

Professor Charles A. Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, studied in Berlin with Roediger and Dorner, and has held his present position for more than ten years, during which he has taught several of the Semitic languages with ability and success, and has brought the Old Testament department in that institution into greater prominence than it ever enjoyed before. His *Biblical Study*¹ is the residuum of certain articles prepared for reviews, as well as of two or three lectures. It is dedicated to Drs. Hitchcock and Dorner, "the survivors of two noble faculties," to whom he confesses that he owes his theological training. The work is really an encyclopædia of current discussions about the Old Testament, treating of the advantages of Biblical study, of exegetical theology, the languages of the Bible, the Bible and criticism, the canon of Scripture, the text of the Bible, Hebrew poetry, the interpretation of Scripture, Biblical theology, the Scriptures as a means of grace; and containing a catalogue of books of reference for Biblical study. The book is deserving of high praise as a useful epitome of valuable information carefully gathered from the latest critical sources. It is designed to vindicate the rights of untrammelled criticism. The standpoint is that of the modern critical school, although the author holds the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in a modified form.

Remaining literature, including the more important contributions to reviews, among which are several critical articles of a positive character, will be noticed in a subsequent number of the EXPOSITOR.

Chicago.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

BREVIA.

Lord Sabaoth.—*κύριος Σαβαώθ*, Rom. ix. 29; James v. 4, is rendered by A.V. and R.V. "the Lord of Sabaoth"; by Delitzsch, *לַיהוָה יְיָ*. The Hebrew equivalent is undoubtedly the right one, but can the English rendering be justified? Surely "the Lord of Hosts," or "the Lord Sabaoth," are the alternatives. Why is it *κύριος Σαβαώθ* instead of *κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων*, as generally in the Septuagint, unless *Σαβαώθ* has become a proper name. It is true that Sabaoth is never used without some word for God being prefixed; the parallel, Ashtar-Kemosh (Moabite Stone, l. 17), offered by the French *Corp. Inscr. Sem.*, is therefore incomplete.

¹ New York, 1884.

But this was necessary in order to avoid the appearance of as-trolatry. I have elsewhere referred to the confusion made, as it seems, by a Roman prætor between the Phrygian deity Sabazius and the Sabaoth of the Jews (Val. Max., i. 3, 3). M. J. A. Hild has, I see, made the same observation (*Revue des études juives*, 1884, p. 1), adding that the collateral form, Sebazius, was connected by the Greeks with *σεβάζειν, σεβαστός*, which accounts for such a confusion on the part of any one who knew Greek. How strange the persistent refusal of Greek and Roman officials and *littérateurs* to acquaint themselves with the classic religion (as we may call it) of the Jews! But—"the kingdom of God cometh not with observation."

T. K. CHEYNE.

Notes on Ecclesiastes.—Dr. Klostermann's review of Dr. C. H. H. Wright's *Ecclesiastes* in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1885, Heft 1, will attract those who can pardon the author's clumsy style and strong self-consciousness. Among the many more or less new views in it, we may mention (a) that of "the angel" in v. 6 as the destroying angel, who appears to the surprise and horror of the careless speaker of the curse (as Death appears to the old man in *Æsop*); (b) that of vii. 28, "among the few human beings who are each like one among thousands I have not found a single woman;" (c) the correction of *לְמַחְשָׁבִי* into *לְמַחְשָׁבִי* (*לְמַחְשָׁבִי* for "conscience" occurs nowhere else); (d) the explanation of Koheleth as *ἡ συλλογιστικὴ (σοφία)*; (e) that of the Epilogue, as appended by the editor of *Ecclesiastes* to give the right view of the book—the details of this explanation are new.

T. K. CHEYNE.

The Seraphim.—May I, through THE EXPOSITOR, supplement my brief appendix on Seraphim, in the *Prophecies of Isaiah* (ed. 3, vol. ii. p. 296)? Perhaps the gifted young Assyriologist, whose name appears among the contributors, may give a word of assent or dissent. At any rate, Friedrich Delitzsch, in Baer's new edition of the Hebrew of *Ezekiel*, says (p. xiii.) that the lion-god Nergal has also the name *Šarrapu*, and the passage, *W. A. I.*, ii. 54, 76, from which this statement is derived, adds that this was the case in "the western land," *i.e.* Canaan. The lion signifies the burning heat of the sun. Altogether the theory that the sacred writers made a point wherever they could of elevating popular mythic expressions to the rank of spiritualized symbols has too large a basis of fact to be disregarded. By "sacred," I mean to express the uniqueness of the gifts and the spirit of Biblical writers.

T. K. CHEYNE.

In answer to Dr. Cheyne I would submit the following facts.

In the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. ii. pl. 54, 75, we have the following equation:—

AN. ŠARRA. PU (or BU). = AN. ŠAR or LUGAL. NIRRA.
MARKI.

Now Dr. F. Delitzsch argues from this that the god Nergal, who is spoken of in the lines above that quoted, was called “Sharrapu” in the west of Canaan (in terra occidentali (h. e. Canaan) numen leoninum, nomine Nêrgal, numen Šarrapu habuisse). It is perfectly true that Nergal is generally understood to be the lion-headed god, although actual proofs of this are wanting: but it must not be forgotten that he was the great god of Hades and also of pestilence and desolation. Moreover, there is nothing hostile to the idea that the word Seraphim may still be found in Assyrian and Babylonian, for its root is in common use in the historical inscriptions, being used by the narrator to express the burning of conquered cities. The fact is that Dr. Delitzsch has misunderstood the passage. If we accept his reading of the left-hand part of the equation, we learn from the right-hand part that one of the titles of the god Nergal was “Great King of the West:” but it does not follow, according to my view, from this that he was called Šarrapu in the west. The right-hand part of the equation is not to be read ŠARRAPU as Dr. Delitzsch thinks, but Šar-rabu “great prince” and if we translate the equation we have:—

AN. ŠAR. RA-BU. = AN. ŠAR or LUGAL. NIRRA. MARKI.
divinity, prince great = divinity, prince great of the West.

from which it is evident that both sides of the equation contain mere titles of the god Nergal. In this view I am supported by my colleague Mr. Pinches. Dr. Cheyne is, of course, right in the latter part of his note, for a remarkable instance of this fact is the mention of לִילִיָּהּ by Isaiah (xxxiv. 14): up to the present, however, the originals of the words Cherubim and Seraphim have not been found in the Assyrian and Babylonian tablets, I would call the attention of those interested in these matters to a short paper on the Cherubim by Mr. Renouf, in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, for May, 1884. He has found what appears to be a very probable etymology of the word Cherubim, in Egyptian, where, however, the Cheresu are lions.

British Museum.

E. A. W. BUDGE.