

Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther ausgelegt.

Von Lic. th. Philip Bachmann, o. Professor der Theologie in Erlanger. A. Deichert'sche Verlagsb. Nachf. Leipzig, Germany. 1905. S. 482. Pr. M. 9.

This is volume VII. in Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Bachmann takes the two Corinthian letters to be letters in the narrowest sense (S. 1), not epistles like Romans or Hebrews. The throbbing questions of actual church life are discussed in a practical way in 1 Cor. while in 2 Cor. the inner personal life of Paul throbs in every sentence. These two letters in a sense form a group to themselves (S. 3), though also related to Galatians and Romans. Bachmann's introductory remarks are not lengthy, but are to the point and full of suggestions. The body of the book shows the work of a careful scholar who has independent opinions and who is familiar with the vast literature on 1 Cor. The book is worthy to be in Zahn's great series, which is an expression of the more conservative criticism of Germany. The treatment is scholarly and practical and not as much overburdened with technical details as Meyer, for instance, though Bachmann does not often slur over matters of importance. His remarks on 14:34-36 are rather meager, but the woman question is not yet a live one in Germany. He rather inclines to take 15:29 (baptism for the dead) as running the risk of death. One could prefer to have the Greek text quoted rather than the German translation as the basis of comment, but then Greek words are often used in the body of the Commentary. There is nothing specially new in Bachmann's treatment of this great book, but he has done his task with distinct ability and success. The Commentary ought to prove very useful to those who have their German in hand.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Die Rhythmen der Asianischen und roemischen Kunstprosa (Paulus—Hebräerbrief—Pausanias—Cicero — Seneca — Curtius—Apuleius).

Von Friedrich Blass. A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. Leipzig, Germany. 1905. M.6.

Blass is amazingly fertile in producing able books in the linguistic field. He had already written on the rhythm of Attic prose, but he now finds that Asian rhythm was a very different thing. It is marked by breaking up the sentence or the thought in the sentence into separate members which balanced one another, somewhat like the Hebrew parallelism. He holds that this Asian rhythm was current among the Romans, especially Cicero. It avoided harsh elisions. It has been poorly preserved to us, though he finds it in a fourth century papyrus of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Blass traces it back to Hegesias of Magnesia who flourished in the third century B. C. The astonishing part of it all is that so artificial an arrangement should be found in the New Testament, even in Paul and Hebrews, the most literary parts of the New Testament. Luke was slightly Atticistic, Blass thinks. Deissmann (*Theol. Literaturz*, 1906, S. 235 ff.) will have none of it, for the New Testament is written in the vernacular *κοινή*. Blass himself has said (*Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 6) that even the schools of Tarsus could not have taught Paul the historical orthography, and yet he thinks (*Rhythmen, &c.*, S. 43) that he learned the Asian rhythm at Tarsus. It does seem a little odd for so practical a man as Paul to be engaged in so purely artificial a literary device. However, the man who wrote 1 Cor. 13 cannot be accused of inability to write poetic prose. It is not unnatural for a gifted man in moments of high feeling to express himself in unconscious rhythm. I should think that what of balanced and polished phrase one finds in Paul is more unconscious than deliberate. But 1 Cor. 13 prevents one from going as far as Deissmann does on the subject. It is a fresh contribution that Blass has here made, even if he also may have pushed his point too far in the New Testament.

A. T. ROBERTSON.