

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Salvation by Grace: The Heart of Job's Theology

ALFRED VON ROHR SAUER

The Church in Community Organization

MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN

Homiletics

Brief Studies

Theological Observer

Book Review

Vol. XXXVII

May 1966

No. 5

Not only is Plutarch's discussion of ethics of interest to the Biblical theologian, but a certain amount of self-study of the reviewer's art is prompted by the publication as No. 426 in the Loeb Classical Library of two works, one of which was itself a book review.¹ Plutarch is the reviewer. The book he reviewed was the history written by Herodotus. Plutarch's thesis is that the father of history was a crook, lacking in historical decency, piling up libel on libel on the heroes of Greece. Instead of reading epigrams and inscriptions, which could have given him many of the facts, Plutarch complains that Herodotus discharged his venom in a base attempt to make cowards of the Greeks. Critical studies of Herodotus assure us that Plutarch was wrong in many of his judgments. In fairness to Plutarch, on the other hand, one must note the editor's reminder that Plutarch's Platonic interest in ethics could not produce a valid or reasonable criticism of historians. He was convinced that history must be written in such a way that the young will find fit models for imitation. Herodotus, to Plutarch's mind, was guilty of "unpatriotic" destruction of national idols. Subtracting this bias, Plutarch would have been in the first ranks today as a critical reviewer, for the principal guidelines of the craft can be extracted from his peculiar support of ethics at the expense of Herodotus.

Plutarch's literary expression, coming from a period when the New Testament canon was nearing completion, is of special interest to students of the New Testament. For example, he refers contemptuously to Herodotus as ὁ ἄνθρωπος (870 c). The paral-

lel illuminates Peter's denial (Matt. 26:72, 74; and Pilate's *Ecce homo*. (Mark 14:71) (John 19:5)

The second work in this volume is the *Quaestiones naturales* (*Causes of Natural Phenomena*), translated by F. H. Sandbach. It probes such problems as the reason for sea sickness, why octopi change colors, and why bears' paws are a gourmet's delight. There are no New Testament parallels for these. The translators have succeeded admirably in elucidating the intricacies and occasional obscurities of the transmitted text.

St. Louis, Mo. FREDERICK W. DANKER

ἄλλος — ἕτερος

In the February issue of this journal, on page 96, footnote 100, the assertion is made that "ἄλλος is sharply distinguished in the Greek from ἕτερος ("another of a different kind") — see Gal. 1:6." This statement, without philological qualification, does an injustice to the Scriptural data. In Mark 4:5 ἄλλο is used of the seed on rocky ground; in the parallel passage Luke uses ἕτερον in place of ἄλλο. See further 1 Cor. 12:8-10; 15:39-41; and 2 Cor. 11:4; compare also POxy II.276¹¹ (A. D. 77) and P Gen. I.36¹⁰ (A. D. 170).

If one were to accept the philological conclusion of the writer concerning Gal. 1:6, it would be necessary to conclude that Paul accepts the possibility of another *gospel*, although not on a par with *the Gospel*. Saint Paul emphatically rejects such a "multiple-source view of the subject" to use the writer's phrase. The truth of the matter is, that in this passage ἕτερος and ἄλλος, instead of being "sharply distinguished" are used interchangeably. It is the total statement, not the individual terms, which communicates the thought of sharp distinction.

St. Louis, Mo. FREDERICK W. DANKER

¹ *Plutarch's Moralia*, Vol. XI. Translated by Lionel Pearson and F. H. Sandbach. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965. xii and 241 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.