

A NEW GERMAN COMMENTARY ON THE
MINOR PROPHETS.

A SHORT review of an important book should at least not fail in giving some true idea of its merits and of the nature of its contents. It should also, if this can be done without impertinence, mention some points which the reviewer would desire the author to reconsider in a second edition, for, even if he approaches the subject of the book from a similar point of view, he is sure to be able now and then to suggest possible improvements. It may be true that at turning-points in our lives we learn only (as Goethe says) from books which we cannot criticise, but when we have gained principles and methods we are, save for the lack of experience, on a level with our teachers. Possibly enough some one who reads these lines may be able to solve some problems by which Nowack has been baffled, even though it is only a year or two since he left the class-room; and the willingness of Nowack to recognise English and American work (though some not contemptible specimens of such work were unknown to him) assures me that he will give a friendly reception to any slight suggestions which I may make. "Gladly would he learn, and gladly teach," are words in which Chaucer aptly describes the true scholar, and such is Prof. Nowack.

The form of the page is the same as in Duhm's *Isaiah* and Budde's *Job*. But space is gained by the total rejection of the division into parallel lines; even the liturgical poem in Hab. iii. is printed as prose. Later insertions are indicated by italic type or by square brackets, while passages translated from a corrected text are indicated by asterisks at the beginning and the end. Where the text is plainly wrong, but no satisfactory correction can be offered, dots are put. The notes are not broken up, as in most English commentaries, but run on to the end of a section.

They are closely packed, and therefore would not translate well; an advanced scholar will find them all the more enjoyable. When the interpretation of a whole section requires to be discussed, as in the case of Hos. i.-iii., ample space is given, and throughout the true sense-divisions of the prophetic texts are carefully indicated. The introductions are condensed, but cannot, in my opinion, be charged with obscurity or inadequacy. Passing next to the translation, it is clear that the critical standard has risen considerably in the last twenty years. Prof. Nowack is cautious by nature, but he accepts or propounds views which would formerly have been called rash, but which, with deeper insight into principles and into the condition of the text, critics receive now with much favour. There is not a single one of the so-called Minor Prophets without passages in italics; asterisks, too, abound. I cannot here give a list of all the later insertions marked as such by this very circumspect critic, but those in Hosea and Amos may be recorded.¹ The three psalm-like passages, Jon. ii. 2-10, Nah. i. 2-ii. 3, Hab. iii., are, of course, among those printed in italics, and due credit is given to Bickell and Gunkel for their acute researches on the second of these poems. I should add that throughout the book ungrudging recognition is given to Wellhausen's only too brief, but truly brilliant, contribution to the study of these prophets.

On the criticism of the text I shall speak more fully below. Much as Wellhausen has done for this subject, a great deal more still remains to be done, and the latest commentator has now and then (probably more often than

¹ Hos. i. 7; ii. 1-3, 6, 8f., 12, 16-18, 20-25; iii. 4 ("and David their king") and perhaps v. 5; iv. 6a (perhaps), 11, 14 (end), 15a; v. 3b; vi. 11; vii. 4; viii. 1b, 5 (end); ix. 9 (part); x. 3, 4, 5 (end), 9 (end), 10, 13b, 14 ("as Shalman . . ."); xi. 8b-11; xii. 1b, 4b-7, 13f.; xiv. 10; besides interpolated words here and there.

Amos i. 10f. (probably); ii. 4 f.; iii. 14b; iv. 12 f.; v. 8f., 26; vi. 2, 9 f.; viii. 8, 11 f.; ix. 5 f., 8-15.

