

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

the early Church stands out more and more prominently as the best and the chief and the sufficient authority for the original facts. Such must be the historian's judgment.

We notice that Justin uses the same word as Paul about the transmission of the record: the Apostles *παρέδωκαν*, 'handed on the record that an order was given to them.' Similarly, Paul says *παρέδωκα ὑμῖν*, 'I have handed on the record to you Corinthians.' The trustworthiness of the tradition originating from historical facts and from the words and actions of the Lord is assumed by both writers as the fundamental truth in this matter.

It should not be left out of notice that Justin knew the Rite to be celebrated with the mixed Cup, water and wine (just as Avircius Marcellus in his epitaph, about thirty years later than Justin's death, mentions the *κέρασμα μετ' ἄρτου*). We cannot, on the principles which guide this investigation, doubt that such was the original form and the fact of the Last Supper; but this is probably to be attributed not to any mystic or hieratic intention, but to the regular and usual custom of the time. The Last Supper was an ordinary meal, which became epoch-making in its consequences and accompaniments; it was served in the customary fashion, with wine after the food had been eaten: this wine was mixed with water, because that was the invariable usage (except among persons who intended to become excited and intoxicated).

Now, according to the fashion which we see acting so effectively in the records, namely, that a series of associated acts might be briefly summed

up by mentioning any one of them (as, for example, the Sacrament might be called either the Breaking of the Bread, which is usual, or, for some special reason on a special occasion, the Cup), it was evidently quite possible and natural that the mixed cup of the Rite might be called either the Wine or the Water, or the mixture. Justin exemplifies all these ways of speaking: he calls it first *ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος*, where the water is most prominently mentioned, and the wine is implied (but not expressly mentioned) in *κράματος*: later he speaks of it as *οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος*, where the wine is most prominent: later he calls it in quotation simply *ποτήριον*: finally, where he asserts that the Rite has been imitated in the Mithraic religion, he speaks of *ποτήριον ὕδατος* alone, because the Mithraic rite was celebrated with water only, and yet Justin regarded this as mimicry of the Christian Rite.

It is necessary, therefore, to avoid laying any stress on occasions where water alone is mentioned, or wine alone, as if the early Rite was celebrated with either liquid singly. Doubtless there would have been no difficulty felt in celebrating the Rite with one alone, if the other were not easily procurable: the early Church laid no stress on such petty details, it was the spirit and the general effect, not the material, that was important. But the proper and original form was the mixed Cup; and it is wrong to attempt to press and force testimony into conformity with any theory as to the superior importance of one element in the Cup. This consideration would modify some modern theories on the subject.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Old Testament.

1. *Précis de Linguistique Sémitique*. This is a translation into French of Professor Brockelmann's *Semitische Sprachwissenschaft*, which was published in 1906. The translation has been made by W. MARÇAIS, Directeur de la Médersa d'Alger, et M. COHEN, Agrégé de l'Université de Paris (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1910).

2. *Verbesserungen zu Mandelkerns Grosser Konkordanz*. Mandelkern's Hebrew Concordance is

a great book. But every concordance contains mistakes, and it is known that Mandelkern's has its share of them. Here is a supplementary volume to lie beside it. Professor Dr. Sven Herner has corrected more than four thousand mistakes (Lund: Hjalmar Möller).

3. *Les Livres de Samuel*. It is surely interesting to learn that a Commentary on the Books of Samuel has been written in Jerusalem. The author, Père Paul Dhorme, is a professor in the École biblique de Saint-Étienne in Jerusalem.

And it is no mean commentary. It contains, first of all, a new translation of the books, a scholar's translation done into idiomatic French, and depending on a thorough knowledge of the difficulties of the text of Samuel and what has been done to resolve them. It contains, next, introductions and a critical apparatus. And, finally, it contains very full notes on the Hebrew text, the most original part of which is the use that is made of Palestinian exploration. But there is scarcely a writer on the Books of Samuel in any department of study, or in any language, that has escaped the notice of this able expositor (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1910).

4. *Die Esra-Apokalypse*. This is the title which Dr. Bruno Violet has given to his edition of 2 Esdras. If such a distinctive title could be generally adopted it would be a considerable gain. At present the book is sometimes called 2 Esdras, the title used in the Apocrypha of the Revised Version; sometimes 3 Esdras, as in the Septuagint; and sometimes 4 Esdras, as in the Vulgate.

Dr. Violet's edition, which belongs to the famous series entitled *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, will certainly

be accepted, when it is complete, as the standard edition of the book. As yet only the first volume has been published, containing the Latin text and, in parallel columns, the translation into German of all the other texts—Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic (both editions), except the Armenian, which is given in Latin. The introduction to this volume contains an account of the various texts. It is minute and reliable. But this important book must be dealt with at greater length when the second volume appears (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910. M.17.50).

5. *Conférences de Saint-Étienne*. Under this title have been published seven essays of an archæological kind, all written by the professors of the Biblical School of St. Etienne in Jerusalem. The first essay is on Babylonian Origins, by Père Dhorme. In the second Père Lagrange gives an account of the Greek Papyri. The third is an essay on Hebrew Measures in the time of the Gospels. Then come two geographical articles, the first on the Sea of Galilee, the second on Mamre. The last two belong to the history of the Church, the one dealing with the biography of Porphyry, the other with a Patriarch of Jerusalem (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1910. Fr.3.50).

Entre Nous.

Skinner's 'Genesis.'

The publication of Skinner's *Genesis* delivers the season of 1909 to 1910 from the charge of mediocrity which has been brought against it. It is a book of amazing learning and as amazing pulpit value. It will increase the reputation of the 'International Critical Commentaries,' a series whose reputation, won by books like Driver's *Deuteronomy*, Allen's *Matthew*, Plummer's *Luke*, and Sanday's *Romans*, is already higher far than that of any series of commentaries in English.

Before going to press we have received another volume of the 'International Critical Commentary.' It is the volume on *The Books of Chronicles*. The Editors are Professor E. L. Curtis of Yale, and Dr. A. A. Madsen of New York.

1 Corinthians vii. 8.

The sentence, 'It is better to marry than to burn' (so in all three common versions, *i.e.* King

James's, British, and American Revisions), is an extremely unfortunate translation. For while it is a literal translation of Paul's words, yet the word 'burn' has been generally assumed to mean something that was not in Paul's thought. The word he used did *not* mean what this English word 'burn' has been assumed to mean in this place.

The Greek word used here, under our English word 'burn,' is quoted by Thayer, in his *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, as being used six times in the New Testament, three times in the Apocrypha, and five specified times in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament; and these he indicates as its only occurrences. Its root meaning is 'to burn with fire, to set on fire, to kindle.'

In these fourteen instances its meaning and usage is as follows: once for 'literal burning,' 2 P 3¹²; once 'filled with fire,' Eph 6¹⁶; seven