belief seems to quicken and elevate. The whole doctrine of the resurrection seems brought home to us with a more vivid reality. If there is a first resurrection, if holy companies of saintly believers are now clustering round the risen Lord, if each revolving Easter Day the mystic number of the elect is approaching nearer and nearer to its accomplishment, what hope and what refreshment seems ministered to the soul when we try, however feebly, to realize the holy mysteries of Easter-tide and all that flows forth from the resurrection of the Lord.

Only too often, when we try to meditate on such subjects, the cold feeling enters the soul that all is so far off, so undefined, that it must be practically better for us to turn our thoughts to our own daily needs and duties, and leave unnoticed subjects which he may think can never exercise any influence on Christian life or the homely details of Christian duty.

But when we so think and act we spiritually suffer in two ways. In the first place we never obtain any true perspective of the life after death, or of the true meaning of union with Christ not only here but hereafter. Every Easter brings home to us that if we have in any sense died with Christ, as regards the world and its ways, we must rise with Him; and that if we be risen with Him we must seek those things that are above, and strive more and more to realize not His resurrection only, but all its consequences. Amid those consequences what the Apostle Paul speaks of as 'our gathering together unto Him' must certainly hold a place, and further, the daily increasing belief that the blessed flowering time of the Church may be nearer to us than we may think,—far nearer, nay, may have actually begun.

But we spiritually suffer also when we put such subjects out of our thoughts, in another and perhaps a more serious manner. We lose the lifting power on the soul which these higher thoughts never fail to supply. Does not the thought of a first resurrection awaken some spark of hope on our part that, this life ended, we may be among those who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth? At first it may be felt to be a hope that in the circumstances of the mass of us never, never can be realized. And yet when that hope enters into the higher prayers of the soul, and those prayers bring about the mystic changes which from time to time show themselves in the whole inner life, who shall dare to say that the love of Christ may not, in this one and in that one, have transmuted the whole being, and changed the humble, hoping worshipper into a son of the first resurrection.

Our thoughts have led us far upwards. Let us now close them with that glorious petition of our Burial Service—that it may please Thee, our Saviour and our God, shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Saul—Paul.

(Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 1895.)

In Ac 13^9 the Apostle who has hitherto been called Saul (Σαῦλος) is suddenly called Paul (Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος), a name which he ever afterwards keeps. The passage has given rise to the most diverse conjectures. It has even been supposed that the change of name had some sort of connexion with the conversion of the proconsul Sergius Paulus. It should be noted that the Apostle did not change the name; only the historian does so; by the ὁ καί he makes the transition from the use of the one name to the use of the other.

This elliptic καί in the case of double names is a very common usage in the times of the New Testament. In his *Studies on Atticism*, W. Schmid has shown from the papyri and inscriptions how widespread this usage was, giving as a first proof an inscription of Antiochus Epiphanes. 'As Latin in the same way in the case of familiar designations uses *qui et*, we might suspect a Latinism, if the Antiochus-inscription had not made it more probable that the Latin usage is a Græcism.' W. Schmid seems to think

that the earliest cases are to be found in some passages of Ælian and Achilles Tatius. But the usage, probably springing out of popular speech, goes back much earlier. Some codices give the form ὁ καί in 1 Mac $7^{5.\ 12.\ 20ff.}$, $9^{54ff.}$, 2 Mac 14^{3}. But even if these readings are spurious, Josephus supplies several examples. In the *Jewish Antiquities*, besides six passages which have the full form, 'who is also called,' five instances are quoted of the shortened phrase, ὁ καί. In the light of these passages it is easy to see that the meaning in Ac 13^{9} cannot be 'Saul who from now was called Paul.' If this had been the meaning, other language must have been used. The ὁ καί admits only the supposition that Saul bore the name before coming to Cyprus; he had a double name like many natives of Asia Minor, many Jews and Egyptians of his age. When he added the non-Semite to the Semite name, we know not. The regulations of Roman law do not here come into question. In Asia Minor or on the Nile an obscure man might assume any name at pleasure. But one can see that such names were preferred as were similar in sound to the native name (see Col 4^{11}, Ac 1^{23}). Such a resemblance may have had influence in the present case. Some papyrus fragments respecting the Jewish war of Trajan several times mention an Alexandrian Jew called Paul, who seems to have been the leader of a deputation to the emperor.

