

earnestly and doubtless sincerely desires, they must know whether they are to accept Mr. Constable's dictum, that 'by having a soul, or being a living soul, in the case of man, the very same thing is meant as in the case of the lower creatures.' Or again, in other words, 'we affirm that the soul of man is nothing more or less than that animal life which he shares in common with the beasts.' It will, moreover, certainly be necessary to decide which is right—for they are diametric contradictions—for the assertions of the Constable school that 'death is the annihilation of man, his hopes, his thoughts, his life, himself,' so that after death the state of man is 'one of loss of all existence, both of soul and body'; and during the intermediate state 'the soul of every man has no existence'—or the emphatic denial of all this in chap. xxi. of Mr. White's book, summarized as it is in his own conclusion that 'the general doctrine of the Bible, that a spirit survives in man's death, seems to outlast all the attacks of its opponents.' When this is settled, we shall be in a position to estimate the logical consequences of either doctrine as regards ultimate annihilation.

To know Mr. White was to revere him; nor can anyone read the concluding sentences of Dr. Petavel's 'open letter' without being touched by the tender sincerity which glows in every line. But in our present state of being, at all events, neither sincerity nor zeal can ever be the test of truth. Some of the most mischievous mistakes and deadly errors in all religion and philosophy have been sincere. And when we read our venerable friend's avowal, that those who believe in human immortality

'seem to forget that Christ has called Himself the Bread of Life, the Water of Life, which are symbols not of enjoyment, or even of holiness, but of ontological maintenance and support,' we can but marvel that it should be possible to one so able and so good, to come contentedly to a conclusion which, the New Testament being its own witness, reduces the promise of present, fullest, and highest life to mere prolongation of future existence, eviscerates the doctrine of Christian holiness, puts man—whom even the Old Covenant declares to be 'little less than God'—on a level with the beast, and instead of relieving the dark mysteries of eschatology, makes them lurid and even ghastly with anticipations of Divine wantonness and despair worse than mediæval travesties.

We agree with Dr. Petavel that a 'reformed eschatology' is urgently needed for a more successful advocacy of the Christian faith, but as to Conditionalism—*non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis*. Many, many steps, and those retrogressive, will have to be taken before the Christian world will be brought into line with those who, though moved by the best intentions, would jettison the dignity of manhood, contemning its deepest and highest instincts; would belittle the character of God; and make the creation of our race to have been only a Divine mistake, which redemption vainly endeavoured to retrieve. Our Conditionalist friends, therefore, must forgive us if, while we 'bear them witness that they have a zeal for God,' we add that it is 'not according to knowledge,' and decline to take even 'one step' in such downgrade direction.

Requests and Replies.

I have read with interest, in the last number of *The Expository Times*, Professor Hommel's article on the newly published list of early Babylonian kings, and his vindication of the biblical chronology, which he connects with it. I am at a loss, however, how to reconcile his view with a statement of Professor Sayce's in *The Expository Times* for January, p. 172. According to Professor Hommel, the Pharaoh of the Exodus was Amenophis II. (c. 1461-1436 B.C.); according to Professor Sayce, the question 'has been set at rest by Dr. Naville's excavations on the site of Pithom,' that Ramses II. (1324-1258 B.C.) was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, which would make his successor, Merenptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Thus in the date which they assign to the Exodus, these two authorities differ by just two centuries; and a question which one affirms to have been 'set at rest' by the progress of

archæology, is by the other declared to be still perfectly open. Can any of your readers tell me how I may reconcile these apparently contradictory opinions?—INQUIRER.

The following is Principal Rainy's reply (published with his permission) to a private request of an old pupil for guidance towards the best literature on the Lord's Supper:—

FOR the patristic and mediæval views, which are not perhaps essential to your object, but with which still one should be acquainted, I don't know that one need go beyond Gieseler, who is reliable. But I understand you want to keep to the Reformation and post-Reformation discussions. For what precedes that, Baur's *Dogmengeschichte* may be

added to Gieseler if it falls in your way (Posthumous, 4 vols.).

The fundamental history for the later time is Hospinian's *Historia Sacramentaria*. It is old-fashioned, but quite worth consulting. Naturally, he leans to favouring his own side, but, I believe, is honest in the main. You get there the whole *detail* down to the end of the sixteenth century.

