

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE ON THE NEW
TESTAMENT.

IN New Testament literature the Continental press has been even more than usually productive during the period which has elapsed since our last summary. In addition to a very large number of books, we have an uncommon wealth of important papers in the various theological journals. We can overtake at present only a part of what has appeared. We select those publications which call for more immediate notice. Not a few, scarce less deserving attention, must lie over for another opportunity.

I. TEXTUAL CRITICISM.—One of the most interesting contributions to this department is again made by M. Pierre Batiffol. We have already referred to the account which he gave of the new Albanian manuscript in the *brochure* issued at Rome in 1885 under the title *Evangeliorum Codex Græcus Purpureus Beratinus*, etc.¹ He follows this up now by a larger publication on the documentary treasures of Berat.² To this insignificant Turkish town, planted by the gorges of the old Illyrian Apsus, we are indebted for some valuable additions to the select class of purple manuscripts. M. Batiffol gives a brief description of two of these,—the *Liturgia Argentea*, which is in the possession of the metropolitan, M. Anthime Alexoudis, and the *Codex Aureus Anthimi*, which is named after the same prelate. He devotes the volume mainly however to the third of these Albanian manuscripts, the remarkable *Codex Beratinus* Φ. He revises and supplements his former statements in a number of points, and asks us to take his view of the document from this publication, not from the earlier. His examination of the scription leads him to the conclusion that Φ resembles in this respect the St. Petersburg palimpsest I', and the type of writing characteristic of the beginning of the sixth century. He holds by his former opinion, that the *Codex Beratinus* is somewhat older than the *Codex Rossanensis*. In this he is at issue with Gebhardt, who contends for the priority of Σ over Φ. He finds itacism abundantly at work in the codex, but also certain dialectic peculiarities. The text is printed at the end of the book, and its general character is very carefully estimated. It

¹ See THE EXPOSITOR, May, 1886, p. 391.

² *Les Manuscrits Grecs de Bérat d'Albanie et le Codex Purpureus* Φ. Par Pierre Batiffol, etc. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1886.)

is marked to a large extent by paraphrastic readings. Some of these are of considerable interest. In Matthew ix. 28, for example, it inserts *δεομενοι* after *τυφλοι*. It agrees in this with certain cursives (5, 123, 124, etc.), but is the only uncial known to make the addition. In various passages, such as Matthew xxiv. 45, Mark ii. 18, etc., it deserves to be consulted for its bearing upon Westcott and Hort's employment of *conflate* readings. Now and again it exhibits traces of intentional change. The text, according to M. Batiffol, is fundamentally Syrian, with a decided infusion of Western readings. He pronounces the non-Syrian element to be analogous to that in N, Σ, and the prototype now represented by the cursives, 13, 69, 124, 346.

Few students of the text can compete with the diligent Norwegian J. Belsheim in the limited but important field which he cultivates. His work in a branch of inquiry in which the Bishop of Salisbury, Professor Sanday, and other English scholars take a special interest, has been of the most helpful and reliable kind. He adds to his previous services in the cause of the pre-Hieronymian Latin text a careful edition, the *editio princeps*, of the text of one of the Corbei manuscripts¹—a codex hitherto very imperfectly known. It may be noticed in passing that Belsheim and Batiffol by no means agree in the views which they take of some recent questions. Batiffol recognises the value of Belsheim's editorial work, but allows much less weight to his critical opinions. This appears in the case of the *Codex Theodoræ*. Belsheim, who has worked with great care at this attractive document, and to whom we owe a transcription of its text of Mark, puts it in the ninth century. Batiffol declares it simply impossible that it can be so old. Looking to the whole style of writing, he declines to carry it higher than the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century. Wattenbach would bring it down even to the twelfth.

In connexion with the subject of old Latin texts, mention should also be made of a paper by Dr. J. Dräseke, of Wandsbeck.² It deals with a manuscript of which even Rösensch has little to tell, one of those formerly in the monastery of Bobbio, and now in Turin

¹ *Codex f² Corbeiensis; sive quatuor evangelia ante Hieronymum latine translata e codice membranaceo quinto vel sexto sæculo, ut videtur, scripto, qui in Bibliotheca "Nationali" Parisiensi asservatur. Nunc primum ed. J. B.* (Christiana, 1887.)

² See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1887, Heft i., etc.

