

Dr. Petavel, when used of the lost, as proof that they will be annihilated. Similarly, on p. 413 a: 'The old world was not annihilated by the flood, but its outward arrangement was brought to an end, and the word used (κόσμος) chiefly calls our attention to an outward arrangement.' But the old world is said to have been *destroyed*. In short, Dr. Petavel admits that the word on which he relies has not always the meaning he gives to it when used to describe the fate of the lost; and he has done nothing to show that in this last connexion it has the special and narrower meaning he ascribes to it.

My correspondent says, on p. 413 a, that, if the word rendered *destroy* does not convey the idea of bringing to nought, the Greek language has no word which conveys this idea. This may be admitted. When Plato wished to convey this idea, he found it needful to define his meaning by a careful circumlocution, as I have shown in my quotation on p. 109. In practical life it is seldom needful to convey the idea of annihilation. And, when required, it is easily done, as Plato does it, by the addition of a few defining words.

The teaching of the Old Testament occupies only a small place in my exposition of the future punishment of sin, not for want of authority, but because we find there so little which adds to the

plain and abundant teaching of the New Testament. On the other hand, for the meaning of the word *eternal* I have frequently quoted the Old Testament because of its frequent use there.

Dr. Petavel asks me to go with him 'one step further.' If he will show me in the Bible words describing the fate of the lost and implying clearly their final extinction, I will go with him. But such words with such clear meaning, I am, after prolonged search, unable to find. There are passages and groups of passages which at first sight seem to teach the extinction of the lost or the ultimate extinction of evil; as there are others which describe their continued suffering without any hint of its cessation. But in neither case do the words of Holy Scripture justify confident assertion. And he who speaks in God's name is bound to go no further than the written Word clearly warrants.

At the same time, I readily admit that the advocates of what they call 'Conditional Immortality' have done good service by exposing the baselessness of the popular doctrine of the intrinsic and endless permanence of the human soul. They have also done good service by demanding a reconsideration of the whole matter; and by protesting against a theory long dominant in the Christian pulpit which, as I believe, goes far beyond the teaching of Holy Scripture.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Bruston on 'The Logia.'¹

PROFESSOR BRUSTON of Toulouse, whose views on the Oxyrhynchus Fragment have been already partially laid before our readers (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, February 1898, p. 221), has published a tractate, which will be a useful addition to the Logia literature. He still maintains his adherence to the view of Abbé Batiffol that the transcription of the text should be in the reverse order of that adopted by Grenfell and Hunt.

This little work is supplemented by a note on

¹ *Les Paroles de Jésus récemment découvertes en Égypte, et Remarques sur le texte du fragment de l'Évangile de Pierre.* Par C. Bruston. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1898.

three passages of the *Gospel of St. Peter*, which, in the opinion of Professor Bruston, have not been correctly given by the editors.

Krüger's 'Nachträge.'²

THIS is a very useful appendix to Professor Krüger's work, *Geschichte d. altchrist. Litteratur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, which forms one of the well-known series, 'Grundriss d. Theol. Wissenschaften.' The voluminous literature and the rapid progress of patristic studies speedily

² *Nachträge zu Geschichte der altchrist. Litteratur.* Von G. Krüger. Edinburgh and London: Williams & Norgate, 1897. Price 9d. net.

make any history of this kind out of date, unless it is supplemented from time to time by such appendices taking note of discussions and results in the same field. It is the object of the author to bring his work thus up to date, taking at the same time the opportunity to introduce a list of *Corrigenda*, and to deal in his preface with criticisms passed upon his original work. As there is no prospect of a second edition meanwhile, possessors of the *Geschichte* will do well to procure the *Nachträge*.

Maryculter.

J. A. SELBIE.

The Works of the Abbé Le Camus.¹

THE Abbé Le Camus is a great traveller as well as a great man. He has travelled over Egypt and the lower half of Palestine, and written the record of it in a handsome volume of five hundred pages. He has also travelled over Northern Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece, and written the record in a handsome volume of five hundred and twenty pages. And he has travelled over the Seven Churches of Asia, and written the record of it in a handsome volume of three hundred and twelve pages.

Of these three volumes, the first two are enriched with illustrations round the margin of every page; the third with numerous illustrations in the text. These illustrations are genuinely Oriental, not fanciful but true. Those in the volume on the Seven Churches are mostly reproductions of photographs. But even the margins of the other volumes, though greater liberty has been taken with them, do much more than embellish the page, they fill the mind with Eastern scenery, and convey as well as anything we have seen, that flavour of Orientalism which is much more difficult to carry away from the Holy Land than a bottle of Jordan water.

