

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 11—July, 1892.

I.

THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BOTH Jews and Christians receive the Old Testament as containing a revelation from God, while the latter regard it as standing in close and vital relationship to the New Testament. Everything connected with the Old Testament has, of recent years, been subjected to the closest scrutiny—the authorship of its several books, the time when they were written, their style, their historical value, their religious and ethical teachings. Apart from the veneration with which we regard the Old Testament writings on their own account, the intimate connection which they have with the Christian Scriptures necessarily gives us the deepest interest in the conclusions which may be reached by Old Testament criticism. For as the New Testament dispensation presupposes and grows out of the Mosaic, so the books of the New Testament touch those of the Old at every point: “*In vetere testamento novum latet, et in novo vetus patet.*”

We propose to take a summary view of the testimony of our Lord to the Old Testament, as it is recorded by the evangelists. The New Testament writers themselves largely quote and refer to the Old Testament, and the views which they express regarding the old economy and its writings are in harmony with the statements of their Master ; but, for various reasons, we here confine ourselves to what is related of the Lord Himself.

Let us refer, first, to what is contained or necessarily implied in the Lord's testimony to the Old Testament Scriptures, and, secondly, to the critical value of His testimony.

X.

REVIEWS OF RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

I.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

TEXTS AND STUDIES. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature.

Edited by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, B.D., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Vol. ii, No. 1: A STUDY OF CODEX BEZÆ. By J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A. Cambridge: University Press, 1891. 8vo, pp. viii, 272. (Also as: *Haverford College Studies*. Published by the Faculty of Haverford College, No. 8. Haverford College, Pa., 1891.)

THE CODEX SANGALLENSIS (Δ). A Study in the Text of the Old Latin Gospels. By J. RENDEL HARRIS, formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and now Professor of Biblical Languages and Literature in Haverford College, Pennsylvania. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1891. 8vo, pp. viii, 56.

TEXTE UND UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUR GESCHICHTE DER ALTCHRISTLICHEN LITERATUR, von OSCAR VON GEBHARDT und ADOLF HARNACK. vii. Band, Heft 1: DIE JOANNES-APOKALYPSE. TEXTKRITISCHE UNTERSUCHUNGEN UND TEXTHERSTELLUNG, von D. BERNHARD WEISS. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1891. 8vo, pp. vi, 225.

A COMPANION TO THE GREEK TESTAMENT AND THE ENGLISH VERSION. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., President of the American Committee on Revision. With *facsimile* Illustrations of MSS. and Standard Editions of the New Testament. Fourth Edition, Revised. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1892. 12mo, pp. xxvi, 616.

We bring together here some recent works in New Testament textual criticism. We cannot be surprised to see Dr. Schaff's admirable *Companion* reach so rapidly its fourth edition: no other book covers quite the same ground and no other one could cover the ground better. Dr. Schaff has a genius for plate-correcting and has brought this fourth edition quite up to date. We wish he would cut the book in half and render the two parts, on the Greek Testament and on the English Version, accessible separately. The latter is very largely an account of the Revision of the English New Testament of 1891, and students of the Greek text do not always desire to buy also

this—indispensable, in its own place and for its own purpose—history of the origin and character of a Revision which has partly failed by the weight of its pedantry. The former portion of the book is the best extant account in brief compass of the material of the textual criticism of the New Testament. It would be even more used than it is now, could it be had separately.