—designated Codex Taurinensis F. vi. 1. Dräseke puts us in possession of what he has gathered from certain communications from Bernardino Peyron, which appeared as far back as 1873 in the Italian journal *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica*. The manuscript is of considerable interest to the palæographer and the student of philosophy, as well as to the critic. A few of its leaves are palimpsests. Chemical appliances have brought out the text of some philosophical writing in Greek. Part of the *Parmenides* of Plato, for example, is legible. The codex consists of some ninety-four leaves in small quarto. It is referred to the sixth century, if not to the fifth, and appears to be made up of the work of three different scribes. It gives a text of the Gospels in Latin, which is pronounced to be one of the *Vetus Latina*, and to approach most nearly to the type given in Bianchini's *Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latinae Versionis Antiquæ*. The most remarkable thing about it is the introduction of prefaces to the several Gospels. Ferdinand Fleck found such prefaces attached to the Gospels in a codex belonging to the Laurentian Library in Florence, which he described in his *Anecdota* in 1837 as *opis pretiosissimum et in Europa unicum*. The Laurentian codex preserved the prefaces to the synoptists in good form, but that to the fourth Gospel only in a mutilated condition. This Turin codex makes what is an extremely rare phenomenon at least not an absolutely singular one. It gives prefaces to Mark, Luke, and John. In all probability it contained originally one also for Matthew. The manuscript however is unfortunately incomplete here. As it now reads, it begins at Matthew xiii. 35.

Another question which has been raised again of late is the subject of a paper by Dr. F. Zimmer, of Königsberg.¹ That is the relation in which the *Codex Augiensis* and the *Codex Boernerianus* stand to each other—a question of obvious importance, particularly as regards the claims of F. Wetstein, as is well known, regarded it as more probable that G was dependent on F than *vice versa*. Scrivener, in editing F, rejected the idea of any such direct relation between the two, and held them both to be representatives of a lost codex. Tischendorf and Tregelles agreed on the whole with Scrivener. Professor Hort holds strongly for the immediate dependence of F in its Greek text upon G. Dr. Zimmer now comes forward in the interest of Professor Hort's views, and

¹ See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1887, Heft i.

claims to establish it as beyond doubt that F is simply a transcript of G. He shows that the resemblance between the two, especially in the matter of omissions, is too remarkable to admit of explanation on Scrivener's theory. By a careful analysis of a number of crucial passages, among which may be named 1 Corinthians vi. 6, 15, 1 Thessalonians v. 23, and Galatians ii. 17, etc. he endeavours to prove, first, that G cannot have copied F, and, secondly, that F must have followed G.

Other publications belonging to this head must be dismissed at present with bare mention. The Abbé Martin continues the issue of his lectures,¹ in which he expounds at length the conservative view of the science. The industrious editor of Tischendorf furnishes an important communication on the *externalia* of the Greek manuscripts, the method of their preparation, the connexion of the leaves, etc.² Gebhardt's very useful Greek New Testament on the basis of Tischendorf, with the readings of Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, etc., appears in its third edition.³

II. BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, INTRODUCTION, ETC.—We welcome a new edition of the handbook on the theology of the New Testament by the late Dr. J. J. van Oosterzee, of Utrecht.⁴ Prepared originally as a manual for the guidance of theological students, it met with a large measure of acceptance in Germany and England as well as in Holland. In the new and enlarged German edition it will still be useful as a concise synopsis of inquiry in an exceptionally rich and important province of biblical study.

A book of a different and more independent order on the same subject is the treatise of the late Professor C. F. Schmid, of Tübingen,⁵ the *quondam* colleague of Baur, and the teacher of theologians of the mark of Dorner and Oehler. It is a satisfaction to see it in its fifth edition. Dr. Heller, who has continued the editorial duties which were discharged for a length of time by Weizsäcker, has wisely decided to give us Schmid's own work,

¹ *Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testam. Partie pratique. T. 5. Leçons professées à l'École Supérieure de Théol. de Paris, etc.* (Paris, 1886.)

² *Les cahiers des Manuscrits Grecs.* A paper submitted to the French Academy of Inscriptions.

³ *Novum Testamentum Græce, etc.* Illustravit Oscar de Gebhardt. Editio stereotypa tertia. (Tauchnitz: Leipzig, 1886.)

⁴ *Die Theologie des neuen Testaments. Ein Handbuch für akademische Vorlesungen, etc.* 2 verm. Aufl. (Bremen, 1886.)

⁵ *Biblische Theologie des neuen Testaments.* Hrsg. von Dr. C. Weizsäcker. 5 Aufl., besorgt durch Dr. A. Heller. (Leipzig, 1886.)

with few additions or alterations. The subject therefore is not brought up to date. But this lack is counterbalanced by the advantage of having the author's construction of the ideas of the New Testament exactly as he himself originally interpreted them. Though the treatise diverges in some respects from more recent studies in its conception of what belongs to this particular science and in its view of the *lie* of certain ideas in the several sections of the New Testament, it is well worth consideration still. It is one of the most satisfactory products of the believing side of the Tübingen theology, uniting loyalty to the historic spirit with modesty and with a clear, firm faith in revelation.

