorical mannerism of the writer, a blurring of the distinction between the two tenses, especially since the phenomenon in question is not confined to this author (see the examples given by Sophocles in his *Lex.*, Introd. p. 45 par. 4). Another idiosyncrasy, also shared with the Biblical author by some of his contemporaries, is the use of *πov* in reference to quotations the source of which must have been definitely in mind. This *πov* Dr. Westcott (on iv. 4) felicitously translates ‘as we know,’ and illustrates from Philo and other writers.

Another distinctive characteristic of the book before us consists in its copious quotations illustrating the Epistle’s interpretation and use by the Fathers. Nowhere else can such a treasure of patristic lore relative to this Epistle be found, or so ample and exact a comparison of the early versions. The care and research with which this part

of his task has been performed by Dr. Westcott appears in incidental rectifications of current texts, and at times in fresh readings from unpublished manuscripts. Among the patristic elucidators of the Epistle is one (Herveius Burgidolensis, of the 12th cent.), whom Dr. Westcott has summoned, as it were, from the dead, and who by his good sense justifies Dr. Westcott’s estimate of his discovery. Dr. Westcott pays, of course, no blind homage to the Fathers. Once and again he calls on the reader to observe how wide of the mark their comments fall, and reminds him (*e.g.* p. 7) how completely sometimes the exact force of the original is missed—even by men among them whose vernacular was Greek—through oversight of some of the simplest grammatical laws, or shows (as, for example, in the case of *ἐπιλαμβάνεται* ii. 16) how the true meaning has been hid quite down to modern times.

Noteworthy, further, is the prominence given in this commentary to the doctrinal element. The vast store of material it contains for the student of Biblical theology has already been indicated. Its presentation gives evidence of the well-read and cautious theologian; on occasion, too (for an example see on ii. 16 *fin.*), there are signs of a discreet reserve which, though among the rarest, is not the least of the theological virtues. But on the general subject more in a moment. Here we are concerned merely with the doctrinal problems imbedded in the text of the Epistle. In ch. i. 8, 9 it is refreshing to find—as however one might have anticipated from the punctuation of the text of Westcott and Hort’s Greek Testament—that the word *θεός* is taken as a nominative, with a recognition of the fact that ‘the direct application of the divine name to the Son would obscure the thought.’ But why in iii. 4 it is unsatisfactory to understand *ὁ πάντα κατασκευάσας θεός* as guarding the sovereign authorship of God, is not made to appear. The treatment of the immemorial problem vi. 4–6 lacks sharpness and explicitness, and consequently, in spite of its fulness, and an ‘Additional Note,’ leaves the reader unsatisfied. Have the persons described by the sacred author actually experienced the new birth? On this point Dr. Westcott’s opening remarks on verse 5 seem to make his own opinion clear. How then can he say (p. 149) that ‘light falls upon the passage from Matt. vii. 22 f.; 1 Cor. xiii. 1 f.?’ But did they actually apostatize? That is confessedly ‘presented in its past completeness’ by the *καὶ παραπεσόντας* of vers. 6. Nevertheless on p. 149 they are described as ‘those who are

conceived of as afterwards falling away,' and on p. 165 we are unequivocally told 'There is nothing to show that the conditions of fatal apostasy had been fulfilled . . . indeed, the contrary is assumed.' Wherein then lies the 'impossibility' mentioned in ver. 4? In 'human agency. This is all that comes within the range of the writer's argument' (p. 150). 'It is impossible for man to renew' them; 'the preacher cannot again renew to repentance' (p. 147). But does '*man*,' does '*the preacher*' work renewal in the first instance? Again, 'Some divine work may be equivalent to this renewing, though not identical with it. The change in such a case would not be a new birth but a raising from the dead' (p. 150, cf. 165). But in the spiritual realm how, except in metaphor, does a 'new birth' differ from a 'raising from the dead'? (Cf. Eph. v. 14; Luke xv. 24.)

