

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Dalman's Lexicon.<sup>1</sup>

LEXICONS to the Targums, Talmud, and other post-biblical literature, besides being expensive, have hitherto been large and unwieldy. A brief lexicon, suited to beginners and those having mainly linguistic interests, was greatly wanted. This work of Dalman's seems well adapted to supply the need. His previous works guarantee the quality of his work, and the compass within which he has been able to bring the book will make it readily accessible. The present volume embraces half the dictionary, and its whole cost will only be 12s.

In a very interesting preface Dalman reviews past studies in the field to which his work belongs, and gives a sketch of what may still be called *desiderata*. The list of the latter is formidable, the study and differentiation of the various Aramaic dialects being specially required. He names as needful, glossaries (1) to the *Judean* idiom of the Onkelos Targum and that of the prophets; (2) to the *Galilean* idiom of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash; (3) to the Babylonian idiom of the Babylonian Talmud; and (4) to the mixed dialect of the so-called Jerusalem Targum of the Pentateuch, the Targums of the Megilloth, of Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, and of the Chronicles. Besides these, he desiderates a new investigation of Hebrew and Aramaic roots for the purpose of explaining words identical in form having divergent meanings; as well as an account of the foreign words assumed into the literature. In this lexicon foreign terms are marked by the letter *x*; when they are Greek or Latin the equivalents in these languages are given, but not when they are Persian. In addition to these linguistic studies, Dalman desires to see further investigation of the *realia*, the material contents of the literature, e.g. the zoology and botany, and the industries, such as agriculture, weaving, dyeing, and the like. It will be seen that Dalman has made a full survey of the field; many labourers will be needed fully to occupy it.

<sup>1</sup> *Aramäisch - Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud, u. Midrasch.* Von Dr. Gustaf H. Dalman. Frankf.-a.-M.: Kauffmann, 1897.

In this work Dalman offers a full glossary of the Onkelos Targum, giving special attention to the vocalization of the nouns, a thing hitherto in great confusion, and to the forms of the verbs in use. He has taken as the basis of his punctuation some South Arabic MSS. These are provided with the superlinear vocalization, which the author, however, has reduced to the more familiar sublinear form. Nearly half the present volume is occupied with an appendix, which is a lexicon of abbreviations. This will be found very useful to readers of the post-biblical literature, the abbreviations being so numerous, and Buxtorf's little work being quite inadequate. This dictionary of abbreviations has been compiled by G. H. Händler. Among the scholars mentioned by Dalman as having assisted him by their services is Professor Thos. Walker, of Belfast.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

*New College, Edinburgh.*

### From the Theological Congress at Stockholm.

THE three lectures mentioned below<sup>2</sup> were delivered at the Theological Congress (*der erste religionswissenschaftliche Kongress*) held in Stockholm, 31st August till 4th September of last year. Differing in their themes as in the nationality and even the language of their authors, there is yet more than a mere external unity amongst them. For each of them comes in the end, more or less directly, to discuss the value and import of the results of scientific investigation in the sphere of religion for religion itself—doubtless one of the burning questions of the present day. And although tentative rather than final answers are given to the question, yet the theological world owes thanks to the publisher, who, with his widely-

<sup>2</sup> *Die vergleichende Religionsforschung und die religiöse Glaube.* Vortrag von P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, Amsterdam. 60 pf.—*Die moderne Forschung über die Geschichte des Urchristentums.* Von Arnold Meyer, Bonn. M. 1.20.—*Moderne Darstellungen der Geschichte Israels.* Von Dr. S. A. Fries, Stockholm. 60 pf. Freiburg, Leipzig, and Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

known and well-recognised enterprise, has given the three companion *brochures* to the public interested in such matters.

