

adapter, like his heroine, belonged to the Northern Israelites who were settled in 'the cities of the Medes' (2 K 17⁶), we hardly expect from him the developed resurrection hope which appears among the Pharisees of Judæa. But what was the eschatology of the Median original? Very likely there was none: it would be difficult to deduce the average English belief as to a future life from a novel or a fairy tale. And if there was, we have no evidence that the populace of Media, at the fairly early date which we naturally postulate for this romance, were permeated by the lofty doctrines introduced by Zoroaster. They probably took a long time to rise out of the negation of belief which was common to Indo-Germanic and Semitic nations alike till God sent Zoroaster and Socrates and the prophets of Israel to reveal a light from the shadow of death. There is, of course, the famous passage in Herodotus (3⁶²), where Prexaspes, the agent of Cambyses in his fratricide, assures the conscience-stricken king that his brother is really dead, and that if the dead rise again he might imagine Astyages come to life, as reasonably as his brother Smerdis. It is impossible to build

anything on this, which at most could only prove that Herodotus knew the (by that time thoroughly Zoroastrianized) Magi to hold the doctrine of a resurrection in his own day. Moreover, the doctrine of a *final* resurrection does not help the interpretation. It seems more likely that Prexaspes is made to travesty some doctrine (Babylonian?) which made the dead by a rare miracle return to this life on earth. And if this evidence be thus eliminated, there is, as far as I know, no other bearing on *popular* Median eschatology.

Kohut's paper (in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*)—in which I now remember my illustration from the Shâh Nâmeh was anticipated—adds a few details which are too slight to be reckoned here. It is, however, his conclusion with which we must mainly quarrel. To read *Tobit* as a veiled polemic against Parsism, and especially against the forbidding of burial—which leads the learned Rabbi to fix on the third century A.D. as the date of the Book!—makes half the coincidences noted above absolutely unintelligible. The key to them all is found at once when adaptation instead of polemic is recognized.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Guthe's 'History of the People of Israel.'

THIS is the latest volume of a series which is best known in England from such representatives as Cornill's *Alttest. Einleitung* and Benzinger's *Heb. Archäologie*. Unlike some other recent works on the subject it embraces the period which ends in the middle of the second century of the Christian era, treating, however, the later portion of the history, from 333 B.C. onwards, much less fully than the preceding part. It consults the interests of the student by prefixing to every section a list of the authoritative literature. It is written out of a great fulness of knowledge, but the author's acquaintance with what others have done and said seems in no case to overweight his judgment or prevent his using his own eyes. It is perfectly lucid and exceedingly interesting: there is hardly

¹ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Von D. Hermann Guthe. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899.

a dull page. Written from the critical standpoint it, of course, begins the history proper at a much later date than we were once accustomed to. Jacob, Israel, Joseph, Judah, etc., are not regarded as individuals but as tribes. A complete set of rules is given for the interpretation of the narratives in which these names occur: what the narrative employs as the name of a man or a father is really the designation of a people or a locality; the name of a wife or mother points to the smaller element in the eventually united whole; marriage is the blending of these elements; concubinage is the absorption of an inferior clan. Moses is a genuinely historical personage, the founder of law and religion amongst his people. On their behalf, too, he exercises priestly functions, and he led them out of Egypt. But he did not promulgate a code of laws. His name is a mutilated form of a longer one, resembling Thutmosis, Ahmosis: the portion which has survived being the Egyptian *mes, mesu* = son.

Readers who are not deterred by this treatment of the earliest period will find a very large amount of useful matter well put in Guthe's *History*. All the recent discoveries in the departments of history and archæology have been firmly seized and aptly used. The Tell el-Amarna tablets have enabled him to draw a clear, almost a vivid, picture of the condition of Palestine prior to and favouring the Hebrew immigration. He shows us how the Egyptian suzerainty, which had been so real a force under Thutmosis III., was gradually weakened; how the Hittites from the north forced their way into Syria; how the nomads of the eastern deserts pressed forward to the west. Weakness and disintegration within the borders of Canaan paved the way for the success of the Hebrew tribes. And the date at which they effectively occupied the country is approximately determined by what is now known concerning the general position: 'The Egyptian suzerainty after 1250 was rather a matter of pretence than of reality, and the Hittite empire soon after 1200 broke up into a number of petty principalities. Hence the successful occupation of Canaan by Joseph-Israel must be placed somewhere in the time between 1230 and 1200, when no external power controlled the relations of Canaan, and no native state could unite the forces of the then inhabitants in a vigorous resistance.'¹

Here are two or three illustrations of Guthe's employment of archæology for the elucidation of minor points.