In the *Biblical Theology* of the late Von Hofmann, of Erlangen,¹ we have a still more original handling of this discipline. It forms the concluding volume of his large and unfinished work on the history, contents, and theology of New Testament Scripture. It has been prepared from the author's manuscripts and from college lectures by his pupil, Professor Volck, of Dorpat. It suffers from the disadvantages which inevitably connect themselves with a work prepared, with whatever care on the compiler's part, from material of this kind. But with all such drawbacks, it remains a contribution of more than usual interest. Von Hofmann could touch no subject in the traditional fashion. Even this imperfect representation of his studies in New Testament teaching bears the impress of a mind which could not but strike out a path of its own. In the method pursued, the exposition of particular testimonies, and the conclusion to which all is brought, we come upon what is novel and provocative of reflection, if not always certain to carry the general suffrage.

Weizsäcker's book on the *Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*,² which forms another volume of the *Mohrsche Sammlung*, deserves extended examination. It must be enough here to notice some of the critical conclusions which are of greatest interest. Taking the apostolic age proper to terminate with the year 70 A.D., and allowing what remains of the first century to be apostolic only in a very modified sense, Weizsäcker pronounces the great bulk of the New Testament literature to be non-apostolic. The Epistle

¹ *Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht.* Von Dr. J. C. K. von Hofmann. Elfter Theil. "Biblische Theologie des neuen Testaments." (Nördlingen, 1886.)

² *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche.* Von Carl Weizsäcker. (Freiburg i. B., 1866.)

to the Hebrews has in all probability a spurious close in chap. xiii. 18-24, and as a whole is not much older than the First Epistle of Clement. Neither the fourth Gospel nor the Apocalypse is by the Apostle John. The whole Johannine writings indeed, as well as those of James and Peter, are dealt with as not genuine. The Apocalypse, further, has probably sustained interpolation from some post-apostolic hand. The epistles of the captivity (with one exception) are spurious, like the pastoral epistles. In the matter of Paul's conversion, we have to distinguish sharply between Paul's own version of it and the more fanciful account by Luke. The event itself was miraculous in the sense of being a miracle in the inner world of consciousness. The narratives of the bodily resurrection of Jesus, the miracle of Pentecost, and other wonders, require to be cleared of the entanglements of legend and Jewish symbolism. On the other hand, not only are the four great Pauline epistles admitted to be genuine, but those to the Thessalonians, and even that to the Philippians as well—a concession which strips this very radical criticism of much of its apparent strength. The credibility of the decree of the convention of Apostles recorded in Acts xv., and that of the tradition of the Ephesian residence of John, are admitted. The last thirty years of the first century, though not apostolic, are to be regarded as the period of John. This is all that is attempted by one of the most keen-witted critics in the way of a *via media* between the old Tübingen position and the ordinary view. The result has its significance for both sides.

Among minor publications, we may refer to Paul Christ's essay on the *New Testament Doctrine of Prayer*.¹ The essay received the prize of the *Haager Gesellschaft zur Vertheidigung der Christlichen Religion*, and is offered as a contribution to an intelligent estimate of primitive Christianity. It is written nevertheless from an extreme Tübingen standpoint. It is of value chiefly as showing to how little Christian prayer comes to be reduced under the pressure of certain critical principles, and what difficulty is experienced, even by an able and, on the whole, open-minded adherent, in accommodating the general strain of New Testament ideas to these principles.

We may mention also a new discussion of the question of the original language of Matthew's Gospel by Licentiate Dietrich

¹ *Die Lehre von Gebet nach dem neuen Testament*, etc. (Leiden, 1886.)

Gla;¹ a monograph by J. M. Usteri, a Zürich Privat-docent, on Peter's teaching on the Descent to Hades,² in which he contends that the passage in the First Epistle points to a manifestation of Christ to the departed in Hades, and especially to those of Noah's generation, but admits a different construction for the section in the Second Epistle; and another brief monograph of considerable interest, by the same writer, on our Lord's use of the title *Son of man*.³

III. COMMENTARIES, ETC.—The new issue of *Meyer* proceeds apace, and with various degrees of liberty in the handling of the original. It is an extraordinary testimony to Meyer's work that edition after edition continues to be called for, notwithstanding that the master hand can no more touch it. The Fourth Gospel,⁴ which was worked over in 1879 by Bernhard Weiss with a thoroughness that seemed to put Meyer himself in the background, has again come under the same editorial pen. The changes in this seventh edition however are comparatively moderate. Weiss himself avers that they are limited to matters of subordinate importance. The more recent commentaries however, by Keil and Schanz, are compared throughout. The Epistle to the Galatians⁵ also appears in a seventh edition by the scholar who brought out the sixth edition in 1880, Professor Sieffert, of Erlangen. Careful use is made here of the most important monographs and papers which have been recently published, as well as of the commentaries by Holsten, Wörner, Philippi, etc., and all is kept within the limits of what is due from editor to author. The Epistle to the Ephesians is issued in its sixth edition,⁶ revised by Dr. Woldemar Schmidt, of Leipzig; and the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon,⁷ in the fifth

¹ *Die Original Sprache des Matthäus-evangeliums. Historisch-kritische Untersuchung.* (Paderborn, 1887.)