Professor CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE, as will be judged from the title of his lecture, discusses the above-mentioned question directly. Admitting the facts, first, that the scientific investigation of religion may be conducted without faith, and second, that a true faith is independent of such investigation, he is yet concerned to find a way by which that which is best in both may be conserved. Amid the prevailing unrest in religious matters he is not inclined to find peace by ignoring the facts of research, still less by building his faith on a scientific scepticism. Is this a hint for the Rit-schlians? For truth is one, whether it be true science or true faith. He discusses various theories of the origin and development of religion, but is not disposed to think that, furnished though they are with whole encyclopædias of facts, they really explain religion: conditions are not causes. Such theories, being nothing more than *empirical* generalizations, do not touch the essence of the question, and when they are used to persuade men that the higher forms are explained by the lower, it is but putting upon them a burden which they are not able to bear. It is the oak which explains the acorn, not *vice versa*. The *abstract* results brought out by such conferences as the Chicago Parliament of Religions, mere points of unity remaining after the elimination of differences, are, to Professor de la Saussaye, equally futile. Yet, he thinks, such investigations can help. They may serve to enable us to understand our Christianity better. From noticing, *e.g.*, how religion in the past has ever been *le génie des civilisations*, we may be preserved against a narrow faith and a pettifogging theology; while, again, a study of Buddhism, with its moan of *suffering*, brings more decisively home to us the fact that the centre of gravity in Christianity is rather the problem of *sin*. Finally, the Professor, finding no hope in mere rationalism, investigation without faith, or in mysticism, faith without dogma, or yet in any eclecticism or syncretism, trusts in something above both, conserving and using all that is valuable in both, *viz.* an energetic and courageous love of Truth.

Professor ARNOLD MEYER of Bonn opened the proceedings of the second day of the Congress with a long and very able résumé of the literary and theological problems which group themselves

around the origin of Christianity, and this résumé, with considerable supplement, now lies before us. Herr Meyer touches practically every book in the New Testament: indicates the traditional view of its composition, criticism and counter-criticism, retreat and advance. He begins with Paul; rightly, for Paul has been a tower of defence for apologist and critic alike. Have the orthodox not deemed him to be an impregnable fortress of the faith? Have the critics not looked upon his four great Epistles as their chief base of operations? What then if Professor van Manen and his brethren be right? Will both apologist and critic not be in pitiable plight, and the critic the more miserable of the two? Herr Meyer does not feel himself shaken in his loyalty to Paul, and will not believe in the complete overthrow of a hundred years of critical work. If criticism has any meaning at all we cannot let the great apostle be resolved into a shadowy group of not over-honest epistle-mongers. With all the wonderful contradictions which we find in the man—partly even because of them—it is not merely a conceivable personality, but an actual and living one, whose voice we hear in the Epistles: no mere resultant of Jewish and Greek ideas, but a man, holding in solution these and other contraries in the heat of a heart that throbs. Professor Meyer next proceeds to take up the rest of the New Testament, Epistle and Gospel, and in a few vigorous strokes indicates the course of criticism and its results: in the main he is at one with the positions which now rank as distinctively critical. In this connexion, we note that he does not side with Jülicher in his acceptance—somewhat hesitating indeed—of *Ephesians* as genuine. Finally, the lecturer gets 'back to Christ,' and gives the more outstanding details of recent discussions about His Self-consciousness, the Kingdom of God, the Son of Man, the Lord's Supper, and especially the significance of the latter in view of His death. These, and indeed the whole course of the early Church, take us back for their full explanation not merely to faith *in* Jesus, but rather to the faith *of* Jesus, *i.e.* to His manifest trust in His Heavenly Father. It is the expansive power of the faith of Jesus which awakens our Christian Faith, Faith in His Father and ours: 'Jesus the author and finisher of our Faith.' And along with this, His word and person are received as God's; hence comes Faith in *Christ*: He is Messiah to the Jew, Logos to the

Greek, God and Lord to mankind. Let, then, historical investigation continue to busy itself with these things in their origin and conditions; yet it must ever be remembered that their true purpose and meaning can be grasped by the faith which generated them, and by that alone.

Reading this in the light of certain lecture-paragraphs in an old note-book, we should like to ask whether Professor Meyer ever sat under Herrmann of Marburg?

Dr. FRIES deals with the criticism of the Old Testament, with special reference to its significance for our views of the History of Israel. His position is a mediating one, and he preserves throughout a very judicial mind, dealing praise and blame with the calmness of a sphinx. He frankly accepts the main results of Wellhausen, but points out that the year 1895 saw at least three vigorous flank movements against that Napoleon of criticism. First, Professor Gunkel of Berlin, in *Schöpfung und Chaos*, protested against the assumption that the lateness of a pentateuchal 'source' implied its being a mere fabrication, e.g. P's account of creation is no invention of his, but a religious elaboration of an old Babylonian myth. Secondly, in the same year, H. Winckler of Berlin, in his *Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen*, showed the error of considering Israel as dwelling apart; whereas its history and character were influenced by the surrounding peoples. Finally, Dr. Fries and Professor Hoonacker, in 1895, independently came to the conclusion that the Wellhausian dogma of 'the centralization of Israel's worship' is insufficiently made out. But we fear that Wellhausen has not been much shaken by the campaigners of this *annus mirabilis*. Dr. Fries, after considering other matters, finds himself not so far from the old conception of the History of Israel—not dogmatically held, but chastened by criticism. He finally discusses the question whether, and how far, the History of Israel, as at present conceived, is of value for Christianity: 'Israel's Geschichte als Heilsgeschichte?' In the meantime he takes the negative side, and would wait at least till we have a more definite historical conception of Christ's person and work, and perhaps, also, till we no more confuse mere historical 'belief' with true religious Faith, the passing forms with the eternal essence.