He proposes to explain the meaning and significance of the ark by reference to an Egyptian custom: 'The images of the Egyptian gods were placed in a small boat which stood in a chapel in the Holy of holies of the temple. The image itself was most scrupulously shielded from profane eyes; on no account might they behold it. The only thing that could be portrayed and shown to the eyes of the people was the boat, which was carried round in the processions at the great festivals. It therefore represented the external world in contrast with the divine image. In the desert, in place of the boat, which is inseparable from the Nile, the ark came in, the chest, to symbolize a house or a shelter or, in general, any contents.'²

In one of the Tell el-Amarna letters a certain Ramman-Nirari (or Hadad-nirari) of Nuhašši (in the district of Aleppo) points out to Amenophis III. that Thutmosis III. had made his grandfather king,

¹ P. 54 f.² P. 30 f.

and had poured oil on his head: 'The custom was perhaps introduced into Canaan by the Egyptians.' And so is light thrown on Samuel's anointing of Saul.

It has not unnaturally been supposed that Shishak's invasion of Palestine was meant to strengthen his former friend Jeroboam. But we are here³ reminded that Israel suffered as well as Judah. Shishak's inscription at Karnak enumerates more than sixty Israelite places as conquered and plundered. Hence, in all probability, the real object of the expedition was to reassert the suzerainty of Egypt. Here it may be mentioned that Guthe adopts Winckler's suggestion that at 2 K 7⁶ it is not Egypt that is meant, but the North Syrian Mušri, which is not unfrequently mentioned in the inscriptions of Assurnazirpal and Shalmanezzer II. in connexion with the Hittites.⁴ On 2 K 17⁴, also, he is inclined to approve of the same Assyriologist's view that So is the Sabe' or Sib'i who appears on the inscriptions of Sargon as the turtan or commander-in-chief of a certain Pir'u, king of Mušur, this Mušur being a province of the kingdom of Ma'in or Melukhkha.⁵ The ruler and people of this principality would have good reason for resisting the Assyrian encroachments, which threatened their command of the great trade route from the interior of Arabia to the Mediterranean. It should be remarked in passing that many of the conflicts between Israel and its neighbours are explained by the position relatively to the trade routes of the towns round which some of these struggles raged.

The book evinces insight as well as learning. How sympathetically it portrays Saul's failure! 'He was sufficiently enthusiastic and daring to restore the downcast courage of the Israelite tribes, sufficiently strong, also, to habituate to obedience their love of liberty, but not far-seeing enough, perhaps, to estimate Israel's strength at its right value in comparison with the Philistines. The bow broke in his hand because he overstrained it. Victorious in mountain warfare he lost all in a battle on the plain. We do not know whether his disease was partly the cause of the error; possibly it was.'⁶ And Guthe is fair to David, fairer than the reaction against traditional opinions has sometimes caused critics to be. If he must choose

³ P. 133.⁴ P. 149; see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vii. p. 405 ff.⁵ P. 191 f.⁶ P. 79.

between the narratives which set the king in an unfavourable and those which present him in a happier light, the latter seem to him more credible. By the way, he explains what has always seemed David's strange insistence on the restoration of Michal (2 S 3¹⁸) as a measure of policy, a public claim to be a member of the royal family, the house of Saul.¹

The chief drawback to our enjoyment of this admirably written book is its failure to recognize distinctly the Divinity which shaped the ends of Israel, rough hew them as the people would. One brief passage looks in the right direction: 'It is in the highest degree extraordinary that Israelite men perceive in their national god who *destroys* his people the God of all the world. So directly is this opposed to the views which then prevailed that it is sharply distinguished by this token from the ordinary products of human calculation or caprice, and is shown to be a divine operation, an idea of faith.'² Almost, if not quite, everywhere else the history is constructed on naturalistic lines. It may, of course, be replied that the historian must not invade the province of the theologian. But if Israel was the vehicle of the highest form of religion, its history cannot be adequately told without reference to the direction and inspiration of God. Many of us who welcome the most searching study of everything that brings this people into connexion with other nations are profoundly convinced that another scholar who has written on these topics is right: 'There are points in the life of mankind where history passes over into the philosophy of history, and speculation, with its interpreting light, must illumine the steps of a historical process which otherwise would remain obscure. . . . Nothing but the immediate contact of God Himself with man can produce the true knowledge of God, or bring man a real step nearer thereto. . . . When the thought flashed across the mind of Moses that God was neither the world nor an idealized image of man, but that He was the Lord of life, the Author of the moral law, enthroned above the manifold and the world of sense, ennobling and not depressing man, that knowledge originated neither in his age nor in himself; it came to him from the immediate revelation of this God in his heart.'³—*Comincio da Dio*.

