

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

As already intimated, the subjects of study for the session 1898-99 are the First Book of Psalms (Psalms i.-xli.) and the First Epistle of St. Peter.

Those who desire to study one or both of these portions of Scripture between November 1898 and June 1899 are invited to send their name and address to the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. There is no fee or other obligation. The purpose of the Guild is to encourage systematic study of Holy Scripture as distinguished from the mere reading of it, and the conditions are made as simple as possible. The best commentary available should be used. There are excellent editions of

both books in the 'Cambridge Bible for Colleges.' And if the member can study the Hebrew and Greek, he will know that Delitzsch's (Hodder & Stoughton) or Cheyne's *Psalms* (Kegan Paul) are scholarly and suggestive; while an edition of a portion of St. Peter by the late Professor Hort has just been published by Messrs. Macmillan.

Students are invited to send short papers as the result of their study. One at least of these papers will be published every month. And the writers will be asked at the end of the year to select a volume out of a list which Messrs. T. & T. Clark will furnish.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Holzinger's 'Genesis.'

THE Genesis in this series has been wisely entrusted to Holzinger, the author of the well-known critical work on the Hexateuch. The author's studies for that work had naturally prepared him for writing the present one, which is characterized by the same learning and thoroughness as the earlier book. The commentary is preceded by an Introduction devoted to some necessary preliminary questions, *e.g.* to the history of the criticism of Genesis, of which a very intelligent sketch is given. This is followed by a characterization of the various writers united in Genesis, J, E, and P, their standpoints, purpose in writing, and religious conceptions. This characterization is on the same lines with that in the author's Hexateuch, though more succinct, and is well worth reading. Holzinger decides that J is the oldest source. It is admitted by all scholars that this source received its final form in Judah, though some think that it originated in the northern kingdom, but Holzinger is of opinion that it is exclusively Judæan. This conclusion is important. It is often represented that what may

be called the Prophetic Religion of Israel appears earlier in the northern kingdom than in Judah, and that it passed, or at least the impulses to it passed, from the one to the other. This is in itself improbable. The political and social history of Israel was marked by more violent movements than that of Judah, and these movements brought great prophetic personages like Elijah to the front, and we hear more of prophets in the north; but if writers like J appeared in Judah, say 100 years more or less before Isaiah, it must be admitted that the Prophetic Religion was not less advanced in Judah than in Israel, though, owing to the calmer atmosphere of Judæan life, its growth or history comes less into prominence in the public annals. The last section of the author's Introduction contains his account of the processes by which the various sources were united together in one work. A useful conspectus of the elements belonging to the respective sources, and those due to editorial or later hands, is added.

The commentary in the earlier chapters of Genesis is very full, though briefer in the later part. The author has adopted a method of exhibiting the contents of the book which, though it is difficult to carry through in some cases, conduces to historical clearness, and reveals whatever difference there may be in religious view or other

¹ *Genesis erklärt.* Von H. Holzinger ('Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A.T.'). Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr. 1898. Price 6s.

things in the different sources. Instead of treating the composite history of the Flood, for example, as it now stands, he disentangles the two threads of which it is woven, and treats them separately, giving first 'the Flood according to P,' and then 'the Flood according to J.' In a similar way he treats separately the Creation narratives, the primitive history, the Covenant with Abraham, and the like. This method of treatment reveals more clearly the lacunæ in one of the narratives, and suggests that to avoid duplicates some portions have been omitted when the narratives were united together. The first eleven chapters of Genesis contain what may be called the Primitive History of Mankind down to the call of Abraham. In these chapters, therefore, many forms of thought and religious ideas are met with common to a wide circle of peoples, and Israelitish only in a remoter degree; while in the chapters following, the ideas are more peculiarly those of Israel. The early chapters are necessarily traditional and fragmentary. The questions that arise in regard to their contents are such as these: First, what elements in the narrative belong to the historical tradition which the writer of Genesis found, and whence came the elements, from Babylon, or Phenicia, or Canaan, or elsewhere, and at what time? It is now evident that ideas which Israel may have come in contact with in Canaan may be Babylonian in origin. Second, with what ideas of the Prophetic Religion has the Hebrew writer informed or animated the historical tradition, necessitating the lopping off, or modification of much belonging to the original pagan form of the story? Comparison of the Bible histories of the Creation and Flood, with the forms such histories have in the Babylonian mythologies, shows how profoundly under the hand of the Hebrew writer the stories were subdued to the ideas of the Jehovah religion. A third question, and one to which the student of the religion of Israel would above all desire an answer, is this: How far did this saturation of primitive Semitic traditions with the ideas of the Prophetic Religion originate with particular individual writers such as J, or to what extent had the process of transformation already taken place in the general religious mind of the people of Israel? After his exposition of the various sections on Creation, the Flood, the Fall, and the like, Holzinger discusses the general questions raised by them with great