ALEXANDER GRIEVE.

*Forfar.*

## The New 'Herzog.'

PROFESSOR BUHL of Leipzig contributes to the last issue of Dr. Hauck's new edition of the *Real-Encyclopädie* a learned and critical article, which states with admirable lucidity the results of modern study of the form and contents of

### HEBREW POETRY.

From the Old Testament itself Buhl shows that Keil was wrong in maintaining that Hebrew poetry was a product of the *religious* life of the nation, and in denying that amongst the Israelites secular poetry ever flourished. In the Scriptures we have glimpses into the life of a people who were fond of singing and richly endowed with the poetic gift; in joy and in sorrow, in peace and in war, their feelings found fit expression in song. Ps 78<sup>63</sup> (R.V.) refers to 'the marriage-song' of maidens, and Is 23<sup>15</sup> to 'the song of the harlot.' The labours of the vintage were lightened by rhythmic shouting,  $\text{וְהָיָה שִׁיר}$  (Jer 25<sup>30</sup>); the writer of Ps 69 complains that he is 'the song of the drunkards,' whilst in Am 6<sup>5</sup> (R.V.) we read of 'idle songs,' which Buhl, like Driver, explains as improvisations, songs extemporized at banquets without premeditation. In the Song of Deborah (Jg 5<sup>15-17</sup>) there is proof that amongst the Hebrews, as amongst the Arabs, satire found expression in the national poetry; other examples of the Hebrew poet's use of irony are found in Hab 2<sup>6</sup>, Is 14<sup>4</sup>, etc. Only a few of the many passages cited and elucidated by Professor Buhl have been given; mention must, however, be made of those which show that the Israelites did not trust to oral tradition for the preservation of their secular poetry, but committed their national songs to writing, and made collections of them. According to 2 Ch 35<sup>25</sup> Jeremiah's lament over Josiah was 'written in the Lamentations,' and in still earlier times we read of 'the Book of the Wars of the Lord' (Nu 21<sup>14</sup>), and of 'the Book of Jashar' (Jos 10<sup>12</sup>, 2 S 1<sup>18</sup>). 'But without doubt other ancient songs found in the historical books were taken from these collections, although there is no direct mention of their sources.'

Amongst a people who had such delight in song it was natural that religious emotions should find poetic expression. Ex 32<sup>18</sup> speaks of singing in connexion with the worship of the golden calf, and Nu 10<sup>35</sup> preserves a very ancient song used

'when the Ark set forward.' In the sanctuaries of Israel songs were sung to the accompaniment of the melody of viols (Am 5<sup>28</sup>), and in Judah songs with the music of pipes formed part of the worship when a holy feast was kept (Is 30<sup>29</sup>). The songs of Zion, which the Jews could not sing in a strange land, were the ancient songs of the temple. But the Book of Jeremiah affords proof that not only in public worship, but also in the expression of the spiritual experience of the individual poetry was the handmaid of religion. The prophet gives utterance to his own communing with God in words which remind us of the Psalms: Jer 12<sup>1</sup> 17<sup>12</sup> 18<sup>18</sup> 20<sup>7</sup>. Hence on the much-debated question of the age to which Hebrew lyric poetry should be assigned, Buhl's judgment is that 'it must certainly have been developed in pre-exilic times.' The so-called 'Lamentations' presuppose an earlier development of such poetry, whilst in chap. 3 there is an alteration of language appropriate to the individual and to the community, such as we find in the Psalms; 'indeed the times of Jeremiah and even earlier—the days of the religious wars under Manasseh—were most suitable to the development in prophetic circles of this class of religious lyric poetry.'