Winchcombe.

JOHN TAYLOR.

¹ P. 86.

² P. 197.

³ Kittel, *History of the Hebrews*, i. p. 251 f.

Duhm's 'Psalmen.'

PROFESSOR DUHM of Basel, whose Commentary on the Psalms in the *Kurzer Hdcomm.* was reviewed by Dr. Taylor in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of September last, has now published a translation of the same book, which, like his earlier translation of Job, is executed in the measure of the original. This translation of the Psalms, as our author reminds us, is designed not from the devotional or the æsthetic point of view, but to provide the educated reader with as exact as possible a reproduction of what is one of the most important sources for the history of religion. Duhm exhorts his readers, accordingly, to lay aside all prejudices and preconceived opinions, and to accept of the Psalter as it is, if they hope to form a right conception of the stage of religious development represented by the book, and of its relation to primitive Christianity. Duhm's standpoint in his Commentary is of course what is represented also in the present work, and in most points of detail as regards translation or the text adopted the two works agree, but the author has not hesitated to deviate from his Commentary, where he believes himself to have discovered meanwhile a more excellent way. The 'apologists' he makes welcome to use this as a new evidence of the uncertainties of historical exegesis. These uncertainties, says Duhm, are well enough known to all readers who have themselves prosecuted the search of truth, but the earnest student will not cry over them. The translation, which, as a matter of course, is a model of accuracy, and which often shows a marked felicity of expression, is preceded by an introduction which will place the reader quite abreast of the current of opinion regarding the origin and date of the Psalter, the titles of the Psalms, the liturgical use and the religious value of the book. It is a sign of the times that so much attention is being turned to the Psalter, and that almost simultaneously three semi-popular works by three of the leading O.T. scholars of the day have appeared—the *Parallel Psalter* by Dr. Driver, the *Christian Use of the Psalms* by Dr. Cheyne, and the present volume by Dr. Duhm. From all three one will learn much, and not least from this last work, which appears to us eminently to serve some of the ends whose desirability is so properly

⁴ *Die Psalmen übersetzt.* Von B. Duhm. Freiburg i. B. : J. C. B. Mohr, 1899. Price M.2.50 ; bound, M.3.30.

emphasized in the opening chapters of Canon Cheyne's book.

Kittel's Commentary on 'Kings.'¹

THE student of the O.T. is fortunate in having put in his hands in quick succession two Commentaries on a part of the Bible where such helps were much needed. The first of these, that by Dr. Benzinger in the *Kurzer Hdcomm.*, we had the pleasure of noticing last August, and now the twin series, *Nowack's Hdcomm.*, has given to us Professor Kittel's Commentary. The author tells us that his aims have been (1) to get as nearly as possible at the text of the original composition, (2) to exhibit the literary structure of the Books of Kings, (3) to put forward anything that may tend to the elucidation of the book from the point of view of linguistics, history, or biblical theology. All renderings which are based upon a deviation from the Massoretic text are indicated by a special mark, and the reason for the deviation is explained in the notes, while different species of type are employed for the different sources that are supposed to be present. The author tells us that his work was practically finished five years ago, but that a variety of causes delayed its publication until now. The actual work of printing having been begun only in April last, he has been able to take account of Benzinger's Commentary, although, either by an oversight or owing to typographical difficulties, the last-named work does not appear in the list of Literature on p. xv f.

The Introduction deals with the Name and Structure of the Book (for in Hebrew it originally formed only one book) of Kings, its Redaction, its Sources, its Chronological Scheme, its Text. The arrangement of the book is declared by Dr. Kittel to be extremely simple. The first two chapters, describing the death of David and the accession of Solomon, are designed to be a connecting link with the Book of Samuel, and then the remaining matter falls under three main divisions: (a) the Reign of Solomon (1 K 3-11); (b) the Disruption of the kingdom and the History of the separate kingdoms of Israel and Judah (1 K 12-2 K 17); (c) the History of Judah to the

¹ *Die Bücher der Könige übersetzt u. erklärt.* Von R. Kittel. Mit 3 Abbildungen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Edinburgh and London: Williams & Norgate, 1900. Price 6s. 6d. net; bound, 8s. net.