fulness. His discussion is fair and reasonable, with full knowledge of what has been said by others, and is always instructive. Of course, where there is room for so much difference of opinion, his readers will not always agree with him. His explanation of Gn 4—the fratricide of Cain—will be thought superficial. He regards the passage as a myth, designed to explain the existence of Nomads and their outcast condition. Cain is the Kenites, and the Kenites are the Nomads; the murder is a mere imagination, invented to account for the fugitive and vagabond condition of the Bedouin. Such an explanation makes the whole story full of contradictions. What can be meant by the statement that Cain was a 'tiller of the ground'? Did the Hebrew writer suppose that nomadic tribes had been originally agriculturists? The identification of the Kenites with the pure Nomads is inconsistent with the reputation the Kenites had in Hebrew history. Holzinger supposes the 'sign' given to Cain to have been something indicative of the religion of Jehovah, to which the Kenites attached themselves. But how then could Cain say that he was driven from the presence of Jehovah? The puerile and the ingenious are so allied to one another that one doubts whether ingeniousness be not a greater foe to exegesis than stupidity. The history of the Fall given by J, though sombre and in a sense pessimistic, is so profound that one cannot believe that Holzinger and Stade have been successful in reading his meaning in chap. 4. Holzinger's work is scholarly and suggestive,—though the suggestions both in textual and historical criticism will sometimes be thought over-ingenious and unnecessary,—and will keep up the reputation of the very vigorous series of manuals to which it belongs.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

Edinburgh.

The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus.¹

THE recent discovery of a portion of the original Hebrew text of Sirach created an interest that increased in intensity as it spread more widely. Besides the value of the discovery for the knowledge of Sirach itself, there was the grand question of the Hebrew of its day. If Ecclesiasticus was

¹ *L'Ecclesiastique: Texte Original Hebreu.* Édité, traduit, et commenté par Israel Lévi. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

written in new Hebrew, as many indications seemed to point, then Ecclesiastes was a much older book than criticism allowed. The answer of the new discovery was unmistakable. Its Hebrew, though mixed with some new words and idioms, is classical Hebrew.

In process of time the Rev. A. E. Cowley, M.A., and Ad. Neubauer, M.A., published an edition of the discovered text, and followed it up with an English translation. The edition before us is, however, the fullest and most satisfactory edition yet issued. It gives the Hebrew, and on the opposite page a translation in French. It annotates both Hebrew and French, and illustrates both from every literary source, and it discusses all the problems that have arisen or can arise, in a long delightful Introduction. It is, in short, the standard edition, and can only be replaced by one that covers more Hebrew. This, as we know, gives us from 39¹⁵ to 49¹¹.

As examples of what the discovery has done for Ecclesiasticus and what Dr. Lévi has done for the discovery, take two short passages.

In Sir 41³ R.V., translating the Greek, renders—

Fear not the sentence of death ;
Remember them that have been before thee, and
that come after.

Cowley and Neubauer, translating the Hebrew, read—

Be not afraid of death, (which is) thy sentence,
Remember that they which went before and they
which come after (will be) with thee.

With this Lévi agrees, but he is able to be more terse and literal—

Ne t'éffraie pas de la mort, qui est ta loi ;
Souviens-toi que devanciers et successeurs [Heb.
(ראשנים ואחרים)] seront avec toi.

But in 43² Lévi improves on Cowley and Neubauer considerably, and seems to us to hit the mark—

R.V.—The sun when he appeareth, bringing tidings
as he goeth forth,
Is a marvellous instrument, the work of the
Most High.

