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](#)

Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel in ihrem Verhältniss zum neutestamentlichen Schriftthum. Eine Untersuchung **Wohlenberg von G.. Erlangen: Deichert. London: Nutt.** **1888. 2 Mk.**

Charles Merk

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 09 / November 1888, pp 286 - 287

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193515, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193515

How to cite this article:

Charles Merk (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 286-287 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193515

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

world διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, the peculiar number twelve assigned to the nations being suggested perhaps by the διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων of the *Teaching*. According to the *Ecclesiastical Canons of the Holy Apostles* founded upon the Διδαχή, the twelve Apostles were commanded ἐκπέμψασθαι τοὺς λόγους εἰς ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, that is to say to teach them [πᾶσι] τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, and for that purpose the world was divided into ἐπαρχίαι according to their number. In the Greek there is apparently a hiatus at πρὸ τοῦ Μέλlete κληροῦσθαι τὰς ἐπαρχίας, but the Coptic version reads, 'He enjoined us, saying (whereas we had not yet divided the countries among us), Ye shall divide them among you so that each one may take his place according to your number.' Compare in chap. viii. of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, οὖσιν δεκάδυο εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν φυλῶν κ.τ.λ. εἰς τὸ κηρύσσειν.

It is strange that a tract which styles itself Διδαχή τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (line 1) should proceed in this fashion (line 9), οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισούντας ὑμᾶς. The inference is that there is an interpolation in chap. i., and that the first recension of the Two Ways was somewhat shorter than that which has come down to us. It seems to follow also that it must at first have existed or been written down separately, since the following chapters of the *Teaching* do not appear to have been addressed τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. These main questions in the criticism of the Διδαχή are thus seen to be suggested by the title itself. If it be the case that there was a separate short recension of the Two Ways before the Διδαχή as we know it, it may be assumed that the earlier tract was known to Barnabas and Hermas. The entire Διδαχή was probably used by Hermas (who may have written about 150 A.D. or earlier), but it is harder to say how much of it was known to Barnabas. If it be inferred from his fourth chapter that he knew the latter part of the *Teaching*, it remains to account for his apparent or alleged want of acquaintance with the matter characteristic of the long

recension of the Two Ways. Suffice it here to remark (1) that if the reading in his nineteenth chapter mentioned above should prove to be the true one he may have known the long recension, and (2) that if he had known it we may be sure that he would not have quoted the part containing the words, οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; since he was an anti-Jewish writer addressing Gentile Christians. Be this as it may, there is no positive proof on the other hand that the Διδαχή is later than Barnabas, or that it may not be practically a work of about 100 A.D. or earlier, at whatever date it was first completely reduced from the oral to the written form. An earlier copy than that of 1056 A.D. discovered by Bryennius might of course shew textual variations, and particular clauses might be found to be of late origin, like the δευτέρα δὲ ἐντολὴ τῆς διδαχῆς of chap. ii., which is not found in *Apost. Const.* vii. 3; but the manual seems to be in substance older than any patristic writing with which we can compare it.

On the minor clerical errors and peculiarities of the manuscript see pp. 12, 13, &c. On p. 62, but not on p. 10, we read οἱ δὲ (sic) ὑπομείναντες. Prof. Harris favours the insertion of οὓς δὲ ἐλέγεις in chap. ii. (p. 104); but the threefold classification of the text, οὓς μὲν ἐλέγεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ, οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν σου, is complete in itself, and the external evidence for the addition is inconclusive. The writer of the *Epistle of Jude* may or may not have been acquainted with the precepts of the *Teaching*, but his expression ἐαυτοὺς πομαίνοντες does not help us much, since it may be referred immediately to Ezek. xxxiv. The parallel in 2 Pet. ii. 13 would seem to have the better claim to priority, if it is to be interpreted with reference to the saying that a prophet ὀρίζων τράπεζαν must not eat of it. The Hebrew in note 1, p. 80, is inaccurately printed.

This edition of the text should be in the hands of all students of the *Didaché*.

C. TAYLOR.

Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel in ihrem Verhältniss zum neutestamentlichen Schriftthum. Eine Untersuchung von G. WOHLBERG. Erlangen: Deichert. London: Nutt. 1888. 2 Mk.

WOHLBERG maintains that the author of 'the Teaching of the Apostles' was acquainted with a written gospel, and that the passages XV. 3. 4, where he enjoins his readers to offer up 'prayers and alms and to do all things ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ,' must refer to a written record, and not, as Sabatier and

Lechler thought, to some oral tradition. The gospel on which the author drew was in the first instance that according to St. Matthew (p. 11), and the chapters of which he availed himself principally are V-VII., X, XXIV. (p. 47). Of St. Luke's gospel Wohlberg finds only two clear traces in the 'Teaching,' viz. I. 3. *sq.*, comp. Luke VI. 27-35, and XVI. 1, comp. Luke XII, 35. Of these two passages only the first appears to us quite conclusive. Nor do we think that great stress can be laid on the collateral evidence derived from a comparison of IV. 8, where the catechumen is enjoined συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ

πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδιον εἶναι, with Acts IV. 32, where it is said of the Christians οὐδὲ εἰς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι etc. That passages from the text of Matthew (and Luke) are found in the 'Teaching' is evident and cannot be denied; but the additions and alterations which are introduced in the latter, as well as the manner in which the quotations are joined together, give rise to several questions; we cannot say that any of them have in this treatise been brought nearer their solution. We read for instance I. 2 πρῶτον ἀγαπήσεις τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε. The last words are not added by the author of the 'Teaching' (p. 20); they are most probably taken by him from Sirach VII. 30. Again I. 3-4, when quoting (Luke VI. 39) ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπάτε τοὺς μισούντας ὑμᾶς, he adds καὶ οὐχ ἔξετε ἐχθρόν: quoting (Matt. V. 39) ἐάν τις σοι δῇ ῥάπισμα etc., he adds καὶ ἔση τέλειος: quoting (Luke VI. 30) ἐάν λάβῃ τις ἀπὸ σοῦ τὸ σὸν, μὴ ἀπαίτει, he adds οὐδέ γὰρ δύνασαι. These additions, as well as the clause νηστεύετε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, point to a record of the Sermon on the Mount partly different from that contained in the canonical gospels.