At great length Buhl investigates the attempts made by modern scholars to show that the essential characteristic of Hebrew poetry is not parallelism in thought but actual rhythm. The various hypotheses may be divided into two groups: Merx, Bickell, etc., are of opinion that amongst the Hebrews, as amongst the Syrians, rhythm was constituted by a definite number of *syllables*. According to Bickell the last syllable but one in each verse and every alternate syllable were always long, verses with an even number of syllables being trochaic, and verses with an uneven number iambic. Ley, Grimme, etc., hold that the rhythm of a verse is determined by the number of *feet* that it contains, syllables without the tone having no effect upon the metre. The latter theory Buhl regards as essentially correct, though he is also of opinion that the rules laid down by some of its advocates are based upon elaborate calculations, the correctness of which with our present knowledge it is impossible to prove.

Dr. Lotz of Erlangen discusses frankly many difficult problems in the 'higher criticism' of the Old Testament in his article on the

#### DECALOGUE.

A brief summary of his conclusions will be of special interest to readers of Dr. Paterson's concise yet comprehensive survey of modern theories in the new *Dictionary of the Bible*.

The decalogue in its original form probably consisted of ten short commands, without promises or reasons, the shorter version in Ex being older than that found in Deut. To the objections urged against the Mosaic origin of the 'ten words' in their earliest form, Dr. Lotz replies at length. The existence of the command which forbids the making of graven images is not inconsistent with such facts as Jeroboam's introduction of the calf-worship, unless it can be shown that to the true servants of Jehovah this worship gave no offence; nor does the command to rest on the Sabbath day presuppose that the Israelites were already settled in Canaan, for although this commandment was especially adapted to the regular life of dwellers in town and country, yet it was by no means without force and fitness as a law for the nomadic life of the nation; moreover, the wanderings of Israel were soon to cease.

Again, no proof that the decalogue originated in the time of the later prophets is afforded by the agreement of its author with those prophets in the conviction that what the God of Israel required and delighted in was obedience to the moral law, whereas the essential feature of the national religion in the days of Moses was the offering of sacrifice. It cannot be assumed that the prophets were the first to insist upon the obligations of morality; their denunciations are mainly directed against forms of immorality which prevail only when the conditions of life are far more complex than those which obtained in the Mosaic period. The 'ten words,' on the other hand, are the simplest expression of the moral laws which are the basis of society in its most elementary stages of development. It is true that in Hos 4<sup>2</sup> transgressions of some of the commands of the decalogue are condemned with other sins, but this is only what might be expected if in Hosea's days the people were guilty of such transgressions. So far, therefore, from supposing that this passage is the origin of the commands, a more natural explanation is that the prophet had them in mind.

Much valuable information concerning a depart-

ment of Church work which is every year becoming more important both at home and abroad is furnished in two articles on

#### DEACONESSSES,

by Professor ACHELIS and Pastor SCHÄFER. A sketch of the history of the female diaconate in the Christian Church is given by Dr. Achelis: Phœbe, whom St. Paul calls a 'deaconess,' in Ro 16<sup>2</sup>, was not appointed to this office by the church at Cenchrea; the first reference to an official designation of women to such duties is found in the Pastoral Epistles and in the letter of the younger Pliny. In the East the female diaconate existed until the eighth century or still later; in Rome it cannot be traced after the middle of the third century. But amongst the Montanists and other sects, until the Middle Ages, women held a position of greater authority and influence than that assigned to them either in the Eastern or in the Western Church.

Dr. Schäfer traces the development of the work of German deaconesses both in the inner mission and in foreign missions from the year 1836, when Pastor Theodore Fliedner founded the first Deaconesses' Home, to the present day. By quotations from Fliedner's letters it is shown that he received the impulse which led to the commencement of this branch of Christian service during a visit to Holland, where amongst the Mennonites he found that women belonging to the most respected families were appointed by the authorities of the Church to serve as deaconesses in visitation of the homes of the poor, etc. 'This praiseworthy early-Christian organization ought to be imitated by the other evangelical Churches.'

Many interesting details of the regulations in force in Deaconesses' Homes and of the probationary training of the sisters are given by Dr. Schäfer; he takes especial pains to show that from the beginning Fliedner never intended that the sole duty of the deaconesses should be the visitation of the sick. What their work should be has found 'classic expression' in the words of Löhe: 'I am neither a painter nor a poet, but if I were, I would paint the ideal deaconess. There would be quite a row of pictures and as many poems. I should paint her at the Communion table and in the wash-house; in the kitchen, in the sickroom, and on the field of battle; singing the *Trisagion* in the choir, and the *Nunc dimittis* to the dying; I

would paint all possible pictures of the calling of a deaconess, and all should portray one person, who is not ashamed of the lowliest task and yet is fully qualified for the highest. With her feet in the mire and dust of menial service, with her hand upon her harp, with her head in the sunlight of communion with Jesus, I would paint her on the frontispiece of the entire collection of portraits, and underneath I would write: "She can do everything—work—play—praise."