For the Roman view, the *Decrees of the Council of Trent* and the *Catechismus Romanus* are authoritative. The decree of the great Lateran on transubstantiation you have in Hospinian.

You ought to have, in addition, if you wish to go deep into it, some weighty Romish controversialist; for this reason, that you get there correctly the shades of view of different Romanists on points not decided authoritatively, and also the prevalent opinion of their theologians. For that reason, instead of Bellarmine, or any writer of that date, it is better to have a trustworthy modern. I find Perrone's *Prelectiones* very useful, the rather that they are primarily intended for their own students.

For the Lutheran view, any collection of the Lutheran symbolical books: Tittmann, Hase, or Meyer. Their view is set forth at much length in the *Formula Concordiæ* and in the *Epitome*. I should recommend also *Luther's Theologie*, by Köstlin. He is a fair-minded man. A brief statement, dogmatically, for the purposes of theological instruction, may be found in a hundred books. Leonard Hutter's *Compendium Locorum Theologicorum* could be got, I should think, for one shilling. Hase's remarkable *Hutterus Redivivus* would cost perhaps two shillings.

The most convenient place in which to find Zwingli's own words is the *Collection of Reformed Confessions*; but I don't think there is anything there very detailed about the Lord's Supper. Christoffel's *Life* (translated) can be got from the libraries. Of course all Zwingli's treatises are in his collected works, but that is cumbersome. You get much of him in Hospinian.

In Niemeyer's *Collection of Reformed Confessions* you have the 'Consensus Tigurinus,' which represents Calvin's view as acceded to by the divines of Zurich. It is a very good statement of what Calvin's followers then saw their way to. It hardly represents sharply enough Calvin's

personal way of thinking on the subject. For that, besides the *Institutio*, you should consult the tract 'De Coena Domini,' in the eighth volume, I think, of the Amsterdam edition of his works. That will prepare you for Cunningham's article, which of course you know, in *Reformers and Theology of the Reformation*.

As regards the Church of England, there have been floods of books, many of them most unhelpful. I should say it might be wisest to begin with Waterland's *Review of Opinions*, and then Goode's *Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist*; after that you can decide whether it is necessary to go any further. What Hooker says in the *Ecl. Polity*, bk. v., ought to be read. Of decidedly advanced books, I suppose Pusey's *Doctrine of the Real Presence* and R. I. Wilberforce's *Doctrine of the Eucharist* are as representative as any.

ROBERT RAINY.

Edinburgh.

The Massoretical note at the end of the Minor Prophets (as published by S. Baer, 1878, p. 102) states—

Anni libri sunt trecenti et viginti septem anni, ab *Usia* rege ad annum quo venit *Alexander*.

Five years ago (*Materialien*, 1893, p. 23) I called it strange that none of the Introductions to the Old Testament mentions this statement or gives an explanation of it. Nor have I yet got any fresh light in the meantime. May I now ask through the columns of *The Expository Times*—

How old is this statement?

How is it to be understood?

Are there any traces, besides, that the time of Malachi was fixed as late as Alexander?

How is it possible to reckon from *Usia* (his first or last year) up to Alexander 327 years? Must the figure be changed, or do we have here another example of incorrect computation? comp. Bevan on Daniel ix. (p. 148). The question is not indifferent, just because of the seventy weeks of Daniel.

Where can I find any light on this curious statement?—EB. NESTLE.

It was not in 1878 that this Massoretic note was first published anew, for it may be read also in the Grammatico-Massoretic Compendium issued in the year 1871 by Joseph Derenbourg under the title *Manuel du lecteur*. The note is given on p. 135. It also appears after 1878 in the *Dikdûkê*

ha-tē'amîm (ediderunt Baer et Strack, 1879), § 70. Here it runs—

ספר הושע בן בארי הוא ספר שנים עשר
נביאים שלש מאות ועשרים ושבע שנים
מן עויהו המלך עד השנה שבא אלכסנדר
עד כאן נתנבאו הנביאים בבית שני בימי
: דרייש וארתחשסתא ובטלה הנבואה :

Accordingly, this statement was long familiar to me, and in my *Einleitung* (p. 459) may be found the words 'in dem interessanten § 70 von *Dikdûkê*, etc. (Jahre der alttestamentlichen Bücher).' But the full terms of this section could not be added to the numerous Massoretic and Rabbinical materials contained in my *Einleitung*. The words just quoted were supposed to be sufficient for the O.T. student, and there are many similar hints in my book, which, extremely full as it is, had to be kept from swelling beyond due bounds. The question of Dr. Nestle now gives me the opportunity to discuss in more detail the above tradition.