I have yet discovered) cleared up what Wellhausen has left obscure. Thus in Hos. vii. 16, where the Revised Version has, "They return, but not to him that is on high" (which is far from probable), Prof. Nowack very happily restores, for לֹא עַל, לְבַעַל, "to Baal." Dislike to the name Baal led to its extrusion from the text. Similarly, as Paul Ruben has already pointed out (Nowack has duly noted this), in Hos. xi. 7, הַבַּעַל has become עַל. This correction adds one more to the list of passages manipulated in the interests of edification. Our critic's judgments on the dates of books, or parts of books, are sensible and circumspect; in the latter part of Zechariah I should sometimes have liked a little more boldness combined with the indispensable caution. But that all parts of Zechariah are post-Exilic, Nowack is as firmly convinced as Wellhausen himself, and having long ago defended the same conclusion, I rejoice. Perhaps our critic is also a little too cautious at the end of Hosea. He admits that the fourteenth chapter has been "worked over" with no sparing hand. What hinders him from printing it in italics is the consideration that Hosea must have expressed such a hope of a better future as chap. xiv. contains; his presuppositions are quite different from those of Amos, who did, as it would seem, conclude with terrible threatenings. This argument is inconclusive. No analysis of xiv. 2-9 seems to me possible; though v. 10 may be a still later addition. Even if, therefore, we conjecture that Hosea did prophesy the return of Israel to Jehovah, we have no warrant for assigning a composition so late in colouring to the authorship of Hosea. But it is quite intelligible that on the subject of "secondary passages" opinion should now and then be divided, and the difference between Nowack and myself is but slight. I should like to add an expression of satisfaction at the treatment of the second part of Micah, and having done this will proceed to make the suggestions to which I referred.

Hos. v. 13, x. 6. Surely *מלך ירב*, "king Jareb," should be *מלך רב*, "the Great King"; cf. Ps. xlviii. 3. Or perhaps *מלך רם*, "the High King"; cf. LXX., *ἰαρεμ*.

Hos. vii. 15. Ruben points out that LXX. has *ἐπαιδεύθησαν ἐν ἐμοὶ κατὰ γὰρ* for M T's *יִסּוּרוּ בִּי וְאֲנִי יִסְרַתִּי יְהוָה*. The conclusion is inevitable that *יִסְרַתִּי* is a dittograph of *יִסּוּרוּ*.

Hos. viii. 1. Wellhausen and Nowack give up the opening words in despair. Certainly, "The trumpet (horn) to thy palate," is impossible. The correction, however, is almost certain. The text should run, "Lift up the voice with strength, (yea,) as a trumpet against the house of Jehovah, because," etc., *הֲרִם קוֹל בְּבֶהַת כְּשֹׁפֵר עַל-בֵּית יְהוָה*. Notice that *מִצְרִים* immediately precedes; this accounts for *הֲרִם* falling out. *שֹׁפֵר* and *כְּנֹשֵׁר* (rather *כַּשְׁפֵּר* = *כַּשְׁפֵּר*) are really various readings; the latter form only is correct, as Grätz has already pointed out. This clever scholar also suggested *קוֹל* for *אֵל*; cf. Isa. lviii. 1. Nowack prints the second half of the verse in italics. I incline to make the whole verse a later addition, except that *בֵּית יְהוָה* may be Hosea's; something, at any rate, stood here, though not the present text.

Hos. x. 7. Nowack should have mentioned Grätz's correction *כִּקְטָף קִצְף*; *קִצְף* is suspicious. Cf. *קִצְפָה*, Joel i. 7, and Nowack's notice of Grätz's excellent suggestion. The margin of Revised Version, "as twigs," is in any case correct.

Hos. x. 14. Nowack, following Wellhausen, regards "as Shalman, etc.," as a later insertion; "Shalman" he identifies with Shalmaneser. But I now think that M T is incorrect. LXX. B has *ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ἰεροβοαμ*. "Beth-Arbel" should in fact be *בֵּית יַרְבֵּעַם*, "the house of Jeroboam," and *שְׁלֹמֹן* should be *שְׁלֹמִים*. Ver. 14b contains a note of a later reader, who was contemporary with the murder of Zechariah, son of Jeroboam II., by Shallum. Cf. Amos vii. 9.

Hos. xi. 1. Surely Ruben (following Symm. and Theod.) is right in reading לֹל בְּנִי, "and ever since (his residence in) Egypt I called him my son." Nowack does not mention this, but is not quite satisfied with his own correction which follows LXX.

Hos. xi. 4. Nowack prints "with cords of love" in italics; an editor misunderstood the expression, "with human bands." But this spoils the structure of the verse. For אָדָם read חָסֵד (with Grätz, *Psalmen*, p. 144). חָסֵד is a favourite word of Hosea. חָסֵד was miswritten חָדָס; then, to make sense, ד was read ס and ח was read א. Cf. סָר for כָּר, 2 Kings xx. 43, xxi. 4f.; וִירָח for וִירָא, 2 Kings xvii. 21.