Wohlenberg however rejects the hypothesis that the author had any other gospel or synopsis of gospels, e.g. the Ev. sec. Aegyptios or sec. Hebraeos (p. 52, sq.) before him; his own belief is that the author, in quoting the canonical gospels from memory, allowed himself no more than the liberty which was common to the christian writers of his time (p. 55). The passages in the 'Teaching' however bear a striking resemblance to Tatian's *Diatessaron*, both as regards their arrangement and their wording, which Wohlenberg himself admits (p. 51), and which he illustrates in his synoptical tables (pp. 23, 26, 35). By refusing to accept an earlier synopsis which formed the ground-work both of the 'Teaching' and of Tatian, he leaves this resemblance practically unexplained. The relationship which the eucharistic prayers, chaps. IX. and X., bear to the gospel of St. John, as well as their likeness to the earliest prayers of the Christian congregation recorded in Acts IV., are fully shown (pp. 56, 71, sq.). But the opinion which Wohlenberg expresses (p. 85), that the 'Teaching' furnishes most important and hitherto unknown evidences of the historicity of the fourth Gospel, is curiously modified by the conclusion at which he arrives (p. 92), that its 'author may possibly have known the writings of St. John, but that he was not intimately acquainted with them as he was with the synoptists, nor did he make any use of them.' The view of Zahn, that these prayers are not eucharistic in the stricter sense, but that they were offered up at the close of the Agape, is fully endorsed (p. 77), but the serious objections which have been urged against it (comp. Funk, *Doctrina Duodecim Apostol.*, p. 26) remain partly unnoticed. The manner in which Wohlenberg has examined the allusions to the Pauline epistles, supposed to exist in the 'Teaching,' (p. 87, sq.), seems to us quite correct, and his conclusion, that there is no distinct evidence of its author having been acquainted with any other books of the New Testament besides those referred to above, appears well founded.

CHARLES MERK.

Griechische Mythologie, von L. PRELLER: vierte Auflage, von CARL ROBERT: Bd. I. erste Hälfte. 5 Mk.

THE appearance of a fourth edition of Preller's work shows that a steady demand for it exists, and this is the most conclusive proof of its value. At the same

time one was more struck in the preceding edition with its inadequacy to the advance of the study than with any other quality, except its general handiness as a book of reference. The present edition gives us a much more thorough revision, alteration, and enlargement of the third edition than the third did of its predecessor. 428 pages now correspond to 349 pages in the last edition. The changes which Prof. Robert has introduced are of various kinds. (1) He frequently eliminates the naturalistic origin which Preller assigned to Greek gods, e.g. on p. 170 the lordship of Hera over sun, moon, and stars has disappeared entirely, whereas Plew in Ed. III. disputed it in a foot-note: on p. 336 the stormy scenes between Zeus and Hera, a picture of the heaven disturbed by stormy weather, have been ejected from the text. So in many places slight omissions or changes have got rid of the most violent naturalistic explanations. The process might have been carried even further with advantage. (2) The history of the artistic representation of each deity is given far more completely, clearly, and methodically, yet with admirable brevity. A good example may be found by comparing pp. 333-5 with pp. 261-2 of the preceding edition. (3) Many notes and passages are re-written with much fuller knowledge, more plentiful references to the modern literature of the subject, and a different point of view. The passage relating to the Sibyls is entirely remodelled, and a long note added, showing among other things that originally there was only one Sibyl. The probability that the Sibyls were in part historical personages is admitted even into the text. The Asiatic origin of the idea is retained and made more precise, the Erythraean Sibyl being explained as probably meant by Heraclitus, Plato, &c., when they speak of a Sibyl. (4) The practical recognition of the principle that cultus is not subject to the variation which continually altered mythology, that it preserves antique usage, and should therefore be taken as the guide in studying mythology wherever it is possible, is one of the most important changes which distinguish recent mythological investigation; and Prof. Robert has added throughout the book numerous details of local cults, and especially those of Asia Minor. The importance of the Asia Minor religion for the history of Greek religion is coming steadily into recognition. An interesting point is that the native Greek goddess of love has disappeared from the fourth edition. Even the third edition was quite certain that the Greeks worshipped a goddess akin to Venus and to Freya before they came into contact with Oriental religion. But Prof. Robert, who has often been content to modify Preller's certainty into probability, here leaves no doubt that Aphrodite is wholly derived from the Syrian, Phoenician, and Canaanite. The change may cause regret to some, but we welcome it as a marked step in advance. There is still room for much more rigorous application of the historical method. The mythopoetic power continued fresh throughout Greek history: and the old myths were constantly liable to change under the pressure of historical or literary conditions. The makers of every great political or social change sought a justification in ancient legend, and were always able to find it. The Aetolian conquerors of Elis, the Dorian in the Peloponnesus, justified their conquest by myths of the expulsion of their leader's ancestors from the country. A very charming example of this kind of myth in a humbler sphere is given in Wilamowitz-Möllendorff's *Ixylos*, excursus on 'Ιάκωv γοῦρα, though Bornemann is not convinced by it. The genesis of any legend can never be assumed as early until its age is proved. But if Prof. Robert had applied this method throughout the book in