1. The age of the statement can, in my opinion, be determined only indirectly and merely approximately. It is found neither in the Talmud nor in the Midrashîm, and one does not meet with it in Jul. Fürst's work, *Der Kanon des A.T. nach den Uebertieferungen im Talmud und Midrasch*. One might, indeed, suppose that the same statement occurred in *Seder 'olam rabba*, cap. 30, because Baer remarks on the words *השנה שבא אלכסנדר*, 'so also in *Seder 'olam rabba*, cap. 30.' (This work is attributed, although upon uncertain grounds, to Jose bar Chalephta, the teacher of Judah the Holy, the redactor of the Mishna.) But the words of *Seder o. r.* (ed. Meyer, p. 90) neither contain anything regarding the 327 years, nor have they in view the book of the Twelve Prophets, but, as is expressly added, refer to 'והצפיר השעיר ונ', i.e. to Dn 8²¹ 11³⁵. Hence the note of *Seder o. r.* is not substantially identical with the questionable statement of the Massoretic. But the note which is read, as we have seen, in § 70 of *Dikdûkê ha-tē'amîm* and elsewhere, stands in the well-known Codex prophetarum Babylonicus Petropolitanus (written in the years 1008-1010 A.D.; cf. *Dikdûkê*, p. xxiv f.), fol. 465. Whether other sources, from which Baer and Strack have derived the statement, date from an earlier period, cannot be determined with certainty.

2. What is the meaning of the words? It is

very natural to ask, first of all, in what sense were they understood formerly? But in the helps accessible to me, I find no mention of the 327 years. They are absent alike in *Seder 'olam rabba* and *Seder 'olam zuta* (written c. 800 A.D. [?]). It may be noted that זוטא, 'parvus = minor,' is generally transcribed *zuta* [Buxtorf, זוטא], but Dalman [*Aram.-Neuheb. Wörterb.* 1897, s.v.] points זוטא, *zota*). Nor does Joh. Meyer in his copious notes on these two works (pp. 121-1144) mention those 327 years. Hence I had almost despaired of a solution of the question, when I discovered that in *Seder 'olam zuta* it is said regarding Uzziah that he began to reign in the year 3115 after the creation of the world (ed. Meyer, p. 104: *החיל למלוך שנה* (ג' אלפי' ק"מו). Further, on p. 108 it is related that 'in the 18th (ח') year of the rulers of the Medes, which is the 70th year after the destruction of the temple (586-516), Ezra the scribe and other exiles with him journeyed to Jerusalem, and he built the wall of Jerusalem and set up (והכין) the house of the sanctuary (? 516), and Zerubbabel returned (והזר) to Babylon and died there, and after him there rose up his son Meshullam, and in his days began the dominion of the Greeks, (namely) in the year 52 (נ"ב) of the Medes and Persians, which is the year 3442 since the creation of the world, and there died Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.' (The activity of these three prophets is assigned to the same period also in the words, 'Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi prophesied in the second year of Darius' [*Seder o. r.*, ch. 20, ed. Meyer, p. 55].) Now, if one counts from 3115 to 3442, one obtains the 327 years of the Massoretic note we are discussing.

The correctness of this solution of the question is confirmed by the circumstance that not only in § 70 of *Dikdûkê*, but also in *Seder 'olam zuta*, after the words cited above, reference is made to the *cessation of prophecy*, and immediately thereafter comes the sentence, 'Alexander the Macedonian, the king of Greece, reigned 12 years (אלכסנדרוס) (מוקדון מלך יון מלך י"ב שנה Meshullam, the son of Zerubbabel.'

3. From the above it is clear (a) that the duration of the Persian Empire was contracted to a period of 52 years, and (b) that Malachi was placed at a point of time near to Alexander.