As to the reason why the change takes place at this point, the conjecture may be permitted that the historian uses one or the other name according as the field of labour referred to is Jewish or Gentile. From the date of Ac 13^{1} the Jewish disciple is the universal Apostle. It is high time that he should be presented to the Greeks no longer under a barbaric name, but under that which he himself as an Apostle alone bore. Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, only as such perhaps did many of his brethren of the same race understand him; from his own confessions we know that previously he was Παῦλος ὁ καὶ Σαῦλος, a man who laboured for the future and for humanity, although as a son of Benjamin and a contemporary of the Cæsars. Christians afterwards would often have fain called him Saul only; but on this account the name Paul only stands in the history above the narrow gate, through which Augustin and Luther passed.'

J. S. Banks.

Headingley College, Leeds.

Among the Periodicals.

The Roman Catholic Church and Pentateuchal Criticism.

In the preface to the sixth edition of his *Introduction*, Dr. Driver shows how, during the last few years, 'the truth that critical conclusions are not really in conflict with the claims and truths of Christianity has been widely recognized.' A new illustration of this is supplied by an article entitled *Les Sources du Pentateuque*, contributed by Père Lagrange to the January number of the *Revue Biblique Internationale*. The last-named publication, which appears quarterly in Paris under the auspices of the Dominican Convent of St. Stephen of Jerusalem, is one of the most ably conducted and informing of our theological magazines.

The article before us is practically a plea, powerfully urged, for the legitimacy within the Catholic Church of the methods of historical criticism. Père Lagrange reminds us, with justifiable pride, that the father of pentateuchal criticism, Astruc, was both a Catholic and a Frenchman, and he quotes from the preface to Astruc's *Conjectures* a passage defining the aims of that work, which, he thinks, still expresses well the sentiments of those Catholics who admit 'sources' not only in Genesis, as Astruc did, but throughout the Pentateuch. He next proceeds to show how the Catholic Church, instead of following the course marked out by Astruc, has hitherto abandoned the field of criticism to 'ces prétendus esprits forts,' until the Graf-Wellhausen theory practically reigns without a rival in all Protestant schools of learning. Such protests as are raised by Sayce (*e.g.* in his *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*), whatever applause they may have gained in some quarters, have had not the slightest influence, according to Père Lagrange, on the learned world. Some Catholics may be disposed to stand aside in the hope that extreme conclusions, such as those put forward by Halévy will furnish a *reductio ad absurdum* of the critical method, but to Père Lagrange it appears that the time has come when it is impossible to continue inactive without imperilling souls and alienating from the Church those intellectual forces which are still attached to her. He next proceeds to examine very carefully the main reasons which

have prejudiced or prevented the examination by Catholics of the sources of the Pentateuch.

1. The question of *the editing of the sacred writings*.—Père Lagrange shows admirably the difference between Oriental and Occidental ways in the matter of treating the text of a book, and how the relations of textual and literary criticism are quite different when they have to do with classical works and with the Bible. By an illustration drawn from Gn 47, he exhibits the work of redaction as going on even after the production of the Septuagint version. In the latter we have two narratives of the arrival of Jacob and his family in Egypt, simply placed one after the other, while in the Massoretic text these are combined. Similar phenomena elsewhere suffice to show that it is a mere prejudice to suppose that the sacred writings were once for all drawn up in a form which was ever afterwards produced with the same scrupulous exactitude as the Massoretic text since the second century A.D. We need not follow our author into his examination of the bearing of all this upon the doctrine of Inspiration, etc.

2. Père Lagrange shows the reasonableness of the doctrine of a *legislative evolution*, modifications and supplements being introduced to meet new circumstances as they arose. But what about the formula, 'God said to Moses'? This certainly implies that the law in question is both of Divine and of Mosaic origin. But it may be the latter, not immediately, but mediately. The priests (Dt 17^{11}) were expressly empowered to promulgate a law in the name of God, a law which should be in the spirit of the first legislator, and an expansion of the principles laid down by him. All this is in thorough accord, again, with Oriental ways as illustrated from other quarters than the Bible. Père Lagrange, then, believes firmly that there was a Mosaic legislation and even that the Priests' Code is the normal development of this, but finds no difficulty in accepting of the latter as posterior to Moses both in its redaction and its special theme.

