

# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

Volume 37

Article 24

---

6-1-1966

## Brief Studies

Frederick W. Danker  
*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Danker, Frederick W. (1966) "Brief Studies," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 37, Article 24.  
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol37/iss1/24>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

## BRIEF STUDIES

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.<sup>1</sup> 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-

<sup>1</sup> *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.

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.276<sup>11</sup> (A. D. 77) and P Gen. I.36<sup>10</sup> (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