C. and N.—The sun, when he goeth forth, poureth out
warmth ;

How terrible are the works of the Lord !

L.—Le soleil, à son aurore, resplendissant, pro-
clame :

'Combien est admirable l'œuvre divine !'

The volume belongs to the *Bibliothèque de l'école des Hautes Études*.

EDITOR.

Strack's 'Introduction to the Old Testament.'

THE fourth edition of this compact and very useful *Introduction* came out in 1895, and has already been followed by this the fifth; it is not to be wondered at that another edition has been demanded; the wonder is, that it has not been translated into English, in which case there would be a considerable demand for it.

The new edition has thirteen pages more than the previous one. It has been thoroughly brought up to date, especially in the literary department. Books published since 1895, such as Moore's *Judges*, Dillmann's *Old Testament Theology*, and the English edition of Dillmann's *Genesis*, are referred to, while books which ought not to have been omitted in former editions are now included, such as Henderson's Commentaries on Isaiah, etc.

I have once more to complain that some indication is not given of the comparative value of books dealing with the same subject. It is the chronological order that is followed. It would be better to arrange the books in order of merit, and in addition to that to put them into two classes, namely, Works for Students and Scholars, and Popular Works. A few words here and there setting forth the aim and worth of the book would be a considerable advantage to those whose time for reading is limited, and Dr. Strack's book is intended for them. This need is supplied in a very few cases. But it must be admitted by everyone that no such complete list of books dealing with the Old Testament is to be found in English or in German, or indeed in any other language. It is quite amazing to see how complete his account of English works is; the Bibliography alone is well worth the price charged for the volume. I have noticed only one typographical error, and that is on p. 59, where we find 'Bundes-Auch' for 'Bundesbuch.' This mistake does not occur in the fourth edition. I take the liberty of suggesting to the industrious and learned author the advisability of adding an index to the volume. That would cost a good deal of labour,

¹ *Einleitung in das Alte Testament einschliesslich Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*. Mit eingehender Angabe der Litteratur von D. Hermann L. Strack, ao. Professor der Theologie an der Universität, Berlin. Price M. 3.50 (3s. 6d.).

where so many names and matters are to be embraced, but it would be a great advantage to the reader.

Unlike the valuable *Introduction* by Canon Driver, Dr. Strack's work embraces General as well as Particular Introduction. In the general part our author writes succinctly of the Old Testament Canon, the history of the text and of the editions of the Hebrew Bible, of the Versions of the Old Testament, etc. Since he gives in most cases the principal opinions which have been held, the work is valuable as a means of information and also as a help in coming to a conclusion.

It is to be noted, further, that this *Introduction* embraces the Apocrypha as well as the Old Testament, and indeed the pseudepigraphical writings too; this shows how comprehensive the treatise is.

The chief merit of the book is that it contains the result of very wide reading brought into a small compass, and put into a very readable form. If anyone is inclined to follow up the study of any particular matter that is discussed, the best books are recommended him, and the chief courses of thinking pointed out. Take, for example, the section on the history of Pentateuch Criticism, what could be neater? Beginning with what the Talmud and other Jewish writings have taught, Dr. Strack passes on quickly to the modern period, when, with the French physician, Astruc, the real science of Pentateuch criticism began. The short descriptions of the point of view taken by the chief authorities are excellent, such as, that Vatke and J. F. L. George approached the subject in a philosophical way, applying the Hegelian principles; and that Reuss was chiefly prompted in his discussions by the silence of the historical book regarding the P legislation; that Graf popularized the position taken by his teacher, etc. Then there is a brief chapter on the dates and character of the chief documents as these are set forth by the principal authorities of recent times, such as Schrader, Dillmann, Wellhausen, and Cornill. The amount of reading which is compressed into these chapters is immense. Indeed, Dr. Strack is so bent upon telling the reader what other people have thought that he has hardly time to say what he himself thinks, which reminds me of a similar difficulty which professors of theology often have. When they have to teach too many subjects, or have not time to study the subject which they do teach, it is often the case

that they have hurriedly to bring together the opinions of others without having leisure to give and vindicate their own. A pupil of the late Dr. M'Cosh of Princeton told me that in the Logic class conducted by Dr. M'Cosh during his Belfast days, after the teacher had given almost everybody else's opinion but his own, the students often shouted out, 'What does Jamie think?' And so in reading the volume before us, one is often moved to ask What does Dr. Strack think? Remembering, however, the limitations and the object of the book, it could not well be otherwise in this respect than it is.