Many individual passages, of course, invite comment. Probably in some cases surprise will be felt that an interpretation is given as though no alternate were possible, where the best expositors are not yet in agreement. But Dr. Westcott evidently expects his readers to remember that the disregard of other opinions in such instances merely indicates that he himself feels no real doubt (see the Preface, p. vii.). Chap. x. 34 is an instance in point. Here the translation which takes *ἐαυτοῦς* as the subject-accusative is utterly ignored, although it received the preference of the Revisers of 1881, is the construction adopted by recent expositors that follow the reading, and accords both with this author's rhythmical transfer of words and with the slight emphasis the pronoun offers to the 'goods' and their unlawful possessors. And, by the way, as respects this Epistle's peculiar fondness for the rhythmical transposition of words, Dr. Westcott sometimes allows it (e.g. in the case of *κρινῇ θεῶ πάντων*, xii. 23) to draw him (with many other expositors) into subtleties, although in the case of *ἐλεῆμων κ.τ.λ.* (ii. 18) his good sense recognises it.

But further specification must give place to two reflections of a general character. We have here unquestionably the masterpiece of a certain type of exposition. It starts the inquiry whether it has escaped the peril of disproportionate attention to philological details. Just as the overstrained eye often seems to itself to see what it is looking for, so overtaxed verbal scrutiny is liable to detect distinctions of thought which can hardly be believed to have dawned upon the consciousness of the writer. Dr. Westcott's readers will in many an instance be unable

to repress a misgiving whether the conclusions he reaches, even in expounding this Epistle, confessedly the most elaborate piece of Greek composition in the New Testament, are not a little too subtle and over-refined; whether his scholarship is not occasionally so tenuous and microscopic that the resultant exposition is over-pressed—in forgetfulness of the caution which Luther couched in his simile likening Scripture to a *mutter-brust*. This criticism is uttered with reluctance; for the failing, if it exists, certainly leans to virtue's side. And a stricture of this sort may be thought to involve both obliviousness of the inestimable service Bishop Westcott has rendered now for more than a generation by his public inculcation of thorough methods of Biblical study, as well as a scanty appreciation of the several commentaries in which he has exemplified conscientious exposition as no other living English scholar has done—among which commentaries this last is indisputably the first. But renewed examination of it only renews the misgiving here expressed. This tendency to over-work words seems to be responsible for occasional subtlety or obscurity of thought, which leaves a reader somewhat uncertain just what is meant, as well as here and there for an inclusiveness of exposition which comes perilously near combining things incompatible. For example, in iv. 1 we are told that the insertion of *δοκῇ* both softens the expression, and at the same time makes it 'more comprehensive in warning'; again, *ὑπὲρ παντός*, ii. 9, can 'hardly mean "for every thing" (*neut.*). This thought, however, is included in the masculine'; once more, of the *νέφος μαρτύρων*, xii. 1, it is stated, 'The testimony which they bear can only be the testimony which they bear to God. . . . There is apparently no evidence that *μάρτυς* is ever used simply in the sense of a "spectator." . . . At the same time it is impossible to exclude the thought of the spectators in the amphitheatre. . . . They are spectators . . . who bear testimony to the certainty of our success,' &c.

The second query, though more general, is even more fundamental. Is not a considerable part of the contents of this teeming volume out of place in a commentary? Undeniably the prime business of an interpreter is to reproduce his author's thought: to give us nothing more, nothing less, nothing other than what lay in the mind of the writer. Hence he has primarily no concern with the aims and interests of the preacher or the theologian. Exposition is one thing, application quite a different thing. The meaning