Hos. xii. 1 (E. V. xi. 12). The margin of Revised Version gives, "And Judah is yet unstedfast with God, and with the Holy One who is faithful." This, however, is self-evidently wrong. Besides, all the other passages in which a supposed root רִיר occurs are corrupt. Cf. note on Isa. xv. 3 in Haupt's edition of the Hebrew Bible. Instead of רִיר, Marti and Nowack would read יִרָע: "Judah is still intimate with God." But LXX., to which they refer, is here wide of the mark. I propose, "But Judah (walks tremblingly with God, and is stedfast in relation to his Holy One," וִיהוּדָה חָרָר עִם־אֱלֹהִים וְעִם־קְדוּשׁוֹ נֹאמֵן. M T's עֵד רִיר comes from חָרָר. Either the ר in חָר is a mistake for ר, and the scribe put ר immediately afterwards to repair his error, or the ר was inserted to make sense after ח had been corrupted into ע. The gutturals ע and ח are often confounded (cf. Zeph. ii. 14).

Hos. xiv. 7 (E. V. 6); E. V., "his smell as Lebanon." "Lebanon" and "olive-tree" are not proper parallels. Read לְבָנָה (iv. 13): some large, shady tree is meant, perhaps the bushy plant called storax.

Joel iv. 11 (E. V. iii. 11), Revised Version, "Haste ye"; marg., "Assemble yourselves." Both these renderings of עִשְׂוּ are highly disputable. "Perhaps the word is cor-

rupt" (Nowack); but this is an understatement. Wellhausen conjectured עורר, "Awake." But it is unlikely that Jehovah's "heroes" (see *v.* 9) and the hostile peoples would be addressed in the same phrase. Rather read גָּשִׁי, "Draw near." ע and נ were sometimes confounded, from phonetic causes; cf. גללתי for עללתי, Job xvi. 15.

Amos i. 2. Prof. Nowack will find that the view which he rejects is my property, and I hope and think that it is much stronger and more solid than he supposes.

Amos iii. 12. Wellhausen, who supposes a word to have dropped out, renders, "who sit at Samaria in the corner of a couch, and at Damascus * * * of a divan." But, as Nowack remarks, what business have the grandees of Samaria, whom Amos threatens with judgment, at Damascus? He suspects that the error lies in ברמשק, and doubtfully accepts Grätz's conjecture בשמיכת, *i.e.*, "on the covering." But שמיכה only occurs in Judges iv. 18, where Grätz himself corrects, no doubt rightly, מכסה. I have no doubt that ברמשק is a corruption of במשכב; render therefore, ". . . and on the cushion of a divan." ערש and משכב, synonymous words, are combined, as ערש and יצוּע in Ps. cxxxii. 3.

Amos iv. 13. For מה־ישׁוּחַו, "what is his musing" (as if שׁיחוּ), read, with Grätz (following Targ.), כְּמַעֲשֵׂהוּ, "his work."

Amos viii. 14. Revised Version, "As the way of Beersheba liveth." Wellhausen conjectured בארך, "thy well"; Nowack, אֵלֶךְ, cf. LXX., ὁ θεός σου. But why not mention Winckler's דִּרְךְ, "thy divine patron"? To me this appears undoubtedly correct (cf. Isa. v. 1, and the personal names containing the element Dōd).

Obad. 20. Revised Version, "And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel, which are (among) the Canaanites, (shall possess) even unto Zarephath; and the captivity of Jerusalem, which is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the south." Marginal renderings, however,