It may be advisable at this stage to give a brief account of Dr. Strack's own position on certain matters of importance, for he *does* give and defend his opinions here and there. Dr. Strack denies of course that Moses is the author of our Pentateuch, and gives abundant reasons for his denial. He admits that the so-called five books of Moses are made up of parts taken from different documents, edited and re-edited in later times. E, he says, makes large use of the Book of the Covenant. At an early date, E and J were united. P existed before D, and therefore long before the Exile. In this last respect it will be seen that he agrees with Ewald and Dillmann, as against the later and now generally accepted opinion that P is post-exilic. J, E, and P were united at an early period. D, he holds, was not written in the time of Josiah, but belongs to a previous time. From his parrying the argument of W. Robertson Smith and of most moderns that Is 19¹⁰ must have been written before D, which condemns the use of *mazzeboth*,¹ one would gather that Dr. Strack puts D farther back in date than the real Isaiah. The argument for the prior date of Isaiah is an uncertain one, as the prophets use symbolical language (compare Mal 1¹¹, and Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy* throughout). But Dr. Strack's early dating of D is opposed to the opinions of most modern scholars, and, details apart, the state of opinion and of religious life implied in the book require a date sometime in the seventh century B.C. In his endeavour to show the early date of P, Dr. Strack appears to me to lay too much stress on mere details, on stray allusions, and on rare uses of words. What if P shows here and there signs of a pre-exilic date,

¹ 'In that day there shall be an altar to Yahwe in the land of Egypt, and a pillar (מַצֵּבֶת) by its border to Yahwe.'

or even of the time and authorship of Moses himself?

Who denies this? Wellhausen does not. The late W. Robertson Smith did not. The latter held that the principle underlying the priestly legislation could be traced back to the days of Moses and even to Moses himself. See *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed. p. 313. The question to ask is, To what period in the history of Israel does the legislation identified with P belong? Does it, in all its details, go back to the time of Moses, or to any time before the Exile? Was our existing Pentateuch or rather the priestly part of it written before the Exile? A negative answer to these questions may be given, and is given, by men who acknowledge that many parts of P belong to a period long prior to the Exile, and even to Moses himself. It is just in this particular point that Professor James Robertson, in his able and well-written book, *The Early Religion of Israel*, goes astray.

Isaiah is not, according to Dr. Strack, the author of the whole of the first thirty-nine chapters of the book called by his name. Chaps. 36-39 are certainly not by him, and it is doubtful whether chaps. 13 and 14 are, although chap. 13 may be. Reasons are given—the old ones of course, at least they are old now—for believing that Isaiah did not and could not write the last twenty-six chapters of the book. Whether chaps. 56-66 are by a fresh writer, as Duhm holds, or by a syndicate of writers belonging to the Deutero-Isaiah school, as Canon Cheyne maintains, Dr. Strack leaves undecided. The early date of Joel is claimed, the reign of Joash being regarded as the time of its writing. Zechariah is the author only of the first eight chapters of the book so called. Daniel is a product of the second century, B.C., of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Jonah is not to be taken as giving real history; its great purpose is to bring out the truth of the universal love of God which embraces heathen like the people of Nineveh, as well as Jews. Like the author of the Book of Job, so the author of this book had probably a basis of fact to work upon, but the purpose of these books as well as of the Book of Daniel is didactic and not historical.