The description of the places which Abbé Le Camus visited is well written and easily read. There is enthusiasm and abundance of bold adjective; but there are no raptures of empty exclamation. The scene makes a certain definite

¹ *Voyage aux Pays Bibliques*: (1) Égypte et Basse Palestine; (2) Haute Palestine, Syrie, Asie Mineure, Grèce.—*Les Sept Églises de l'Apocalypse*. Paris: Sanard et Derangeon.

impression, and that impression is conveyed to the reader in well-chosen accurate language. A careful examination further reveals merits that do not lie on the surface. Abbé Le Camus has an extensive knowledge of the literature of his subject, and knows when to turn it to account. Besides that, he has had special privileges granted him,—mainly, it would seem, because of his name and ecclesiastical position,—and he has thus been able on many occasions to pass beyond his predecessors' work, correcting or at least supplementing it.

The books deserve the widest circulation. Nothing but their great size will stand in the way of that. But it is just because of their size that the widest welcome should be offered them. For their space is never wasted. It is the ground they cover, and the enthusiasm with which they cover it, that makes them run to so many imposing pages. We shall keep them beside us constantly; for they are good science to refer to, as well as good literature to read.

Bovon's 'Morale Chrétienne.'²

WITH the second volume of the *Morale Chrétienne*, Professor Jules Bovon completes his *Étude sur L'Œuvre de la Rédemption*. The whole work is divided into three parts, and each part occupies two volumes, which are remarkably uniform in size. The first part is entitled *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, one volume, of 550 pages, describing the Life and Teaching of Jesus; the other, of 604 pages, the Teaching of the Apostles. The second part is the *Dogmatique Chrétienne*, its volumes extending to 550 and 584 pages. The third is the *Morale Chrétienne*. Its size is slightly less, the one volume extending to 438, the other to 464 pages.

The volume before us thus completes the only systematic and adequate study of the Work of Redemption which we have had for many years. It is a credit to the Church in Switzerland, and a gain to the cause of scientific theology all the world over. For Professor Bovon's work possesses the characteristics of the most lasting and progressive study. It is believing and it is liberal. The roots have hold of the unshaken rock, but

² *Morale Chrétienne*. Par Jules Bovon. Lausanne: Georges Bridel et Cie. 8vo, pp. 464. 8 fr.

the branches wave freely in the unfettered air. From beginning to end it is a faithful and unquestionably very able treatise upon biblical theology and what biblical theology leads us to.

This last volume excites the keenest interest for the present of the whole work. For it handles the subjects that are most keenly debated. Dogmatic theology, even biblical theology, has to give place for the moment to Practical Theology. Our theories have been made, we are now concerned to see them go. And on all matters of conduct and life Professor Bovon speaks plainly and with authority. He has studied till he knows; and he neither wastes his own space nor tries our patience. Of course he has his attitude, and it is neither yours nor mine in every feature. But his bias is no tyrant. His book deserves the closest study; the closer and more competent, the better for the book and us.

Among the Periodicals.

'The Logia.'

IN the July number of the *Revue Biblique*, PROFESSOR CERSOY of Lyon has an interesting article on the recently discovered Oxyrhynchus fragment. In the first place, he reiterates the views already expressed by him in the *Université Catholique* of 15th May last regarding the second Logion:—

ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, οὐ μὴ εἴρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον, οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα.

He believes that we have here a translation from an Aramæo-Palestinian original, of which the real sense was, 'If ye fast not the *fast*, ye shall not find the kingdom of God, and if ye "sabbatize" not the sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.' The translator he supposes to have mistaken צום, 'fast,' for עולם, 'world' (or rather in the emphatic state, נומא, עולם), and he would emend τὸν κόσμον accordingly to τὴν νηστείαν. This emendation, he points out, removes the logical and grammatical anomaly of the words ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, and restores the parallelism which is wanting in the Greek text. For parallels to 'fast the fast,' he cites 2 S 12¹⁶ (Heb., Peshitta, Targ. Jon., LXX) and Zec 7⁵ (LXX, Peshitta). In favour of an Aramaic rather than a New Hebrew original he

argues that, at the date to which the Logion belongs, the Hebrew 'olam, 'world,' would have been written with *vaw* quiescent, עולם, between which and צום or נומא there is much less resemblance than between the latter and עולם or נומא.