show the uncertainty of the Revisers, and had they been at liberty they would probably have expressed a serious doubt as to the correctness of the text. Nowack, "And the exiles of . . . who are in . . ., will conquer Phœnicia as far as Sarepta, and the exiles of Jerusalem, who are in . . ., will conquer the cities of the Negeb." In a note he says, "Verses 20 and 21 are hopelessly corrupt; in ver. 20a the verb belonging to גלת is wanting. Nor can we say what is to be understood by החל. Orelli and others explain חל, 'army,' Hitzig 'fortress.' But neither rendering gives a clear sense. . . . What is meant by ספרד is equally uncertain; LXX.'s *Eφραθα* produces no intelligible interpretation." And then come four lines about the cuneiform inscriptions, including a reference to Schrader's well-known book (translated by Whitehouse). This is rather unsatisfactory. Surely a reasonable conjecture, suggested by the probability of omission and of transposition of letters or words, ought to be ventured. Surely too the facts of the cuneiform inscriptions ought to be given, and a reasonable attempt to harmonize them ought to be made. That ספרד is corrupt, is doubtless not impossible, but, unless we set our faces against the use of archæological evidence (which is just the offence with which we are, most unfairly, charged as a class by Hommel, Sayce, and Winckler), we ought to presume that, if it can be explained archæologically, it is *not corrupt*. Now it can be so explained, and has been so explained. First, however, as to the text of the first half of *v.* 20. אשר before כנענים (rather כנען, as Nowack) and לבני ישראל, both appear to me misplaced; and the groups of letters (words I cannot call them) החל-יהוה may be fragments of בהלח ובחבור נהר גיון. The whole clause should run, "And the exiles of the Israelites who are in Halah and by Habor the river of Gozan (2 Kings xviii. 11) will conquer Phœnicia as far as Zarephath." Next, as to Sephard. The province Sparda

is mentioned by Darius next to Ionia. It is highly probable that Jewish captives were to be found not only in Ionia (cf. Joel iii. = iv. 6), and hardly less likely that the name of the province should once at least find mention (just as 'Abar-naharā is mentioned) in the later literature. Prof. Sayce's exposition of the archæological facts in his *Criticism and the Monuments*, pp. 482-484, seems to me very lucid. The probability therefore is that verses 15-21 were written not later than the latter part of the Persian age, and it is not impossible (more we cannot say) that the Jewish exiles in Sepharad, or rather (for the form סְפָרַד is pausal) Sephared, *i.e.* Sparda, found their way thither as a result of the cruelties of Artaxerxes Ochus. That this fierce conqueror did drive many Jews into exile is expressly stated.

Mic. i. 15. Nowack, "Unto . . . will I bring you, O inhabitants of Mareshah; unto Adullam will come the glory of Israel." I venture to think the required correction is a very simple one. In fact, because it is so simple, I have some hesitation in proposing it. Read—

"Unto a new betrother will I bring thee, O community of Mareshah; For ever shall the nobility of Israel perish."¹

The "betrother" is the foe, who, on the battle-field near Mareshah, will destroy for ever the noblest part of the people of Israel. Compare the metaphor in *v.* 14*a*, where there is evidently a word-play in כּוֹרֶשֶׁת and מְאֹרֶשֶׁת, "the betrothed." The passage runs (Revised Version), "Therefore shalt thou give a parting-gift to Moresheth-Gath." The word rendered "parting-gift" occurs again in 1 Kings ix. 15, of the city of Gezer, which Pharaoh took from the Canaanites and gave to his daughter, Solomon's wife. Into the difficulties connected with "Moresheth-Gath," which are well stated by Nowack, I am not called upon to enter.

¹ עַד-מְאֹרֶשׁ אֲבִילָךְ יִשְׁבֶּת כּוֹרֶשֶׁת
עַד-עוֹלָם יֵאָבֵד כְּבוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל :

Hag. i. 9. Nowack makes no reference to the interesting little dispute between Wellhausen and Kosters relative to the meaning of **וְאַתֶּם רָצִים אִישׁ לְבֵיתוֹ**. In his translation of the Minor Prophets the former scholar renders, "While ye are in haste to build your own houses." Kosters (*Het Herstel*, etc., p. 21) objects that this puts violence on the Hebrew text, which only says that the Jews have, each man, a house to go into; nothing is said of building. In his reply to Kosters, Wellhausen abandons his former view, and reads **וְאַתֶּם רָצִים אִישׁ בְּבֵיתוֹ**, "while each of you takes pleasure in his house." Nowack gives the right sense, but vainly tries to justify it as a translation, "while each of you bestirs himself (*euch eifrig regt*) for his house." He refers to Prov. i. 16, Isa. lix. 7 (in reality one passage), which, however, are not parallel. Surely we should read **הָרָצִים** (Prov. xiii. 4).