3. *The testimony of the Bible itself* is often supposed to be fatal to the critical conclusions. But first, in regard to the O.T., it is well to note that nowhere is it said that Moses was the author of the whole Pentateuch. It might be argued, rather, that when we read 'J" said to Moses, Write such and such' (Ex 17^{14}), this proves two things: first, that Moses wrote something on that subject; secondly, that he did not write all the rest (cf. Nu 33^{2}, Ex 24^{7}). And even regarding the Book of Deuteronomy, which may seem specially to be claimed for Moses, a candid examination of the evidence, keeping in view what has been already said on the formula 'God said to Moses,' will lead one to rest satisfied with the conclusion that this work contains nothing that is not in complete harmony with the spirit of Mosaism. Again, to cite from the N.T. the supposed testimony of our Lord (*e.g.* Jn $5^{45\text{-}47}$) is quite beside the point. Père Lagrange does not resort to the theory of nescience on the part of Jesus, but he points out that the *personality* of Moses does not enter into the argument of Jn $5^{45\text{ff.}}$ at all, the contrast being simply between the written book and the spoken word.

4. *Tradition*, which has special weight allowed to it in the Roman Catholic Church, appears to throw all its weight into the opposite scale from criticism. But it is not difficult for Père Lagrange to show that there is all the difference in the world between the literary and the historical tradition. To the latter the utmost respect is due, the former is frequently marked by Jewish extravagant imaginings. The one tells us that Moses was the legislator of Israel, and that Mosaism underlies the whole history of the people of God. The other tells us that Moses composed the Pentateuch. It is possible to accept the first while we reject the second. Père Lagrange seeks to show that such a position is covered by the decrees of the Council of Trent, which fixed the canonicity, but avoided the question of the authenticity of the books of Scripture.

5. The *historical value* of the Pentateuch may appear to be destroyed by the conclusions of criticism. But, after all, the date of the redaction of a book matters less than the existence of its sources in written documents dating from a much earlier period. The whole course of discussion at present, as well as the discoveries of archæology, are tending to vindicate the historical value, not only of J and E, but even of P. Not that Père Lagrange is concerned to deny that in the latter there may be much uncertainty in details, and a good deal of idealized history. In the Pentateuch, especially in P, the history is mainly a frame in which the legislation is set. This indeed would be a serious inconvenience if matters

of grave importance were involved, but criticism itself has shown that this is not the case. In minor details, such as chronology, we have to resign ourselves to a measure of uncertainty as inevitable.

Père Lagrange's article, which merits the careful study of all who are interested in the present current of critical opinions, closes with an expression of the firm conviction that the history which will emerge from the distinction of the 'sources' will still be the history of Revelation according to the word of God.

Cornill and Oort on Cheyne's 'Introduction to Isaiah.'

Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES are aware that this work of Professor Cheyne has been translated into German by Pfarrer Böhmer. It forms the subject of a very appreciative notice in the *Theol. Rundschau* (April) by Professor CORNILL, who expresses the opinion that Cheyne's *Introduction* and Duhm's *Commentary* together have done more for the explanation of the Book of Isaiah than anything that has been published since the time of Ewald. This, he thinks, will be admitted even by those who do not fully accept, or who even decidedly reject, the results reached by these two scholars. Cheyne, the pupil of Ewald, and the indefatigable pioneer of biblical science in England, has special claims to recognition in Germany. Cornill complains that acquaintance with the works of English scholarship is sadly lacking on the part of his countrymen. This he attributes partly to insufficient familiarity with the language, and partly to 'the enormous cost of English books due to their splendid get-up, which makes it impossible even for libraries to procure them to the extent that is desirable and necessary.' Hence he welcomes this translation which will no longer permit a work like Cheyne's *Introduction* to be overlooked in Germany, as it has been overlooked by Brückner, who actually, in a book on the *Komposition des Buches Jesaja Kap.* 28–33, never once refers to Cheyne's work!

In the *Th. Tijdschrift* (May) Professor Oort takes occasion, from the appearance of Böhmer's translation, to express his concurrence with the very high estimate formed of the *Introduction* by the late Professor Kosters (see *Th. Tijdschrift*, November 1896, pp. 577 ff.).

Cyrus and Deutero-Isaiah.

This is the title of an article in the current number of *ZATW* by Professor KITTEL. Its starting-point is the remarkable resemblance (amounting sometimes to identity of expression) between the clay-cylinder of Cyrus and Deutero-Isaiah, particularly $45^{1ff.}$ of the latter. Accidental coincidence being out of the question, it appears at first as if we were shut up to one of two alternatives,—either Cyrus was acquainted with the words of Deutero-Isaiah and imitated these on his cylinder, or the author of Is $45^{1ff.}$ knew the cylinder and had regard to its contents.

