

Recent Foreign Theology.

New Cuneiform Inscriptions.

IN a sumptuously printed volume (*Mission en Cappadoce 1893-1894*, Paris, Leroux, 1898) M. Ernest Chantre has just published the results of his excavations at Boghaz Keui, Euyuk, and other Hittite sites in Asia Minor. The excavations were undertaken at the expense of M. Guimet, and the objects found in them are now in the Musée Guimet at Paris. They have been reproduced, many of them in colours, in M. Chantre's work, and throw a new and welcome light on many of the problems of Oriental archæology. Among them are vases and fragments of pottery which help to bridge over the gulf between the ceramic art of Asia and prehistoric Greece, terra-cotta heads of animals which are characteristic of Cappadocian or Asianic religion and art, and numerous bronze figures which we may provisionally term Hittite. Nor must we forget the clay spindle-whorls which are identical in form and ornamentation with those found by Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik.

But the most important of M. Chantre's discoveries are the inscriptions. Very little indeed was found in the way of Hittite texts, and that little consisted of clay impressions of seals disinterred at Boghaz Keui; but several fresh Cappadocian inscriptions were met with as well as cuneiform tablets. The Cappadocian inscriptions, the first of which was brought to light many years ago by Hamilton, turn out to be not only in the Phrygian alphabet, but also in the Phrygian language, or at all events in a dialect closely allied to it, and belong to the period after the fall of the Assyrian empire, when the Phrygians spread over Cappadocia and Armenia, and an Aryan language superseded that of the cuneiform inscriptions of Van. The chapter on the Cappadocian texts has been contributed by the competent pen of M. de Saussure.

It is, however, the cuneiform tablets which possess the greatest interest and are of the highest scientific importance. Some of these are in what is now known as the Cappadocian script and dialect, and come from the temple archives of an Assyrian colony settled near Kaisariyeh in the

district called Khani-rabbat or the Greater Khani by the Babylonians. The language of them is a modified Assyrian, and a study of the proper names contained in them has induced me to give up my old opinion that they are of the age of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, and rally to the view of Professor Jensen, who would refer them to the period of Khammurabi. The Cappadocian tablets with which we have hitherto been acquainted are derived from a mound near Kaisariyeh called Gyül Tepé, and most of those purchased by M. Chantre from the peasants of the neighbourhood must have come from the same site. But he also obtained two from the mound of Kara Euyuk, north-east of Kaisariyeh, where he made extensive excavations and found a large quantity of Cappadocian or Hittite objects. At first I thought it possible that Gyül Tepé and Kara Euyuk might prove to be the same place, more especially as both represent the sites of burnt cities; but an examination of the contents of the tablets seems to indicate the contrary. While the proper names in the Gyül Tepé tablets are predominantly Assyrian in type, most of those in the Kara Euyuk tablets are Asianic and not Semitic at all.

The Cappadocian tablets were purchased by M. Chantre. But at Boghaz Keui he himself discovered others, all of them unfortunately in a fragmentary condition, but nevertheless of the highest archæological value. The language of them is unknown, or rather a comparison of it with that of the two letters from Arzawa included in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence shows it to be the same as that of Arzawa, which can be partially deciphered, thanks to the ideographs with which the longer and more perfect of the two letters is filled. When in 1889 I published for the first time the text of the latter letter, I suggested that it might turn out to be written in the Hittite language, and the suggestion is now verified. Boghaz Keui was a great Hittite centre, and the Hittite inscriptions which have been found there show that the Hittite hieroglyphs were employed on the spot down to a comparatively late time. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that in the language of the cuneiform tablets of Boghaz Keui we have that of the still undeciphered Hittite texts.

And in fact I have detected in the fragments discovered by M. Chantre not only the proper name Khattu-sipa, which is parallel to the Hittite name Khattu-sar, and perhaps also Sapa-lulme, but the adjective *Kha-ta-a-na* as well. In one of the Arzawa letters it has long been recognised that the words *Khattanas SARR-us* must signify 'Hittite King.'