J. G. TASKER.

*Handsworth College.*

### Among the Periodicals.

#### Schürer on the New 'Dictionary of the Bible.'

THIS work, the first volume of which was recently published by Messrs. Clark, is reviewed by Professor SCHÜRER in the *Th. Literaturzeitung* of 28th May last. He welcomes its appearance as an evidence of the gratifying position which biblical study has reached in Great Britain. One of the points emphasized in Dr. Hastings' preface was *fulness*, and Schürer has tested the *Dictionary's* claims to this attribute. He instances the names in Ro 16, all of which he has found included, and about which he remarks that in every instance something has been found worth saying. He commends the inclusion of the Apocryphal as well as the Canonical books of the Old Testament, and points out that this *Dictionary* surpasses German works like those of Winer, Schenkel, and Riehm, in treating not only of such subjects as History, Geography, and Antiquities, but also of Biblical Introduction and Biblical Theology.

Schürer selects for special eulogium the articles of Dr. Driver, which (*e.g.* that on *Ashdoreth*) he calls an ornament (*Zierde*) of the work. His only regret is that Dr. Driver's articles are not more numerous. His opinion of Conder's work is very different, and we may say that this is really the only severe criticism he makes on any of the contents of the *Dictionary*. Schürer is willing to admit that as an engineer Conder has rendered valuable service in the Survey of Palestine, but considers that in Historical Geography he has never got beyond the stage of a certain dilettan-

teism. The attitude of the *Dictionary* towards Old Testament criticism is pronounced upon the whole very satisfactory. In all important Old Testament articles the essential results of modern pentateuchal criticism are either presupposed or established in the course of the discussion. The new light thrown upon certain subjects, when the earlier and the later sources are kept apart, is illustrated by such articles as *Aaron* (H. A. White), *Altar* (A. R. S. Kennedy), *Day of Atonement* (Driver and H. A. White). A similar value belongs to the articles *Chronicles* (F. Brown), *Daniel* (Curtis), *David* (H. A. White), *Deuteronomy* (Ryle), and *Ecclesiastes* (Peake). *Exodus* (Harford-Battersby) is instanced as a specimen of fine literary analysis, and *Ezekiel* (Skinner) and *Ezra-Nehemiah* (Batten) as exhibiting the scientific standpoint which characterizes the whole work. Schürer is a little doubtful whether the same standard has been reached in some of the N.T. articles, where he is inclined to think that caution in accepting of negative results has been carried to excess. As an example he cites Headlam's article, *Acts of the Apostles*, which recognizes, indeed, different degrees of historical value in the earlier and the later parts of that book, but maintains that the whole work is by Luke, the companion of St. Paul. To Schürer this appears quite impossible in view of the unhistorical light in which the primitive apostles are presented, unless we are prepared to admit that the author consciously distorted the history. The articles on *Corinthians* (A. Robertson) are commended for the extreme care bestowed upon them.

As articles of value Schürer specifies, further, *Agriculture* (Paterson), *Alphabet* (Taylor), *Apocrypha* (Porter), *Assyria* (Hommel), *Babylonia* (Hommel), *Chronology of New Testament* (Turner), *Dress* (Mackie), *Eschatology* (Davidson, Charles, Salmond). He desires to call special attention to the thoroughgoing articles on the Versions:—*Arabic Versions* (Burkitt), *Armenian Version* (Conybeare), *Egyptian Versions* (F. Robinson), *Ethiopic Version* (Charles). All these are the work of experts, and are extremely valuable sources of information for German as well as English readers.

Finally, Schürer refers to the get up of the *Dictionary* as being what one is accustomed to look for from English (not yet, unfortunately, from German) publishers. The clearness of the

printing and the excellence of the paper make the comparatively small type not in the slightest degree trying to the eye.

### Archæology and Old Testament Criticism.

Ever since the appearance of Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, a copious stream of literature has flowed dealing with the merits and demerits of this book. Of all the reviews which we have seen, none strike us as more fair and solid than those by Zimmern and Meinhold in the *Th. Rundschau* of May last.