² *Hinabgefahren zur Hölle. Eine Wiedererwägung der Schriftstellen 1 Pet. iii. 18-22 und 2 Pet. iii. 6.* (Zürich, 1886.)

³ *Die Selbst-bezeichnung Jesu als des Menschen Sohn.* (Zürich, 1886.)

⁴ *Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das neue Testament.* Von Dr. H. A. W. Meyer. *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Johannes.* Siebente Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. Bernhard Weiss. (Göttingen, 1886.)

⁵ *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief an die Galater.* Siebente Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. Friedr. Sieffert. (Göttingen, 1886.)

⁶ *Kritisch exeg. Handbuch über den Brief an die Epheser.* Sechste verbesserte Auflage, bearbeitet von Dr. Woldemar Schmidt. (Göttingen, 1886.)

⁷ *Kritisch exeg. Handbuch über die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser, und*

edition, by the hand of Professor Franke, of Kiel. In the case of the last-named section of Meyer's *Commentary*, a very radical revision was contemplated, which circumstances prevented.

Professor Kübel, of Tübingen, gives us a fourth and enlarged edition of the New Testament section of his *Bibelkunde*.¹ The volume is made up of a series of exegetical studies of the weightiest and most difficult passages from the Gospels and other New Testament books. The essays are short, and free from all learned apparatus or terminology. They are in general remarkably interesting, and sometimes strike upon rich veins of exposition.

Professor Rübiger of Breslau published a book on the two Epistles to Corinth² so long ago as 1847. After well-nigh forty years it reaches a second edition; it thus obtains a long delayed but well-merited honour. The strength of the volume lies in what it has to offer on the vexed question of the parties in the Church of Corinth. It can scarcely be said that we are much nearer unanimity of opinion on that problem after all the discussions of these forty years. Dr. Rübiger subjects the leading theories to a very acute criticism, and in view of all that has passed holds with increased confidence that the idea of a distinct Christ-party is groundless. The summary of results in the last few pages regarding the condition of the Church and the object of the two epistles deserves attention.

Dr. Heinrici, of Marburg, follows up the weighty volume which he published in 1880 on the First Epistle to the Corinthians by another, similar in method, on the Second Epistle.³ Both are extensive and searching studies, which leave little that is of any importance unnoticed. They deserve a place beside the commentaries of Godet, Meyer, and Edwards. They differ from all three however in method, and aim at more. Like its predecessor, this book addresses itself largely to the solution of the historical

Philemon. Fünfte Auflage, völlig umgearbeitet von Dr. A. H. Franke. (Göttingen, 1886.)

¹ *Bibelkunde*, etc. Von Robert Kübel, etc. *Zweiter Theil, Das neue Testament*. Vierte vermehrte Auflage. (Stuttgart, 1886.)

² *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Inhalt der beiden Briefe des Apostels Paulus an die Korinthische Gemeinde*, etc. Von Dr. J. F. Rübiger, etc. (Breslau, 1886.)

³ *Das Zweite Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinther*. Erklärt von Dr. C. F. Heinrici. (Berlin, 1887.)

problems, and is of interest for the attempt which it makes to reproduce in the light of solid fact the process by which a primitive Christian Church originated and grew and exhibited its life.

The *Kurzgefasstes Kommentar*, edited by Strack and Zöckler, has made a fair beginning. Two sections of the New Testament division have come to hand. The one embraces the synoptical Gospels,¹ which are undertaken by Professor Nösgen, of Rostock. The other is devoted to the fourth Gospel and the book of Acts, and bears the names of Professors Luthardt and Zöckler.² The volumes satisfy the design of the series on the whole very creditably. The exegetical notes, which are thrown to the foot of the page, are as brief as may be. It is the same with what is offered on matters of criticism and introduction. In the case of a veteran in Johannine literature and exegesis like Luthardt, the plan secures in briefest compass and simplest form the thrice sifted results of mature scholarship.

S. D. F. SALMOND.

¹ *Neues Testament. Erste Abtheilung: Die Evangelien nach Matthäus, Markus, und Lukas.* Erläutert von Dr. C. F. Nösgen, etc. (Nördlingen, 1886.)

² *Neues Testament. Zweite Abtheilung: Das Evangelium nach Johannes und die Apostel-geschichte.* Erläutert von Dr. E. C. Luthardt und Dr. Otto Zöckler. (Nördlingen, 1886.)
