

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes.
Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit
or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the
copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the
ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the
links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

conscious of the difficulty in the disappearance of the rough gutteral *h*: further it is a far cry from "assembly" to "lots."

In any case my derivation is Semitic, and it involves no long descent in meaning from *puru*, "turn," "time," "term of office," to a good sense for Purim, nor even to a meaning "lot" for that word.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

SOME RECENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

THE publication of the Revised Version of the Apocrypha¹ completes the work of the revisers. Most of the more important books were translated by committees of the New Testament Company, but 1 and 2 Esdras, the additions to Esther, Baruch, the Song of the Three Children, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, and the Prayer of Manasses were undertaken by a committee of the Old Testament Company. The text is for the most part that of A.V., but in 2 Esdras use has been made of Professor Bensly's reconstruction of the text, and vii. 36-105, the Latin text of which was discovered by him, and published in 1875, has been included in the translation. As regards form, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and the poems in Tobit and Judith have been printed according to the parallelism of sense in the originals—an arrangement which makes these passages much more intelligible and readable. The changes in the translation—as far as we have been able to examine them—give the sense of the original not only more accurately, but also more vividly, than the A.V. It is to be hoped that this publication will powerfully stimulate the growing interest in the Apocrypha. Many of the books possess great intrinsic interest and literary merit; the Maccabees

¹ The Apocrypha, being the version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1894. Oxford University Press, 1895.

are almost our only authority for one of the greatest crises in the history of Revealed Religion; some knowledge of the Apocrypha is essential to the right understanding of our Canonical Scriptures; these books were part of the Bible of the Middle Ages, and created a powerful influence on the development of theology, and for a very large part of Christendom they are still part of the Bible.

This last instalment of the revisers' work adds very considerably to the debt due to them by the English-speaking peoples. Like all emended translations of the Bible, this revision has had arrayed against it great vested interests, commercial, homiletic, dogmatic. The reception given to the Revised Version by the general public is easily summarized; the New Testament version was blamed for its merits, the Old Testament has been praised for its defects. Those who should have been its friends have often been more anxious to show how it might have been made better than to recognise how good it was. Nevertheless, history cannot fail to acknowledge the immense services which the Revised Version has already rendered, and will continue to render, to the religious life and thought of England.

From the Apocalypse it is an easy transition to a pseudepigraph "of whose existence there had never been even a surmise in the world of scholarship, and to which there was not a single unmistakable allusion in all ancient literature" (pref. viii.)—*The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*.¹ This is an entirely different work from the well-known Book of Enoch, and doubtless one reason why it has been so entirely lost sight of is that it was confounded with the more famous work, and references to the Book of the Secrets was supposed to refer to the Book of Enoch. The new work is now extant in five Slavonic MSS.—three of

¹ *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, translated from the Slavonic by W. R. Morfill, M.A., and edited, with introduction and notes, by R. H. Charles, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896, pp. xlviii., 100, 7s. 6d.

which contain a “shortened and incomplete redaction”—of the 16th and 17th centuries. The editor, Mr. R. H. Charles, the great English authority on the Ethiopic Enoch, decides that this Slavonic Enoch was originally composed in Egypt, probably at Alexandria, by an orthodox Hellenistic Jew, between A.D. 1–50, and that it was written in Greek. The author, however, made use of an earlier work in Hebrew. It contains very close parallels to Matthew v. 9, 34, 35, 37, xxv. 34; Luke vi. 35; John xiv. 2; Hebrews xi. 3; Revelation x. 5, 6, and Mr. Charles is inclined to think that the work was known to New Testament writers, and states also that: “Some form of the Slavonic Enoch seems to have been in Mohammed’s hands.” He notices many parallels between the Ethiopic and the Slavonic Enoch, but does not discuss their relationship at any length; possibly he intends to do so in some later publication. The plan and subject-matter of the Slavonic Enoch have much in common with the Ethiopic Enoch. Enoch, after his translation, is conducted through the seven heavens, where he witnesses the bliss of the righteous, and also—curiously enough—the sufferings of the lost. Hell is a kind of department of heaven. God reveals to him the secrets of the universe in a discourse which is an expansion of the opening chapters of Genesis, and makes him write down his experiences in 366—or 360, the MSS. vary—books. He then returns to earth, tells his children what he has seen and heard, gives them the books, exhorts them at great length, and is finally translated to heaven.