We have already learnt from the Arzawa letters what was the structure of the language they contain, as well as several of the grammatical suffixes, and the forms of the possessive pronouns. What we have now to do is to identify the suffixes, the pronunciation of which is given us in the cuneiform texts, with the corresponding hieroglyphs which express them in the Hittite inscriptions. In this way we shall ascertain the phonetic values of a certain number of the Hittite characters, and a basis will at last be afforded for the decipherment of the Hittite texts. A beginning has already been made. Many years ago I identified one of the Hittite signs—that representing a yoke—with the nominative suffix (*e*)s, and this identification is regarded by Messerschmidt in his recent criticism of Jensen (*Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Inschriften*) as one of the very few facts of Hittite decipherment which may be considered certain. Since then I have suggested that the suffix denoted by the gloved hand was that of the accusative, which in the Arzawa letters had the sound of *-n*; if I am right, the phonetic value of another character will have been ascertained. At all events the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions has at last been brought within measurable distance.

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

The Science of Religion.

WE have received three lectures, with titles as below,¹ delivered at the first Congress of those interested in the Science of Religion, held at Stockholm in September of last year.

Sabatier's lecture contains opinions which are already familiar to readers of his brilliant, and not

¹ 'Die Religion und die moderne Kultur,' von Prof. August Sabatier. M.o.80. 'Jesus und die Religionsgeschichte,' von lic. th. H. Martensen Larsen. M.o.60. 'Die Religion und die soziale Entwicklung,' von Nathan Söderblom. M.1.60. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr.

too profound, 'Philosophy of Religion.' He addresses himself to the problem of reconciling the modern spirit with religious faith, which is so often regarded by liberal thinkers as the greatest obstacle yet remaining to the advent of a better future. Must we choose, he asks, between the destruction of faith and the triumph of superstition? To settle this question, Sabatier analyzes the principles which lie at the foundation both of modern culture and of traditional religion. A specially interesting section of the lecture deals with the frigid relations between religion and culture which exist within the pale of Romanism. The author is at his best, perhaps, in describing the more genial reception accorded by Protestantism to modern science, art, literature, and politics. Finally, Sabatier reduces the alleged opposition between religion and science to the natural difference which cannot but exist between the mystical and theoretical sides of experience. If, again, it be asked, what faith has to do with conduct, he replies, in a fine sentence, that 'piety is the soul of morality.' By various examples he illustrates the reciprocal interpenetration which goes on continually between culture and religion, and contends that culture, by its ceaseless criticism, has forced religion to purify its idea of God, to humanize its conception of the Person of Christ, and to transform and spiritualize its theory of the Church.

Anything which Sabatier writes is sure to be readable. Epigrams which it is difficult to forget sparkle on every page. The theology of this pamphlet might be termed 'diluted Ritschlianism.' It may be enough to sustain the individual, but one cannot but ask whether it is sufficient to justify the existence of a Church.

Martensen Larsen takes as his subject 'The Place of Jesus in the History of Religion.' There are scholars in this department who reduce Him to the same level as the heroes of pagan myths; some investigators, indeed, do not hesitate to affirm an historical connection between Christ and Buddhism, and have found in the fables of Eastern religions parallels to the miraculous narratives of the Gospels. What is the true science of the matter?

Larsen replies that the history of religion, *as a science*, finds something absolutely unique in Jesus Christ, and that something is His consciousness of being the Son of God. This consciousness is

not the result of reasoning; it is intuitive. The attempt to explain it by the theology of His time utterly fails. Anything of the kind to be found in the Old Testament, or in the religious literature of other peoples and times is only the expression of a *tendency* which finds its perfect fulfilment in Christ. The history of religion says: No one has ever felt himself God's Son as Jesus did; faith adds: The reason is that no one ever *was* God's Son as Jesus was. And faith is right.