Upon close examination, however, Kittel finds that neither of these alternatives is credible. As to the first, we see from the cylinder how Cyrus studied to gain the favour of the hitherto dominant race, and we can understand his recognition of, and professed reverence for, the Babylonian gods Marduk, Bel, and Nebo; but why should he have paid to the already subjugated Jews the extraordinary compliment of clothing the narrative of his exploits in the language of a Jewish seer? It is no answer to say that Cyrus did in point of fact show marked favour to the Jews in permitting them to return to their own land, for we now know that the privilege accorded to them was not exceptional but part of the general policy of Cyrus. Further, the worship of Jahweh by Cyrus, once believed in, has not stood the test of historical inquiry.

As to the second of the above alternatives, Kittel, as the result of a careful examination, finds no reason to deny that Is $45^{1ff.}$ is an original constituent of chaps. 40–48, and that as such it was written prior to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. Such language prior to B.C. 539–538 is at once intelligible and practical in its aim, subsequent to that date it could serve no object but to minister to Jewish vanity.

But a third hypothesis is possible, and this, according to Kittel, accounts for the phenomenon in question. The author of Deutero-Isaiah and Cyrus have drawn from a common source the language in vogue at the court of Babylon, which delighted to describe the king as called by the gods to empire, etc. All the characteristic expressions which Is $45^{1ff.}$ and the cylinder have in common, are such as can be proved to have been current then, and such as must have con-

sequently been familiar to a resident in Babylonia, as Kittel considers it practically certain the author of Is 45 was.

The Syro-Phœnician Woman.

The story of our Lord's treatment of this woman's application raises difficulties which have seldom if ever been met in a thoroughly satisfactory way. The explanation needs only to be stated in order to be rejected, that Jesus spoke to her as He did 'in a moment of fatigue and irritation,' and that the woman of Canaan taught Him a lesson of wide sympathy and of charity (Pécaut and Réville)! But Professor BRUSTON, who writes on the subject in *La Vie Nouvelle* of 15th January last, finds the favourite explanation, 'that Jesus so spoke in order to try her faith,' inadequate. True, her faith was tried, and it came through the ordeal so marvellously, that Jesus exclaimed, 'O woman, great is thy faith!' But, according to Bruston, the key to the understanding of the narrative is found in the spiritual condition of the *disciples* and the intention of Jesus to teach *them* a lesson in breadth of views and charity. In fact, it was an acted parable, Jesus in His treatment of the woman assuming for the moment the character of the disciples with their Jewish prejudices and exclusiveness, in order that seeing the evil of this disposition when *exhibited by another* they might be shamed into better feelings and prepared for a mission wider than one to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. The Canaanite woman must have been startled, indeed, by Jesus' language about taking the children's bread and casting it to the dogs, but we may believe that the words were accompanied by a look which reassured her and robbed them of their sting. And her reply would convince the disciples that a despised pagan might have a faith as real as their own; and be as worthy as themselves to enter the kingdom founded by the Messiah.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

Immortality: One Step Further.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PROFESSOR J. AGAR BEET, D.D.

BY THE REV. E. PETAVEL, D.D., GENEVA.

LOCARNO, SWITZERLAND,
8th February 1898.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—Having carefully read your valuable book on *The Last Things*,[1] I will now submit to you my remarks, as kindly suggested by yourself.

I must begin by expressing the great pleasure I have had in finding so many points on which we are in agreement. I have admired the charitable efforts you have made in order to state fairly the views of your opponents, and I rejoice over the results which you have reached by your conscientious scholarship; they are not very different from the conclusions to which I have been led by a lifelong research.

My observations will be in answer to a question of yours. In a note, dated 8th December, you say: 'I simply teach that the future punishment of the finally impenitent is utter and final ruin, and refuse to make any assertion about their condition. Is it needful to try to go further?'

My frank reply is in the affirmative. On both biblical and rational grounds, I think, and I hope to show you that it is 'needful'; that you are logically bound to advance *one step further*.

But before attacking your present standpoint, I must attempt to defend my book — *The Problem of Immortality* — against a criticism of yours. After an honourable mention of it, for which I feel grateful, you represent me as having 'mixed together and identified two distinct issues, namely, the essential immortality of the soul and the ultimate extinction of the lost, and accepted as proof of the latter every disproof of the former' (*The Last Things*, p. 304). I observe that you do not support this statement by any quotation; and that if you will take the trouble of

[1] London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1897.