downfall of the State, with a short glance at some of the most important events subsequent to the latter (2 K 18-25). The use of sources by the compiler of the book is testified to by himself, and Dr. Kittel is of opinion that it is comparatively easy to distinguish these objective sources from the subjective work of the compiler, whose hand is plainly traceable in the formulæ with which a reign is introduced or closed, and in the judgments with so strongly Deuteronomic a colouring which are passed on the various kings or on the national character and conduct. Dr. Kittel thinks there are many grounds for the conclusion that this Deuteronomic redactor is the same who compiled the histories contained in the Books of Judges and Samuel. His interest is not political but religious, so that what he gives us is not so much a history of Israel as a history of religion and church in Israel. But the hand of this redactor, who is probably identical, further, with the author of the Deuteronom. historical work which originally dealt with the whole material from Gn 24 to 2 K 24⁽⁶⁷⁾, is not the only hand that is to be recognized in the Book of Kings. The conclusion of Dr. Kittel is that the composition proper of the book was effected before the Exile, probably shortly after B.C. 600. Then a second redactor carried on the book to the Exile, and also revised the former work here and there. He wrote after the year 561, but perhaps still during the Exile, as he does not mention the release of the people. A third 'super-revision,' which was not a very strict one, took place after the advent of Ezra, when some slight additions (e.g. 'the Levites' in 1 K 84) were made to the text.—The other points in the introduction are handled with equal care, and the Commentary, if perhaps a little more conservative than Benzinger's, is not less thoroughgoing, and may be warmly commended as one of the best available aids to the study of the Books of Kings.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Among the Periodicals.

The Sirach Question.

THE publication of the Oxford, the Cambridge, and the British Museum Fragments of the Hebrew Sirach has given birth to a whole literature,

especially of articles in the reviews, not to speak of Professor Margoliouth's famous pamphlet.

In the current number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Dr. SCHECHTER has a valuable paper, consisting mainly of critical notes, on the British Museum Fragments. At the outset he refers to the editor's (Rev. G. Margoliouth's) profession of faith in the authenticity of these fragments, and remarks, 'To do this in the face of the thunderbolt from Oxford, followed by a shower of abusive and denunciatory language, poured down on the heads of all those who still maintain their allegiance to the new discoveries, requires indeed a good deal of moral courage.' To the same issue Professor BACHER contributes a series of Notes on the Cambridge Fragments. In the first section of these he endeavours, by means of emendations of the text, 'to give new, and perhaps more satisfactory, explanations of such passages of the Hebrew fragments as appear not to have been satisfactorily elucidated by the editors.' In the second section some passages of the Greek and the Syriac are elucidated by the light of the recently recovered Hebrew text, while the third section is devoted to the discussion of the relationship between the quotations contained in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature, and in Saadiah's works, taken from the Hebrew Ben-Sira—and the fragments of the Geniza. He believes that his article will contribute 'to silence further scepticism as to the genuineness of the Hebrew Sirach, and the artificial hypotheses by which it is tried to prove the late composition of the fragments.' In passing, Professor Bacher refers to Professor Margoliouth's letter to the *Guardian* of 8th November last, in which the latter argued that Professor König's misunderstanding (frankly acknowledged in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of January last, p. 173 n) about *صرف*, and Professor

Bacher's misstatement about the non-occurrence of a particular Persian phrase in Vullers, relieved him from the necessity of taking any further notice of their objections. Professor Bacher freely admits that he was wrong about Vullers, but points out that he really laid no stress on the point, and actually added, 'It is not impossible that it [the Persian phrase] was used in speaking.' He regards it as a strong testimony to the general force of his criticism of Professor Margoliouth that the latter can only fix on a slip like this, and

that he makes no rejoinder to his main attack. Professor Bacher considers that the arguments of M. Israel Lévi in the *Revue des Études juives* against the genuineness of the Cairene text, which are based on quite other grounds than those of Professor Margoliouth, are of a far more serious character. He hopes to deal with these when they are complete. Meanwhile, although confessing that the problem is a difficult one, Professor Bacher does not think it can be solved by discarding the good with the bad, and by holding that the Geniza fragments are the work of a mediæval Hebraist.

The January number of the *Theologische Rundschau* contains an interesting survey of the latest Sirach literature. It is written by Professor König, whose name is so well known to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. We observe, with pleasure, that the elaborate and exhaustive papers dealing with the various fragments and with Professor Margoliouth's pamphlet, which Dr. König contributed to this periodical, have now been revised and enlarged by their author, and, with the sanction of Messrs. T. & T. Clark, have been issued in book form in German.¹

The *Revue Biblique* of January also contains an interesting account of Schechter and Taylor's edition of the Cambridge Fragments.

The Second Volume of the New 'Dictionary of the Bible.'