One of Mr. Charles’s MSS. also contains a fragmentary version of the Melchizedek myth, including an account of Melchizedek’s birth, which is a grotesque and repulsive parody of the Gospel of the Infancy. Probably Mr. Charles’s opinions as to the date, etc., of the Book of the Secrets of Enoch will not be accepted without discussion.

For instance, the parallels with New Testament passages may be Christian interpolations. In any case, however, this discovery makes an important addition to our knowledge of the first century A.D.

Prof. Findlay, who is well known for his work as a New Testament scholar, contributes a work on the Prophets¹ to the Wesleyan series of "Books for Bible Students." This is the first of three volumes on the Prophets, and includes those whose ministry came before the Fall of Samaria, *i.e.*, according to Prof. Findlay, Obadiah, Joel, the author of Isaiah xv., xvi., Amos, Hosea, Zechariah, ix.-xi., Micah. It will be evident, even from this list, that Prof. Findlay accepts the principles and results of modern criticism. Where he differs from prevalent views, *e.g.*, as to the date of Obadiah, Joel, and Zechariah ix.-xi., he does so on critical and not on apologetic grounds, and he usually states the alternative views side by side with his own. This book contains much useful information in a compact form, which it will probably introduce into circles where Driver's Introduction is tabooed. It is a valuable addition to the series to which it belongs.

The latest of the "Little Books of Religion" is Dr. Marcus Dods' *Visions of a Prophet*,² which consists of eight practical and devotional studies based on the visions contained in the Book of Zechariah. It will be most helpful and suggestive as a manual of private devotion, and we trust it will be widely read. Obviously such a work is also useful to the teacher and preacher.

We have next two works on the Book of Genesis: one is a new edition of Mr. Spurrell's very useful notes on the

¹ *The Books of the Prophets in their Historical Succession*, by George G. Findlay, B.A., Tutor in Biblical Literature, Headingley College, vol. i. To the Fall of Samaria. London: C. H. Kelly, 1896, pp. xiv., 297.

² *The Visions of a Prophet: Studies in Zechariah*, by Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895, pp. viii., 185.

Hebrew Text of the Book of Genesis.¹ It is most encouraging to find that this book, which appeals solely to Hebrew students, has got into a second edition. A large amount of new matter is incorporated in this new edition, viz., an Introduction of 64 pages on the composition of the book, crowded with information, and 40 pages of additions to notes and new notes. Nowhere else are the interests of the Hebrew student of Genesis cared for in such a thorough and scholarly fashion. The other book on Genesis² is by Prof. Wade, of Lampeter; it is "intended chiefly for English readers . . . and the discussion of matters of pure scholarship has been purposely avoided." This book is specially interesting as an edition of Genesis with introduction and brief notes, accepting and expounding the documentary theory of the Pentateuch; and, at the same time, carefully adapted to the needs of English readers who are entirely innocent of Hebrew. Prof. Wade is moderate and cautious, but he substantially adheres to the theory, which arranges the documents in the order JE, D, P. The text is arranged in two columns, on the left P, on the right J, JE, or E, as the case may be. When J and E are closely and minutely interwoven, JE is printed as it stands in the Hebrew text, without any attempt at analysis. Prof. Wade has carefully followed leading authorities, and this volume is a useful popular introduction to the methods and results of the analysis of the Pentateuch.

In *Memphis and Mycenæ*³ Mr. Cecil Torr, who is an authority on classical antiquities, examines the Egyptian evidence for the statement that the Mycenæan age in

¹ *Notes on the Text of the Book of Genesis*, by G. J. Spurrell, M.A., formerly Hebrew Lecturer at Wadham College, Oxford. Second edition, revised and corrected. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896, pp. lxiv., 416, 800. 10s. 6d.