The writer keeps rigidly to his task, which is to give a scientific, rather than a believing, answer to the question with which he starts. One can only admire his sobriety of statement, applaud the lucidity of his thought, and concur in his conclusions.

In Söderblom's short treatise, for its length is too great for a lecture, we have a wise, careful, and thoroughly competent discussion of the duty of the Church towards the social revolution which is slowly proceeding at the present day. While maintaining decisively the supernatural character of religion, he contends that religious men ought to adopt a more positive and helpful attitude towards the working classes than is commonly the case. To preach contentment is not the Church's only task. Doubtless the regeneration of the individual is the true solution of the social question, but there still remains an infinite deal to be done by the Christian congregation, as a brotherhood whose task it is to pervade every secular relationship with the spirit of Divine justice and compassion. The material aim of religion is to provide for all an existence worthy of their manhood.

The author has at his command a vast amount of historical information with which to illustrate his position, though it would gain in impressiveness if it were better arranged. The whole is written in a spirit of candour and earnestness which inspire sympathetic confidence in the reader.

HUGH R. MACKINTOSH.

Typeset.

Among the Periodicals.

A Roman Catholic View of the New 'Dictionary of the Bible.'

It is with unusual interest that we turn to the notice of the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE in

the pages of the *Revue Biblique Internationale* (October 1898). This publication deservedly enjoys the highest reputation for scholarship, and, while an organ of the Roman Catholic Church, it is scrupulously fair, nay, even generous, in its notice of work done outside the pale of that Church. In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June last (pp. 405 f.) we gave an account of a remarkable article, contributed by Père Lagrange to the *Revue Biblique*, on 'Les Sources du Pentateuque,' which will have prepared our readers for the very significant attitude assumed towards the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.

The notice opens with an appreciative reference to the magnitude of the work, and the assurances from all quarters that if it continues to maintain the level at which it has begun, this Dictionary will be the best Biblical Encyclopædia, one in which the results of scientific research are popularized in a way to make the work of extreme value to every one who can make a prudent use of it. Naturally, the reviewer makes some reservations, especially where we should expect a Roman Catholic writer to do so, namely, in the department of Biblical Theology, a department where, as we are reminded, the *Guardian* made similar reservations. The latter suggested that, while in theory there might be nothing to prevent a Nonconformist, say, from doing justice to a doctrine accepted by the Church of England, still it would have been safer to entrust the articles which treat of doctrines characteristic of each Christian communion to writers belonging to that communion. The *Revue Biblique* is quite justified in pushing this principle a step farther, if it is to be acted upon, and pointing out to the *Guardian* that when a word is differently interpreted by the Catholic Church and by Anglicans, it would be safer to entrust the article dealing with it to an exegete or a theologian of the Catholic Church.

The reviewer joins in the almost universal approval that has been meted out to the critical part of the Dictionary, where in so many instances specialists, who have dealt with their subject elsewhere on a larger scale, have presented the result of their studies in an accessible form. 'Among the articles devoted to the Literature of the New Testament may be cited as models of clearness, of scientific precision, and of popularization, *Chronology of N. T.* (Turner), *Acts of*

the *Apostles* (Headlam), *Epistles to the Corinthians* (Robertson), *Ephesians* (Lock), *Colossians* (Murray); while the articles on the *Arabic, Egyptian, Armenian, Ethiopic Versions* (by Burkitt, F. Robinson, Conybeare, and Charles respectively) place at the disposition of the public the result of labours confined hitherto to very technical publications. The extra-canonical literature, Jewish or Jewish-Christian Apocalypses, apocryphal acts of prophets or apostles will be treated by Mr. Charles, who has already contributed the article *Enoch*, and Dr. James; the readers of the *Revue Biblique* know the unimpeachable authority of these two scholars in their own sphere, which has such peculiar attractions.'