In his new Preface Dr. Schaff gives a brief notice of Dr. Weiss' study of the text of the Apocalypse. Dr. Weiss has for many years been a most careful student of the New Testament text, as readers of his Commentaries have been kept aware—especially of his Mark (1872) and Matthew (1876). He speaks of having been led by accident to bring his studies in the text to final, formal publication first in the case of the Apocalypse: but his readers may congratulate themselves—as he has found already occasion to congratulate himself—that his good star led him first to publish on a book which needed the careful work he has given it above all others, and the material for which was of comparatively manageable compass. Dr. Weiss has spared no pains in his investigation of the characteristics of the five uncial MSS. which have come down to us for the Apocalypse, $\aleph$, A, C, P, B, neglecting the minuscules and versions. He finds that these fall into two groups, a later, P B, and an earlier, $\aleph$ A C. From the text which he has established he finds that 480 variations can be counted in P and B, and 830 in $\aleph$, A and C. But 380 of the former 480 bear the character of intentional corrections, while out of the latter 830, only 250 bear this character, and the most of these are of the more mechanical and less reflective sort. His reading of the history of the text is that systematic emendation began very early; the earliest text we have, $\aleph$, was already strongly influenced by an earlier revised text, and from its influence no text has entirely escaped. The problem is to find our way behind it. Forty-five of the 830 erroneous readings found in $\aleph$, A or C, are common to two of them, showing a common basis of error. The right reading is found in the whole group $\aleph$, A, C, only twenty times, while in sixty-five cases it is found in two of these MSS. A alone preserves the right reading sixty times; $\aleph$ alone, eight; Calone, four; and in the sixty-five cases where two of them stand for it, A is absent only five times. $\aleph$ A has it twenty-two times; A C, thirty-seven. P B has the right reading ten times, and either P or B alone fifteen times more. From the detailed and most fruitful study of the MSS., covering over 150 pages, it is concluded that the group A C gives the relatively best text, and that A is the best single text. These results correspond with and confirm the conclusions of Dr. Hort. It follows naturally that the text which Dr. Weiss has constructed assimilates very closely to that of Westcott and Hort. We regret that the book lacks a collation of the two texts. We have noted the following variations only, for the first three chapters; the actually printed text alone being taken into account, with neglect of brackets and margins. i. 10: Weiss, *φωνην μεγ. ωπισω μου*; W. and H., *ωπισω μου φωνην μεγ.* 13: Weiss, *εμμεσω*; W. and H., *εν μεσω.* 13: Weiss, *οιω.*; W. and H., *οιον.* 13: Weiss, *μαζοις*; W. and H., *μαστοις.* ii. 1: Weiss, *εμμεσω*; W. and H., *εν μεσω.* 1: Weiss, *χρυσων*; W. and H., *χρυσων.* 4: Weiss, *πεπτωκας*; W. and H., *πεπτωχες.* 10: Weiss, *εξετε*; W. and H., *εχγτε.* 13: Weiss, *αις*; W. and H., omit. 24: Weiss, *μετανοησωσιν*; W. and H., *-ουσιν.* 28: Weiss, *πρωτον*; W. and H., *πρωτον.* iii. 17: Weiss, *ελεεινος*; W. and H., *ελεινος.* These differences are inconsiderable. The text is accompanied by a brief but most valuable running philological commentary, by which the volume is made important even beyond its contribution to fixing the text. One of the results to which Dr. Weiss has been led is that the Apocalypse is a unit; whence arises another argument, if another were needed, against the crop of divisive hypotheses which have sprung up from Völter's and Vischer's seeding.

Prof. Harris' two books do not yield in importance even to Dr. Weiss' grounded study of the text of the Apocalypse. They are primarily studies of two of our Græco-Latin texts, and are, as such, models of watchful, acute and fertile investigation. They make valuable contributions to our knowledge of Latin and Romance philology, and to our knowledge of the origin and history of the Old Latin Version, as well as to our knowledge of the character and the history of the two texts more immediately under investigation. The brilliancy of Prof. Harris' work in these regards passes all praise. But beyond these contributions to our knowledge, Prof. Harris seeks in the volume on Codex Bezae to untie for us that hitherto hopelessly compacted knot of the origin of what Dr. Hort calls technically the "Western" text. His reading of the problem is that practically the whole body of Western readings and certainly all that is characteristic of that text, has arisen from the effect of the Old Latin version on its parallel Greek in such bilingual MSS. as D. The Greek text in such MSS., he holds, has first been systematically Latinized, and then these Latinized copies spread over the world from Rome as a literary centre. No pains have been spared to prove or illustrate the theory. The greater portion of the volume on Codex Bezae is occupied with a study of the parallel texts with a view to proving the influence of the Latin upon the Greek, and with investigating the age and distribution of the suggested Latinization. Prof. Harris' conclusions are that "the whole of the Greek text of Codex Bezae from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Acts is a readjustment of an earlier text to the Latin version" (p. 41); and that "now we have at last succeeded in tracking the Western corruptions to their origin" (p. 191). The solution which Prof. Harris proposes for this vexed and vexing problem has such *a priori* verisimilitude, and he has supported it with such a wealth of ingenious illustration, and moreover it would be so welcome an end to the long and long-fruitlet study of the subject—justifying the neglect of "Western" readings as obviously, as a whole, that body of corruptions which all schools of textual criticism agree that they are—that we are tempted to adopt it out of hand. A closer study of Prof. Harris' body of proof, however, bids us draw back. We think he has proved that Codex D has suffered occasionally from Latinization; but not to such an extent as will supply a basis for this wide-reaching and attractive hypothesis. Nor do the readings which appear to be Latinisms seem to have had any very wide currency. At the most, we can look upon his studies as, besides illuminating the history of this individual codex, supplying the student of readings with a new source of corruption to which he may on necessity appeal, for the explanation of separate readings. It is odd that scattered Syriasm appear to have obtained a wider currency in the text than Latinisms. We do not know how to doubt that the reading *Δαλμανουθά* in Mark viii. 10 and certain Bezae readings quoted by Prof. Harris (p. 178 *sq.*) are Syriasm. But *Δαλμανουθά* is the reading of nearly the whole transmission. In noticing an earlier publication of Prof. Harris', his study on *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, in which he suggested that those odd corruptions of the Gospel text which Dr. Hort has called "Western non-interpolations," arose from a Syriac passion-harmony, we were led, while recognizing their origin in a passion-harmony, to express doubt as to its having been Syriac (PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW, ii, p. 691). In view of the facts now before us, we would withdraw that doubt. It looks as if a certain rarely occurring Syriac corruption has entered the whole text-transmission, except the "Western" text, and one of the chief values of the "Western" text is that it enables us to excise it. We have expressed our estimate of Prof. Harris' brilliant brochures more fully in *The Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature* (T. and T. Clark), for April, 1892.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.