He then passes to the Logion:—

οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.

The last expression evidently has a meaning which would be more accurately expressed by εἰς τοὺς γνωστοὺς αὐτοῦ. Here again Professor Cersey believes the translator to have had before him one or other of the two Aramaic expressions ידעוהי or ידעוהי (peal and pael participles respectively of ידע, 'know'; but which came to be used as substantives = 'friends,' 'acquaintances'). The translator, through ignorance, will have treated as a simple participle the word he had before him, and given it a corresponding Greek rendering. In this instance Professor Cersey admits that there is no cogent evidence that the original was Aramaic rather than Hebrew, for ידעוהי might play the same rôle as either of the above Aramaic terms. But the primitive text was at least Semitic. A similar doubt, though not to the same extent (see the article in *Rev. Bibl.*) attaches to the original language from which the phrase ποιεῖ θεραπείας, 'works cures,' is translated.

Then comes the famous fifth (Harnack's and Swete's *fourth*) Logion, the first part of which is mutilated, but evidently deals with the presence of Jesus by His spirit with His disciples and with the aid He renders them everywhere. Clemen has taken the words μόνος αὐτῷ as representing the Hebrew לְבַדּוֹ; Cersey points out that they answer equally well to the Aramaic בְּלְחֻדּוֹ (frequent in the Targums); but he does not care to build any argument on this, for the reading αὐτῷ is not certain. The second part of the Logion is the much discussed—

ἐγείρων τὸν λίθον, κακέει ἐύρησεις με,
σχίσον τὸ ξύλον, καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ εἰμί.

The verb ἐγείρειν, it is pointed out, must here mean 'raise' and not 'awake.' There is no warrant for discovering a reminiscence of Hab 2¹⁰, where a woe is pronounced on those who say to the stone, 'Awake!' The prophet is there dealing with idolatry, of which there is no question in the Logion. Cersey cannot assent to the inter-

pretation of Harnack and others, who find in this saying a simple affirmation of the spiritual presence of Jesus with His followers amidst their daily toils, however common and laborious. Why should ἐκεῖ, 'there,' be = μετὰ σοῦ, 'with thee'? There is force, too, in Lock's remark that the arists point to a single act rather than a constant occupation. Cersoy thinks it is impossible to resist the impression that what the saying has in view is the Divine immanence in all natural objects, even the most impenetrable. He finds nothing pantheistic in the notion. What is surprising is to find such a sentiment put into the mouth of Jesus. God, indeed, is everywhere; but Jesus is not everywhere bodily present in an invisible manner; and as to a presence by His spirit, this could not be predicated of irrational objects like wood and stone, unless these had any special consecration, which is not the case in the instance in question. If the saying is authentic, Jesus must have spoken of Himself from the side of His deity, as when He said πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ('Before Abraham came into being, I am'—Jn 8⁵⁸). If this explanation be not satisfactory, one is at liberty to suspect the orthodoxy of the expression as well as that of the second Logion, seeing that the authenticity of neither is by any means established.

But now here again there is a want of parallelism and proportion between what is said of the *stone* and what is said of the *wood*. 'Raise' the one, 'cleave' the other—the Divine presence is found *in the very heart of* the wood, but only *under* the stone. What if in ἔγειρον we have a mistranslation of a Semitic word implying the idea of *penetrating*? What if הָרַצַּב, 'raise,' was misread for הָרַצַּב, 'cut' or 'bore'? Such a mistake, implying a confusion between ה and ח, would be easily explicable. We thus obtain a logical and perfectly symmetrical rendering, 'Cut the stone and there thou wilt find me, cleave the wood and there I am.' In the case of this part of the Logion, the probability, according to Cersoy, is that the original text was Hebrew, not Aramaic. But he is by no means clear that the same thing is true of its first part, which concerns the spiritual presence of Jesus with His followers. The two sayings may have been originally quite unconnected, and may have been brought together by an editor who missed the point of both of them. There is no reason why the first may not have

had an Aramaic source notwithstanding the Hebrew origin of the second.

Such are the simple '*observations*,' as the author modestly calls them, which Professor Cersoy submits to the consideration which their interest and acuteness will certainly procure for them.

Germany and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.