(a) The first point comes out no less clearly in the following passages: the three kings announced to the Persians in Dn 11² are in *Seder o. r.* (ch. 28,

p. 84) identified with Cyrus, Ahasuerus, and Darius (שלשה ו' זה כורש ואחשורוש ודריוש). Further, it is remarked that the Persian dominion 'in the presence of the temple' comprised 34 years (*Seder o. r.*, ch. 30, p. 91: מלכות פרס בפני הבית שלשים (ח' שנה). Hence in the words, 'the sum of the years of the kings of Persia and Media is 250 years' (ch. 30), Meyer (pp. 89, 1142) rightly recognizes a typographical error (חמשים ומאתים) instead of (ח' ושנים). He might, it appears to me, have reached this conclusion simply from the arrangement of the words.

(b) Other 'traces that the time of Malachi was fixed as late as Alexander' have not been found by me in the more recent works (the *Einleitungen* of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hävernick, *et al.*, the Commentaries, etc.). But L. Cappellus was of opinion that Malachi prophesied after the 22nd year of Artaxerxes Mnemon (405-361 B.C.), and before the 1st year of Ptolemy Euergetes (246-221) [*Opera posthuma*, p. 178; Wähner, *Antiquitates Ebræorum*, i. p. 65]. Further, Joh. Meyer (p. 1085) remarks, 'Malachiam nonnulli putant haud diu ante Christum floruisse.' This rests, of course, upon the supposition that the prediction, 'the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple' (Mal 3¹) must have been uttered not long before the advent of Christ. But Meyer has already rightly opposed this late date for Malachi in the words, 'quod verisimile non videtur, quia tempore Maccabæorum destituti erant prophetis (1 Mac 4⁴⁶ 9²⁷ 14⁴¹).'

4. Such a contraction of a longer period might happen all the more readily, the less information there was regarding it (cf. Chwolson, *Corpus inscr. Heb.*, col. 486). In the same way the years 701-681 are in Tob 1¹⁸⁻²¹ contracted to πενήκοντα (*var. lect. τεσσαράκοντα*) ἡμέραι (cf. Fritzsche, *Libri apocr. pp.* 110, 113). Compare also Ex 12⁴⁰ (according to which the Hebrews sojourned 430 years in Egypt) with Gal 3¹⁷ (according to which they were 430 years in Canaan and Egypt). It is self-evident that this characteristic of the chronological knowledge of the Jews helps to explain the Book of Daniel, and especially the 70 sevens (less properly 'weeks') of years (cf. regarding the internal value of this external uncertainty of the data of the Book of Daniel, my *Einleitung*, p. 390). Moreover, I have been for long struck with the circumstance that alongside of the plur. *shābū'ōth* (Ex 34²², Nu 28²⁶, Dt 16^{9f. 16}, Jer 5²⁴, Ezk 45²¹, 2 Ch 8¹³ [all]) the form *shābū'im* is found only in the Book of Daniel, 6 times (9^{24. 25a. b. 26} 10^{2b. 3b}), and that it is always written without ו. Hence for many years I have cherished the notion that this plural form has a double source in the author's circle of ideas. In the first place, this orthography is intended to prevent *literal* weeks being thought of. Secondly, the constant form שבעים is meant to indicate that these *shābū'im* represent simply an amplified form of the round number שבעים (*shib'im*, 'seventy') of Jer 25¹¹ and 29¹⁰.

ED. KÖNIG.

Rostock.

Sacramental Hospitality.

BY THE REV. JAMES WELLS, D.D., GLASGOW.

In a previous article (on 'Bible Hospitality') I showed that the wonderful hospitality of Bible times has been stereotyped among those Palestinian Arabs of to-day, who have not been touched by European influences. I also gave some specimens of the expository helps offered to us by these new-old customs. My plan was, and is, to lay alongside of each other the heavenly medallion and the earthly mould in which it was fashioned. I am now to exhibit four of the incandescent side-lights which Arab hospitality—ancient and

modern—sheds upon the Lord's Supper. The very best thing in Oriental life has been utilized by Christ as an image of the very best of God's gifts to man.

I. *The Lord's Supper is a Reconciliation Feast.*—Schumacher (see his *Across the Jordan*), when selecting the route for the railway which is to connect Damascus, the Sea of Galilee, and Haifa, often came into collision with the chiefs. When they wished to come to terms with him, they made what they called 'a reconciliation feast,'