Zech. vii. 2. Revised Version renders, "Now (they of) Bethel had sent Sharezer and Regem-melech, and their men, to intreat the favour of the Lord," etc., with a marginal rendering, "Now they of Bethel, even Sharezer . . . had sent." Wellhausen detected the corruptness of the text, and rendered thus, "In fact, . . . sent Regem-melech and his men to propitiate," etc. Marti took a slightly different course. In Kautzsch's Old Testament he rendered thus, "The family of El-sarezzer and Regem-melech with his men sent (an embassy)," etc. I believe, however, that I have proved that the true reading is as follows: "It came to pass . . . that Bel-sarezzer and Regem-melech sent men (*i.e.* a deputation) to propitiate Jehovah," etc. Also that Bel-sarezzer and Regem-melech are no other than Bilshan and Raamiah, who are mentioned in Ezra ii. 2, Neh. vii. 7, among the "heads" (so Esdr.) of the Judæan community in the early post-Exilic period. In Ezra ii. 2 Raamiah is wrongly given as Reelaiah, in 1 Esdras v. 8 as Resaias. The text in 1 Esdras v. 8 further gives, instead of Bilshan,

Beelsarus, and it was this that put me on the right track. "Bethel Sarezzer" in Zech. vii. 2 should of course be "Bel-sarezzer"; "Bethel" is senseless. The insertion is indeed not so common as the omission of letters, but it occurs sometimes (*e.g.* in Isa. xvii. 3, where אֶפְרַיִם, "Ephraim," should probably be אֲרָם, "Aram"). The senders of the deputation are obviously leaders of the community. Wellhausen asks, "Is Bethelsarezzer (or however else the name should be written) perhaps Zerubbabel?" But Haggai calls Zerubbabel by his usual name elsewhere. The truth is that the deputation was sent by two of the twelve leaders called "heads." Zerubbabel had probably been recalled to Persia on a suspicion of his disloyalty. His successor as governor may have been a Persian; at any rate, the two leading members of the college of "heads" feel that they can represent the laity of Jerusalem. Dr. Marquart, of Tübingen, pointed out to me that Regemelech is Raamiah; probably the right form of the name is Raam-melech ("the divine king is the Thunderer"). He thus enabled me to complete the explanation of the passage, Beel-sar(us) being obviously a shortened form of Bel-sarezzer. There is no doubt more to be said, but this may suffice on the present occasion.

Zech. xii. 11, "as the mourning for Hadad-rimmon"; so Nowack rightly. But our critic's explanation of the name is, I think, certainly wrong. Rimmon is no doubt Ramman, the Assyrian Storm-god. The two views which I have expressed may no doubt appear inconsistent. But I believe that the name has a strange history (see "Hadad-rimmon" in Messrs. A. & C. Black's forthcoming *New Bible Dictionary*).

Mal. iii. 20 (E. V. iv. 2). Nowack retains MT's פִּשְׁתִּים, a most suspicious ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. But is not Grätz's correction, טַפְּשִׁים, "ye shall grow fat" (Ps. cxix. 70) far preferable?

These suggestions are offered to Prof. Nowack in no arrogant spirit. Some of them may be better than others, but all are perhaps worth consideration. In textual criticism, as well as in critical analysis, he does some good service, but more I think in the latter than in the former. I would also venture to refer him to an article on difficult passages in the prophets, which appeared in the *EXPOSITOR* for Jan. 1897, and which, among other interesting passages, dealt with Hos. vi. 8, 9; Amos i. 2, v. 26, ix. 8-18; Nah. ii. 8. In the last of these passages I consider a difficult word from an Assyriological point of view, adopting a suggestion of Paul Ruben's which has escaped Nowack's attention (העתלה = העלתה; cf. Ass. *etellitu*, "mighty, regent," a feminine form). The whole passage now becomes simple. Altogether, the author has lost not a little from his perfectly excusable and unavoidable unacquaintance with the latest English and American work. I will only mention Dr. Davidson's *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, in the small Cambridge Bible; Dr. Driver's *Joel and Amos* in the same series; Prof. G. A. Smith's interesting *Twelve Prophets*, vol. i., and, last but not least, several articles in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, especially one by Prof. N. Schmidt on Amos v. 25-27. Nor has the new edition of Robertson Smith's *Prophets of Israel* been used quite as much as it might have been. On the other hand, some of the older English works have been noticed by Prof. Nowack in a very friendly manner, e.g., articles by Robertson Smith in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. It is a misfortune that English and American scholarship should still be so little known on the Continent, though an improvement is beginning to be visible.

Once more I beg to recommend Prof. Nowack's book as a fine piece of critical and exegetical work, and indispensable to all students of the prophets.

T. K. CHEYNE.