Zimmern, whose competency Hommel himself would be the last to question, sets out with an examination of the qualifications of Hommel for the task he set himself in his recent work. He concedes, of course, the thorough up-to-date acquaintance of the latter with all the Monumental evidence, and his ability to interpret it at first hand. But he finds, also, a dangerous offset to this in that gift of combination which frequently, indeed, conducts Hommel to the right conclusion, but at other times leads him to extremely bold positions, where scarcely another Assyriologist will follow him. We have thus to be on our guard in reading his book, and carefully distinguish between what is real documentary evidence, and what are simply combinations of his own.

Zimmern examines carefully the crucial question of Gn 14 and the names of kings contained in that chapter (for details see the *Rundschau*). His conclusions are of extreme importance. On the strength of the inscriptional evidence it may be considered certain that the nomenclature in Gn 14 rests upon valid ancient tradition. Further, in opposition to former opinions, it must be admitted that the situation presupposed in Gn 14—a campaign undertaken by an Elamite king, in company with Babylonian and other princes, against Palestine, as well as the prominent position assumed by Jerusalem and its prince—is, with our present knowledge of the oldest history of Palestine, historically quite conceivable. But of course—and here is the point where Hommel's deductions forsake the solid ground—all this proves nothing regarding the historicity of the campaign of Gn 14. And even if a campaign of Chedorlaomer and his vassals against Palestine were proved by the inscriptions, as it is not, yet this would be no evi-

dence for the historicity of the person of the Abram of Gn 14. The latter point remains unestablished, even if Hommel be right in his contention that at least the basis of Gn 14 is ancient tradition and not late-Jewish invention. From the circumstance that during the Persian (Seleucid) period there appears to have been an epos in circulation in Babylon, of which the principal figures were Hammurabi, Kudur-lughamar, Eriaku, and Tudchul, one might rather be led to the conclusion of Ed. Meyer that a Jew of the Exile introduced Abraham specially into the history of Kudur-lugamar.

While Zimmern is inclined to accept Hommel's assumption of the Arabic origin of the Hammurabi dynasty, he considers it very rash to infer from the frequent occurrence of the element *ilu*, 'God,' in Babylonian (as in Sabæan and Hebrew) proper names, that those who bore these names held a 'pure monotheism.' He takes exception to several of Hommel's identifications, both ethnological and linguistic, but all the same expresses the hope that O.T. science will give due consideration to the new materials supplied by Hommel's book. The final conclusions reached, he expects, will differ from those of the Munich professor, but it will be a misfortune if the circumstance that the latter, instead of submitting the material for examination *sine ira et studio*, has given to his work an apologetic character, should lead to the depreciation of its true merits.

What Zimmern does for Hommel's book from the side of Assyriology, Meinhold does from the side of the Old Testament. He examines the bearing of Hommel's conclusions upon such points as that of a supposed primitive revelation, and the relation between faith and the historicity of the patriarchal narratives. Suppose Hommel has succeeded in proving the historical existence of Abraham, he has done nothing to prove that Abraham fell heir to a primitive revelation. It

is indeed a purely scientific question, having nothing to do with faith in the evangelical sense, whether Abraham ever existed; while, as to a primitive revelation, this hypothesis, as Dillmann has pointed out, has long ago been disproved by the Science of Religion. Meinhold charges Hommel with inaccuracy in his statement of the prevailing opinions of the critical school regarding the patriarchal history and the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, and regrets that such misstatements should be contained in a book destined for a wide circle of non-expert readers.

Meinhold's conclusions may be thus summarized. Hommel has not brought forward a vestige of proof that pre-Mosaic documents underlie Genesis, and that everything there related must be taken as strictly historical. As little has he been able to shake in a single point the modern view regarding the development of Israelitish religion. In seeking to achieve his purpose he shows himself wanting above all in a thorough acquaintance with modern criticism, as well as in self-restraint and avoidance of extravagant fancies in his examination of the O.T.—a sphere in which his book shows that hitherto he has been nothing more than a dilettante. It would be a misfortune, on the one hand, if this book, with its wealth of material and of objections, which the majority of readers are unable to estimate or to answer, were to strengthen in many circles the notion that the Old Testament stands where it used to do. But it would be equally a misfortune if this book should have the effect of increasing that shyness of Assyriology which is only too often justified, and which is found not only among Hebraists, and if O.T. investigation should wilfully close its eyes to the wealth of material which this young science has already supplied, and it is to be hoped will yet supply in richer measure.

J. A. SELBIE.

*Maryculter.*