As to the Old Testament, the reviewer notes that this is treated entirely from the critical point of view—a symptom of the change that has taken place in England within the last twenty years. At the same time the field is left open for discussion on many points, and the list of authors, which includes Professors Sayce and Hommel, who are often supposed to be opposed out and out to the 'higher criticism,' is a guarantee of fairness. The reviewer quotes, with approval, a sentence from the *Guardian*, to the effect that the labours of critics have by no means shattered the basis of Christian faith, but have served to make us know better the mode of the Divine inspiration in the Old Testament. He sees no ground for alarm, but the reverse, in the circumstance that, through works like the new Dictionary, the 'higher criticism,' instead of being confined to the speculations of theologians, is now brought within the reach of all who may be interested in those questions.

The Text of the Old Testament.

PROFESSOR ROTHSTEIN of Halle, the translator into German of Driver's *Introduction*, contributes an important article, entitled 'Text, Canon, und Uebersetzungen des Alten Testaments,' to the October number of the *Theol. Rundschau*. Somewhat in the style of Macaulay's *Essays*, he uses a number of recent works on the Old Testament as the text for a general dissertation on the proper methods and the present position of Textual Criticism.

He sets out with calling attention to the notorious fact that the text of many of the Old Testament books does not lie before us in the form in

which it came from the pen of the original writers. Hence a careful, critical examination of the text is the necessary preliminary to all further critical operations. Now there are two ways of going to work. Where there appears to be manifest corruption of the text, a good deal may be accomplished by conjectural emendation based upon the known causes of scribal errors, and upon other probabilities. This, in view of the extremely meagre aid to be derived from Hebrew MSS., is, of course, called for in dealing with the Old Testament to an extent which happily does not arise in the New Testament. But, in the second place, we possess in the ancient versions an aid which we must appreciate all the more highly because of the comparative uselessness of the MSS. referred to. Unfortunately, here we are hampered again by the circumstance that the text of these versions is itself frequently so uncertain, not to speak of the uncertainty that must prevail as to whether the version in any particular case offers a true, if somewhat free, reproduction of the Hebrew original, or whether the translator introduced changes for dogmatic reasons, or failed at times to understand the text that lay before him. Rothstein thinks it may be a long time yet before all the conditions are established that will make a thoroughly reliable text of the Old Testament possible. Meanwhile all work is to be welcomed that brings this goal nearer. Much valuable material has been accumulated already in commentaries and other writings dealing with books of the Old Testament, and he emphasizes the fact that the majority of modern authors display in their criticism of the text sound philological caution, even in using the testimony of the versions. Extremely valuable contributions towards the solution of the above problems he notes as having been frequently made in Stade's *ZATW*. As the most notable instance of an edition of a book of the Bible provided with a complete and all-round *Apparatus Criticus* based upon sound philological methods, he selects Cornill's *Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig, 1886).

Rothstein passes on to speak of the series that is being issued under the name of the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, edited by P. Haupt. With the aim and the methods of this great work he has much sympathy, but notes, what has been already perceived by not a few, the necessarily unequal character of the different parts. A great

deal must always depend upon the value which different scholars entrusted with different parts of the work attach respectively to the Massoretic text or to the Alexandrian and other versions. A similar subjective element will reveal itself also in regard to the distinction of the 'sources' in cases where relative unanimity has not yet been reached. These defects Rothstein finds attaching to Ball's *Genesis*, a work possessed of many excellences, but too 'subjective' both in regard to its critical handling of the text and its treatment of the 'sources.' Quite a different verdict is pronounced upon Kamphausen's *Daniel* in the same series. Kamphausen maintains an attitude of discriminating conservatism towards the Massoretic text, and when an emendation of the latter is manifestly indispensable, he carries out the task in a fashion so free from all subjectivity or arbitrariness, that the reader feels he is in the hands of a trustworthy guide. Perhaps, and here Rothstein echoes the opinion of many, a little more emendation of the text would not have been out of place, but it may be better to err in this direction than in that followed in Ball's *Genesis*.