² *The Book of Genesis*, by G. W. Wade, M.A., Professor of Latin at St. David's College, Lampeter. London: Hodder Bros., 1896, pp. viii., 264. 5s.

³ *Memphis and Mycenæ*, an examination of Egyptian Chronology and its application to the early history of Greece, by Cecil Torr, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1896, pp. x., 74. 5s.

Greece can be definitely fixed at 1500 b.c. He comes to the conclusion that "there certainly is nothing to justify the confident assertion that the Mycenæan age in Greece was concurrent with the eighteenth dynasty in Egypt, and that this dynasty began in 1700." On Egyptian evidence he concludes that dynasty 18 must have begun in 1271 b.c. at latest, dynasty 20 about b.c. 1000 at latest, dynasty 12 about 1500 b.c. at latest. He admits that these dynasties may have begun at earlier dates, but that it is impossible to prove any earlier dates. Now Prof. Flinders Petrie, in his recent *History of Egypt*, vol. i., dates the beginning of the 18th dynasty in b.c. 1587, and of the 12th dynasty in b.c. 2778; and states, pp. vi., vii., that "the range of uncertainty may be about a century in the earlier parts of this volume, diminishing to about a generation by the close of the volume." The volume includes dynasties 1-16, but also gives a table of the dynasties extending to the 18th. The reader will remember that Prof. Petrie has published, in a recent number of the *Contemporary*, a translation of a newly discovered inscription of Merenptah II., better known as Menephthah II., and, according to a widely accepted theory, the "Pharaoh of the Exodus." In his article Prof. Petrie gives b.c. 1200 as an ascertained date in Merenptah's reign. Mr. Torr would apparently deny that there is any strong evidence for making Merenptah's reign begin earlier than about b.c. 1028, p. 43, though he admits that his evidence merely fixes 1028 as the latest possible date for this accession. Mr. Torr devotes a chapter to showing that the astronomical evidence, on which Prof. Petrie and others largely rely, is worthless: "there is very little hope of correcting any dates in history by reference to the cycles of the phoenix and the dog-star, or other things belonging to the calendar. And there is still less hope of learning anything at all from the orientation of the temples. No building can be planned in such a way

as to prevent its axis from pointing to some heavenly body at some date or other." It will be interesting to see if Mr. Torr obtains any allies from among the experts in Egyptology whose dominions he has invaded.

Mr. Compton's *Sacrifice*¹ is an attempt to interpret Old Testament sacrifices so that they may lead up to and connect with the Eucharist, which also is discussed and expounded from the standpoint of a moderate Sacramentalism. The Eucharist is a "cooked Minchah . . . with its great appendage of wine." The book belongs to a region of thought entirely free from the taint of any reference to such researches as those of the late Robertson Smith. Prof. Moulton gives us *Proverbs*² in a dainty little volume, in which type, arrangement and headings do their best to further the reading and study of the Revised Version.

Dr. Anderson's book on *Daniel*³ is a fierce attack on critics in general and Dean Farrar in particular.

Sir J. W. Dawson's *Eden*⁴ consists of material already familiar to our readers, being a reprint of articles published in *THE EXPOSITOR*.

¹ *Sacrifice*, by Berdmore Compton, late Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street. Jas. Parker & Co. London : 1896, pp. viii., 118. 2s. 6d.

² *The Proverbs*, edited by R. G. Moulton, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Literature in English University of Chicago. Macmillan & Co., New York and London, 1895, pp. xxiv., 193.

³ *Daniel in the Critic's Den*, by Robert Anderson, LL.D., Barrister-at-Law, Assistant Commissioner of Police in the Metropolis. Wm. Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh and London, 1895, pp. ix., 126. 3s. 6d.

⁴ *Eden Lost and Won*, by Sir J. William Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., etc. London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1895, pp. viii., 226.