There is one department of theological science in which England has been able to hold its own with Germany, the country to which we have to look for reliable and detailed information on so many subjects. That department is the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Lachmann and Tischendorf are great names, but so are Tregelles and Westcott-Hort. It is generally admitted, indeed, that during recent years and until quite lately, this branch of study has neither excited the interest nor achieved the success in Germany that it has done in England. There are abundant signs, however, that any reproach that may have attached to Germany in this matter will be speedily rolled away. Of those who have contributed to bring about this change none has laboured more assiduously and successfully than PROFESSOR NESTLE of Ulm, whose *Einführung in das Gr. N.T.* (1897) has been already noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (Aug. 1897, p. 505). Amongst the greatest services he has recently rendered, not only to Germany but to the whole Christian world, is the editing of the new edition of the Greek New Testament for the Bible Society of Stuttgart.¹ This, which will probably come to be known as 'Nestle's Greek New Testament,' has been very favourably noticed in several periodicals which we have seen. For instance, there is a eulogistic review of it by A. Wabnitz in the *Rev. de Théologie* for July last, and another by O. Herrigel in the *Evang.-prot. Kirchenblatt*, No. 29/32, 1898. The paper by Herrigel has an independent value of its own, containing as it does an exhaustive and exact account in small compass of the history of editions of the Greek N.T., from the days of the Complutensian Polyglot and of Erasmus down to the publication of Nestle's edition. No better evidence could be found than this paper itself supplies of the growing interest of Germany in N.T. textual criticism. Herrigel naturally devotes

¹ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of June last, pp. 419 f.

a good deal of attention to the question of Cod. D, and the value which Nestle, Blass, and others, in opposition to Westcott-Hort, allow to that manuscript. We may expect a lengthy controversy on this subject; but whatever be the ultimate verdict pronounced by critical experts on the value of the Western text, this may safely be said, that the Stuttgart Bible Society has supplied a sorely felt want, that it has been extremely fortunate in its editor, and if the British and Foreign Bible Society is to serve the interests of N.T. study in the future, she cannot do better than co-operate with her German sister in circulating Dr. Nestle's text. In any case, it is surely not too much to hope that she will no longer continue to circulate the Textus Receptus. A generation hence it will be hard to believe that in the year 1898 the text practically of 1516, with all its *known* defects, was still scattered broadcast as *the* New Testament.

The Four Great Pauline (?) Epistles.

Professor van Manen, whose papers, entitled 'A Wave of Hypercriticism,' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (Feb., March, April 1898), will be remembered by our readers, returns, in the *Th. Tijdschrift* for July, to the subject of the authenticity of Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians. He renews his complaint that the objections of himself and those who hold with him have been simply rejected, not refuted, by the 'best critics' of Germany, and that in England there has been a disposition to assent, without examination, to this unfavourable verdict. Even Clemen's *Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe* (1893) cannot be regarded as a serious attempt at refutation, although van Manen cheerfully admits the ability of Clemen, his more than ordinary acquaintance with the work of Dutch writers, and the generally unexceptionable tone in which he carries on the discussion (van Manen, however, enters a protest against such expressions as 'die *Bestreitung* der paulinischen Briefe' and 'die *Diskreditierung* der vier grossen Paulinen').

In so far as Clemen's work can be called a 'refutation' of the views of the Dutch school (using the latter expression in a sense which none of our readers will misunderstand), there are three propositions which he maintains—(1) the general considerations which are alleged by way of objection to the old representation of the history of

primitive Christianity can be easily explained away; (2) the new view which is recommended to us is inconceivable; (3) the arguments by which the latter is sought to be supported have no point.

1. The only one of the general objections dealt with by Clemen is the allegation that Paulinism, as we become acquainted with it in the four leading Epistles, presents itself as a transformation of the more or the most ancient Christian system that preceded it, as the fruit in any case of earnest and long-continued reflexion, so that we cannot think of it as arising only a few years after the crucifixion of Jesus. All that Clemen offers by way of answer to this objection is to point out that the objectors are blind to the fact which every day becomes clearer, that primitive Christianity contained within it the germs of its subsequent development, and that Paulinism itself only gradually developed to the degree which we encounter in the four leading Epistles. But van Manen, even if prepared to admit this, would not feel his position in the least damaged. We must refer the reader to the *Th. Tijdschrift*, where Clemen is charged with failing to see where the shoe pinches, as well as with ignoring what van Manen considers to be a very important contribution to the discussion by Blom.