As is well known, in the Greek Bible the translation of Theodotion in the Book of Daniel early displaced that of the LXX. The latter version was long lost, till last century it was rediscovered in the library of Cardinal Chigi at Rome. This (the Codex Chisianus) found a valuable auxiliary in the discovery at Milan of the Syriac translation of the Hexaplar LXX text. Now, the LXX text raises questions at once of much interest and of much difficulty. On the one hand, we have the remarkable circumstance that the translation of chs. 1, 2, 3 shows itself throughout to be a real (if marked by many peculiarities) reproduction of the text that lies before us, and that in like manner the translation of chs. 7-12 is a literal (not unfrequently literal to the verge of unintelligibility) rendering of the present text, while the Greek of chs. 4-6 treats the Semitic text with an almost incredible degree of freedom. On the other hand, the so-called Additions to the Book of Daniel, as these appear in the LXX as compared with their form in Theodotion, raise another interesting problem in the literary history. The insertions in ch. 3 (the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children) are essentially the same in both Versions; but the other pieces (Susanna, Bel and the Dragon) show such differences as to make it

impossible to regard the form they bear in Theodotion as simply worked over from the LXX. Professor Bludau of Münster, in his *Die Alex. Uebersetzung d. Buches Daniel u. ihr Verhältniss z. Massor. Text*, arrives at the following conclusions regarding the questions just stated:—The LXX translator of chs. 1-3 and 7-12 meant to produce a Greek translation to take the place of the original, and in spite of many uncertainties, this translation may be taken as supplying for these chapters a relatively trustworthy testimony as to the text of Daniel which was read in Alexandria in the 2nd cent. B.C. Bludau concludes regarding chs. 4-6 that their Greek text 'ought to be called an editing rather than a translation.' As to the Additions or deuterocanonical portions, he holds that for all these a Semitic original is at least highly probable. Rothstein thinks this conclusion certain as far as the insertions in ch. 3 are concerned, but is not so clear as to the rest. Regarding the peculiar relation of the LXX text of Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon, to the text of Theodotion, Bludau holds, Rothstein thinks rightly, that the difference between the two is explicable only upon the assumption that the (Semitic) originals underlying them also deviated from one another. Finally, Bludau seeks to explain the remarkable phenomena presented by the relation of the LXX text to the M.T., and, in the case of the Additions, to Theodotion's version. He regards it as probable that the translator had already before him a Greek version of chs. 4-6 and 13, 14, and that he took this up into his own work. This comes practically to the view supported by Bevan and Kamphausen that the LXX version of Daniel is the work of two different hands.

The Date of the Capture of Babylon by Cyrus, etc.

In the current number (1898, Heft II.) of the *ZATW*, ED. MEYER writes in defence of certain positions adopted by him in his *Entstehung des Judenthums*, which have been called in question.

The first of these concerns the date of Cyrus' capture of Babylon. Kittel (in *ZATW*, xviii. p. 152) gives this date as 16 Tammuz (June-July), 539, and remarks, 'Ed. Meyer (*Entsteh. d. Judenth.* p. 47) wrongly gives the date as 16 Tisri (= 12 October).' Meyer admits that to appearance Kittel is right, all editors and translators of the