and purpose of the writer are not to be confounded even with the purpose of Providence through him, as the latter may have been disclosed by the educative uses his writings have subserved in the history of the Kingdom of God on earth. It is not easy, may not always be possible, to draw hard and fast lines in this matter. The history of opinion is a convenient if not a legitimate part of a commentary's contents, as has been indirectly acknowledged above. Moreover, the jejuneness and at times timidity that have characterized certain attempts at a more scientific treatment of the sacred text have not tended to command admiration for it, hardly even respect. But after all it holds true that the province of the exegete is distinct from that of the homilete and from that of the speculative theologian; and the distinction cannot be disregarded without detriment. The book before us is avowedly constructed on a different theory. Its opening sentence strikes its key-note: 'Every student of the Epistle to the Hebrews must feel that it deals in a peculiar degree with the thoughts and trials of our own time.' Its author frankly declares that 'he has endeavoured to suggest in the notes lines of thought which he has found to open light upon problems which we are required to face.' Now the objection to this is not that the

remarks are not rich, instructive, judicious; but that they tend to burden and distract a reader intent simply on understanding what the sacred author has said—tend to make that author look through our eyes, rather than to enable us to see through his.

In conclusion a few trivial matters may be noted, worthy of correction in subsequent editions. Page xlv. line 1, for '168' read '169' (Dr. Westcott is not responsible for the error); p. lviii. second paragraph, line 3, for 'xiii. 18' read (probably) 'xiii. 9'; p. xl. paragraph 2, line 7, for '22' read '22, 23'; p. 6, col. 2, line 2, for 'Wünsche' read 'Weber'; p. 8, col. 1, fifth par., last line, for 'vi. 10' read 'vi. 12'; p. 136, col. 1, par. 2, last line, for 'ψυχῆς' read 'καρδίας'; p. 168, lines 3 and 4, for 'Ps. xiv. (xv)' read 'Ps. xxiv. (xxv.)'; p. 353, col. 2, par. 2, line 4, for 'note' read 'Additional Note'; p. 400, line 1, for 'παίδων' read 'παιδέων'; p. 413, line 2, the comma should come *after* πανηγύρει (not before it); frequently we find Œhler, sometimes (p. 225) correctly Oehler; in the case of re-edited works the editor's name is sometimes prefixed to the author's (e.g. Moulton-Winer, pp. 223, 224, 245, 342, 350, &c.), sometimes (*correctly*) appended (e.g. Winer-Moulton, p. 78).

J. H. THAYER.

HUDE'S THUCYDIDES.

Thucydidis Historiarum, libri vi.-viii. ad optimos codices denuo collatos recensuit CAROLUS HUDE, Dr. Phil. Hauniae MDCCCXC. Impensis Librariae Glyden-dalianae [F. Hegelii et Fil.]. pp. xv. 219. 5 Mk.

THIS is the first instalment of the critical edition of Thucydides on which Dr. Hude is engaged. That the last books appear first will cause no surprise to those who know the author's *Commentarii Critici*, which formed his exercise for the degree of Doctor at Copenhagen in 1888. None the less, the 'odd plan, which threatens to become a recognized system, of beginning anywhere in an author but at the beginning, is to be deplored. In the present case an additional reason is that A. Schöne's revision of Bekker has already forestalled Dr. Hude to some extent in books i. and ii. But the edition under notice differs from Schöne's in that

it includes all the readings of AEF G, while it omits the *testimonia veterum* and the *scholia*. The collation of ABCEFG is careful and elaborate, and it is improbable that anything remains to be discovered from the best MSS. in regard to these latter books. With regard to M, our own MS. of the first rank, Hude has been content to use the collation which was made for Stahl. That collation was very incomplete, and I have often lighted on mistakes in it, apart from the many omissions. Where the reading of M is unrecorded, Hude signifies the fact by the sign m. This is inconvenient, because the symbol m is already in use to denote the *manus recentior* which supplied the lost leaves of M. What is Dr. Hude to do if he edits, as every one will hope that he may do, the first and second books, to which the leaves are supplied? Scholars have not lost much by neglecting M. I know of no constant reader of it but the indefatigable