2. Clemen maintains that the view taken by van Manen and others of the course of events that followed the crucifixion of Jesus is inconceivable. These views are alleged to have been, some of them, retracted by the writers themselves, while some are not seriously meant and *per se* are more than improbable. So be it, says van Manen, what bearing has this upon the main question of the authenticity of the leading Epistles? The new view has at least this advantage over the old, that it gives time and space for the development which even Clemen partly acknowledges to have taken place in primitive Christian faith and life and thought.

3. Finally, the summary handling which Clemen accords to individual objections is found by van Manen to be very inadequate; and he still desiderates a really thorough scientific examination of objections which are offered in no capricious but in a purely scientific spirit.

The 'Theologischer Jahresbericht.'

The first *Abtheilung* of the current issue of this extremely valuable publication appeared not long

ago. Its subject is 'Exegese,' and it embraces the literature in that department for the year 1897.

'Exegese' is a wide term, embracing not only commentaries and similar helps for the study of the books of Scripture, but works in Grammar, Lexicography, Textual Criticism, Archæology, Geography, etc. etc. It is almost incredible how exhaustive and careful the work is. Far from being a mere catalogue of books, the *Jahresbericht* always contrives to give the reader a correct notion of the contents and aim of the latter. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES appears very frequently in its pages, not one of the contributions of scholars like Cheyne, Driver, Baudissin, Jensen, Hommel,

Nestle, König, etc., escaping notice; nay, even papers of far minor importance are not only noticed but their contents summarized. We cannot imagine any more useful guide to the student. The Old Testament Literature is dealt with by Professor Siegfried of Jena, the New Testament by Professor Holtzmann of Strassburg, than which no names could command greater confidence. The *Theologischer Jahresbericht* is published by Messrs. Schwetschke & Sohn, Berlin and Braunschweig, and in our own country by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, London and Edinburgh.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

The Lord's Supper under a New or an Old Aspect.

BY THE REV. E. P. BOYS-SMITH, M.A., HORDLE VICARAGE, LYMINGTON.

THE sacrament of the Lord's Supper as Jesus appointed it was a transfigured Paschal Feast; that is to say, the Passover was its starting-point. For the Paschal meal just ended was its occasion; or, if any deny that this was the actual Paschal Feast, it will be conceded that the occasion was a supper eaten in lieu of it. The Lord's words treating the bread as His body and the wine as the blood of the new covenant, are plain allusions to the Paschal sacrifice. And that the first disciples understood Him so is proved by the language they held. To cite two examples, by St. John's quotation of the Paschal law in connexion with the crucifixion, 'A bone of it shall not be broken,'¹ and by St. Paul's appeal, 'Our Passover hath been sacrificed, even Christ, wherefore let us keep the Feast.'² This then is beyond dispute, and the primary associations by which the Christian sacrament is connected with older Hebrew rites must undoubtedly be considered those which link it with the Passover.

But are these the only associations which connect it with the earlier religious usages of Israel? It may well be that while the leading thought in the Master's mind as He gave the form to that act of communion which He provided for His followers was this, there were other ideas associated with ancient religious practice which He meant to

embody also. If so, even though they were subordinate, to recognize them is to enrich the Christian ordinance with a fuller significance. The object of the present paper is to point out such a group of associations with the past. If their presence in Jesus' thoughts that night of institution cannot be proved, may it not, at least, be deemed probable?

Scattered among the prophetic writings of the Old Testament are several allusions showing that in Israel, as in so many other races, men were accustomed to make 'offerings for the dead.' In some religious cults these offerings have obtained the greatest prominence; e.g. among the ancient Egyptians,³ who laid the utmost stress upon the piety of children who brought such sacrifices to their deceased parents, it was so; among the Chinese it is so still; and the customary libations which the Romans made before the Lares and Penates afford further familiar illustration. In Israel, however, these offerings acquired no such leading importance. Owing to their general likeness to practices followed by the heathen, to their liability to superstitious abuse, and to the obliteration of ancient ideas in later times they were not regulated but discouraged by the fully developed law. But the references made to them by the prophets are enough to show they were commonly

¹ Jn 19³⁶ (Ex 12⁴⁶).

² I Co 5⁷.

³ Cf. Page Renouf's 'Hibbert Lectures,' p. 132.