Chronicle of Nabonidos dating the Fall of Babylon on 16 Tammuz. But he argues that there must be a mistake in this. From the 17th year of Nabonidos (539/8) we have a continuous series of documents coming down to the 28th day of the 6th month; then come three isolated dates, x/7, x/8, x/9. The most of these texts, including the last three, proceed from Sippara. The last document expressly marked as from Babylon is dated vii/4, besides which we have a text dated xxi/5 and two v/6, proceeding from a locality named apparently only by Nabonidos, 'the house of the king of Babel,' by which perhaps the residency, and thus presumably a part of Babylon, may be understood. On the other hand, the series of texts dated after Cyrus begins with x/7 of the year of his entry, then follow the dates xxiv/8, vii/9, xxiv/9, etc., all from Sippara. The first document from Babylon is dated xxi/12 of the year of his entry. All this would suit admirably with the texts of Nabonidos but for the two of those dated from the 8th and 9th months. These two dates Meyer can explain only as due to a slip on the part of the author or the editor of the tablet. On the other hand, it is clear that Sippara and Babylon cannot have fallen in Tammuz, but, at the earliest, two months later, in Tisri. This is supported by the fact that, according to the Chronicle of Nabonidos, it was not till the 3rd of Marcheshwan (the 8th month) that Cyrus made his entry into Babylon. But the Chronicle of Nabonidos itself proves that Babylon was not taken on the 16th Tammuz. For two lines earlier we find ourselves in Elul, the 6th month. 'Till the end of Elul the gods of the land of Akkad were transported to Babylon.' This is impossible if already a month and a half before, in the middle of Tammuz, the dominion of Nabonidos was at an end. Hence it is clear that the sign for Tammuz has been wrongly written for the quite similar one for Tisri (the 7th month), or, perhaps more likely, that the latter really stood in the text and that the distinguishing stroke has disappeared. If we substitute Tisri for Tammuz, everything falls into place. Nabonidos seeks for help from the gods of the country; up to the end of Elul (Sept. 539) their images are carried to the capital. But immediately thereafter Cyrus triumphs; on 14th Tisri (8th Oct.) Sippara, and on the 16th of the same month Babylon, is occupied, and Nabonidos taken prisoner. Then on the 3rd Marcheshwan (27th

Oct.) Cyrus entered Babylon in triumph and accorded grace to the city. During the next months, Kislev to Adar (December-March), the gods of Akkad were sent back to their homes. Thus, while, according to the old reading, an inexplicable interval of three and a half months elapsed between Cyrus' capture of Babylon and his entrance into the city, the interval, upon Meyer's interpretation, is reduced to a little over fourteen days.

The reader will do well to turn to the *ZATW* to see how Meyer deals also with Löhner's criticisms of his treatment of Ezr 4-6 and of the names Shesbazzar and Senazar.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Kautzsch's 'Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.'

It is with the utmost pleasure that we herald the appearance of the first number of this most important and most necessary work. Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* has received a very cordial welcome from all competent judges, and the same reception will no doubt be accorded to this new publication which was needed to complete that great work. In form and typographical arrangements the former principles are carried out, two slight changes, both of which are claimed as improvements, being noted—the footnote references being indicated, not by asterisks, etc., but by small Roman figures (a, b, c, etc.), and the critical discussions being given at the foot of the page (this is unquestionably an improvement) instead of being relegated to an appendix.

Professor Kautzsch, in his preface, touches upon the need of an accurate and accessible translation of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, in view of the extreme importance of this whole literature for the study of the N.T. and of N.T. times. It has been a difficult task, and it has taken time, to accomplish the work, of which the first instalment lies before us. Each book has been entrusted to one who has made long and special study of the questions connected with it, and

¹ *Die Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*; von E. Kautzsch. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898. Erste Lieferung. Pf. 50.

hence in this series, more than in the *Altes Testament*, each man is responsible for his own work. It is claimed as a merit of the new translation that the reader can always see what text underlies the rendering, and on what grounds any deviations from it rest. A careful and exhaustive introduction is to be prefixed to each book, and the copious footnotes will supply the necessary commentary.

It is expected that the work will be completed in from 24–30 parts, within the space of a year. Each number costs on an average 50 Pf. (6d.), and the whole cost to subscribers will in no case exceed 15 shillings. Orders are received only for the *whole* work.