No theological periodical has more thoroughly established itself as a first-class power than the *Revue Biblique*. Whether it be on questions of Biblical Introduction or of Theology, on Archæology or Geography (departments in which it always contains valuable results of firsthand research), or on the literature of the day, its judgments invariably carry great weight. Hence it was a source of gratification to many when the *Revue Biblique* spoke in such appreciative terms of the first volume of the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. It is scarcely necessary to remind our readers that this important organ of opinion is under the direction of the Dominican Fathers at Jerusalem, so that its opinion in the present instance can have no suspicion of bias. The January number of the

¹ *Die Originalität des neulich entdeckten hebräischen Sirachtextes, textkritisch, exegetisch und sprachgeschichtlich untersucht.* Von Ed. König. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr. M.2.50.

Revue deals with the second volume of the Dictionary. Attention is first directed to the commendable despatch with which this volume has followed its predecessor, and then special notice is taken of individual articles. Amongst the German contributors, Professor König is singled out as having made an important contribution to the volume by his 'remarkable articles' upon 'Jonah' and the book of 'Judges.' The reviewer agrees with Schürer (*Th. Literaturzeitung*, 1899, p. 553) in his estimate of the contributions of Professors Davidson and Driver as amongst the most scholarly in the volume, while their conclusions are moderate. As notable O.T. articles are mentioned, further, 'Genesis' by Ryle, 'Flood' and 'Hexateuch' by Woods, 'Joshua' and 'Isaiah' by G. A. Smith (both of which have, as the reviewer naïvely remarks, 'a fuller Bibliography than is usual'), 'the excellent article of Macalister on "Food,"' and the very useful article on 'Genealogy' by Curtis.—Passing to the New Testament, the reviewer speaks appreciatively of Professor Sanday's article 'Jesus Christ,' in which he cannot find justification for the remark of M. Jacobs in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (Oct. 1899, p. 160) that 'his whole article is encouraging for the Jewish position towards Jesus,' nor for the same critic's satisfaction that Dr. Sanday shows such reserve on the questions of the Trinity and of Miracles. He thinks there is no mistaking Professor Sanday's position, although with extreme courtesy and scrupulous delicacy he has set himself rather to convince those whose views he states without sharing them, than to impose upon them his own opinion. The reviewer is equally satisfied with Ottley's article on the 'Incarnation,' and expresses his thankfulness that this Dictionary is not the mouthpiece of scarcely disguised rationalism. 'Of course it does not satisfy us on every point of doctrine, but we have pleasure in noting those points on which we remain united in the faith of the Early Church.' After remarking on Headlam's 'Herod,' Stanton's 'Gospels,' and the articles on 'John' which 'attain almost to the dimensions of monographs,' the reviewer writes, 'The Editor, Dr. Hastings, discusses the meaning of various words, with quite a wealth of citation from the English poets

. . . a feature which one soon comes to look for, and which is not without its charm even for a foreigner. Mr. Selbie appears to have reserved for himself the articles dealing with minor subjects, which are difficult to handle and difficult to put in a presentable form. He has succeeded in treating them with conciseness and accuracy.'

As to the important departments of Archæology and Geography, the 'Geology' of Palestine is pronounced to be well discussed by Professor Hull, who, however, is found to be less fortunate in his article 'Gomorrhah,' and the reviewer declares it to be quite erroneous to say that the view which locates the Cities of the Plain at the north end of the Dead Sea is 'now pretty generally admitted.' He suggests, further, that it might be well not to entrust too many of the geographical articles to the *personnel* of the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, most of whom are already committed by published views to certain opinions on sites, etc., and who are slow to admit new evidence. There is one of these writers, however, from whom the reviewer would welcome more articles, namely, Major-General Wilson.—The reviewer is a little inclined to complain that Roman Catholic authorities are overlooked in the Literature referred to in the Dictionary (he specifies, *e.g.* Schanz, 'one of the best commentators on the Gospels,' who should have found mention in the art. 'Gospels').

The review closes with an interesting comparison between this Dictionary and the great work of M. Vigoroux. While the latter is declared to hold its own easily in Archæology and Geography, it is pronounced to lag far behind its English rival in the department of Biblical Theology. For instance, 'Foi' occupies only 1 column in Vigoroux, 'Faith' has 23 cols. in Hastings; 'Dieu' has 2 cols. under 'El' and 3 under 'Elohim,' and there will be something under 'Iahvé,' whereas 'God' has 38 cols. in Hastings; 'Enfer' receives only 4 cols., while 'Hell' has 6 and 'Hades' 4 cols. in Hastings, etc. In fact, the place given to Biblical Theology, and the character of the articles belonging to this department, are reckoned by the reviewer amongst the principal merits of the Dictionary.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.