It will interest our readers to see the complete list of subjects and authors. This is as follows:—

The <i>Book of Enoch</i> and the <i>Martyrdom of Isaiah</i>	G. Beer.
The Proem and Bks. iii.–v. of the <i>Sibylline Oracles</i>	F. Blass.
The <i>Assumption of Moses</i>	C. Clemen.
The <i>Fourth Book of Maccabees</i>	A. Deissmann.
The <i>Apocalypsis Mosi</i>	C. Fuchs.
The <i>Extra-Apocalypse</i> (i.e. 2 Es)	H. Gunkel.
The <i>Third Book of Ezra</i> (i.e. 1 Es)	H. Guthe.
The <i>Second Book of Maccabees</i>	A. Kamphausen.
The <i>First and Third Books of Maccabees</i> , and the <i>Testament of Naphtali</i> acc. to Heb. text	E. Kautzsch.
The <i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	R. Kittel.
The <i>Book of Jubilees</i>	E. Littmann.
The Books of <i>Tobit</i> and <i>Judith</i>	M. Löhr.
The <i>Book of Baruch</i> , with the <i>Epistle of Jeremy</i> and the <i>Additions to Daniel</i>	W. Rothstein.
The <i>Prayer of Manasseh</i> , <i>Additions to Esther</i> , <i>Sirach</i> (chs. 39–49 acc. to the recently discovered Heb. text), and the <i>Apocalypse of Baruch</i>	V. Ryssel.
The <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	F. Schnapp.
The <i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	K. Siegfried.
The <i>Letter of Aristeas</i>	P. Wendland.

The first instalment of the work contains Guthe's *Third Book of Ezra* and part of Kautzsch's *First Maccabees*.

Guthe has anything but a high opinion of the historical value of 1 Esdras, as illustrated, e.g., by the Story of the Three Pages. Rather would he class it with many other products of the later Jewish literature, which take liberties with older writings in order to find in these a clothing and a support for ruling ideas of their own day. Since

the book is used constantly by Josephus, its date cannot be later than the beginning of our era. Guthe's translation is based upon the text of O. Fritzsche in his *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. græce* (Leipzig, 1871), but takes account also of Swete's edition of LXX, and of the so-called Lucianic recension (ed. Lagarde).

Enough of Kautzsch's introduction to *First Maccabees* is contained in the issue before us to show the extreme care and accuracy of his work. We turn with interest to discover his opinion as to the meaning of the name 'Maccabee' (Μακκαβαῖος), which acc. to 1 Mac 2⁴ (cf. v. 66) was originally the surname of Judas alone, but was later applied to the whole family, and finally (e.g. in the title of the so-called *Third Maccabees*) to all champions of the Jewish religion against the Greeks. Assuming that *makḳābî* was the original form of the name, Kautzsch finds the most probable derivation to be from the Aram. *makḳābā* (Heb. מַכְקָבָה, Jg 4²¹, etc.), 'hammer,' so that *makḳābî* would be = 'the hammerer.' It is true that *makḳābā* is not the hammer (battle-axe) of war or even of the smith, but the workman's hammer; still this derivation appears to Kautzsch preferable to that contended for by Curtiss, from מַכְבֵּי 'extinguisher,' 'quencher' (of strife; cf. Is 43¹⁷).—The original language of the book, Kautzsch is inclined to think, was 'Hebrew' in the strict sense, and not Palestinian-Aramaic.—The author may have had written 'sources' at his disposal; in any case, neither he nor anyone else invented the whole detailed history of Judas. Kautzsch is disposed, for various reasons, to seek this author amongst the Sadducees. We have not space to do more than refer to the discussion of the genuineness of the numerous documents that profess to be quoted in 1 Mac, the chronology of the book, and the date of its composition, all of which show the thoroughness we expect from the editor.

The debt of the theological world to Professor Kautzsch and to the firm of J. C. B. Mohr, which was great already, has been very materially increased by the editing and the publishing of this work, which is *simply indispensable to every student either of the Old Testament or of the New*.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.