One has to be careful at times in reading Dr. Strack's description of what those who differ from him teach. It is proverbially difficult to state quite fairly the case of an opponent. Wellhausen's

attitude in regard to P's account of the Tabernacle (Ex 25³¹ and 41⁴⁸) is not quite correctly indicated by our author, who makes him to say that P's description of the Tabernacle was due to his fancy, pure and simple. I think those who have read Wellhausen's account of the matter would not have that impression. P's Tabernacle, when it differs from the First Temple, agrees with the Second, and also with the Temple of Ezekiel, as in the number of golden lampstands, and in the possession of inner and outer courts. The priestly writer, or rather writers, living amid the religious conceptions and practices of the post-exilic period, picture the wilderness life, with Moses in the centre, as enjoying in perfection the form of religion known in the time of the writers. The fancy was really controlled by the actual events amidst which they lived. The picture is no more fanciful than those of the perfect time of the Messiah which Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, etc., draw. In each case the writers could only see the ideal, whether past or future, in colours and in forms suggested by the life amidst which they lived.

The fact that careful, conservative, and devout scholars, like Dr. Strack, have advanced so far in the acceptance of critical opinions so-called of the Old Testament, is interesting and instructive. Indeed, such views are now almost orthodox, though less than forty years ago the late laborious and estimable Dr. Samuel Davidson lost his chair at the Lancashire College for advocating them. *Tempora mutantur*. God, however, and the truth remain the same, only they become more precious to us as the years go by.

T. WITTON DAVIES.

*Bangor Baptist College,
North Wales.*

Among the Periodicals.

Nero and the 'Beast' of the Apocalypse.

IN the September number of the *Revue de Théologie*, PROFESSOR C. BRUSTON returns to the discussion of the above question. His own views on the apocalyptic 'Beast' have been already presented to our readers (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, January 1897, p. 168), and he vindicates these in the article before us, in opposition to the

explanation offered by Bousset in his *Offenbarung Johannis, neu bearbeitet* (in Meyer's Commentary). Regarding this work as a whole, Bruston uses the language of panegyric. He agrees, too, with its author and with the majority of recent commentators in holding that the principal object of the Apocalypse is to predict the fall of the Roman Empire, and thus to console the persecuted saints. Bruston and Bousset are also in accord in ascribing the book not to a single author or a single epoch.

But on one point of capital importance our two authors differ. Bruston considers that the hypothesis of *Nero redivivus*, particularly in the form adopted by Bousset, is exposed to insuperable objections as an explanation of the language of Rev 13³, 'And I saw one of his heads as though it had been smitten unto death (ὡς ἐσφαγμένην εἰς θάνατον), and his (αὐτοῦ, not αὐτῆς, sc. the beast's not the head's) death-stroke was healed, and the whole earth wondered after the beast.' The interpretation generally offered of the seven heads of the Beast is that the Beast is the Roman Empire and the seven heads the first seven emperors, and thus far Bruston agrees. Bousset, however, holds that the first Roman emperors are represented not by the seven heads without crowns, but by the ten crowned horns, remarking, strangely enough, as Bruston thinks, that the seven heads have lost all significance, having been simply borrowed from tradition. To return to the interpretation of Rev 13³. It is very often alleged that the head wounded to death is Nero, who, according to a widely spread (?) belief, was not really dead but concealed in Parthia, from which he was to return to exercise greater sway than ever. Bruston points out, however, that there is no word in the above text of the healing of the *head* (the murdered emperor) but of the *beast* (the empire wounded by this murder). Upon the peculiar view taken by Bousset of the seven heads and the ten horns, it is all the more difficult, as Bruston remarks, to find in the wounding and the cure of one of the seven heads any relation to the death and the future (imaginary) return of Nero, which, all the same, Bousset finds referred to in Rev 13³. 'It is surprising that one of the *seven uncrowned heads* should represent one of the *ten emperors* already symbolized by the *ten crowned horns*.' Bruston considers that with all his skill, Bousset has been unable to extricate himself from the

difficulties in which his peculiar interpretation has involved him, and that the common view of the partisans of the *Nero redivivus* hypothesis is right, that the author of the Apocalypse speaks of only *seven* emperors, not *ten*. 'They (the seven heads) are seven kings; the five (first) are fallen; the one (the sixth) is; the other (the seventh) is not yet come' (Rev 17¹⁰). The representation here is perfectly clear, and Bruston argues that it is impossible to interpret differently the language of chap. 13.

The author of the Apocalypse then refers to only seven emperors, and he himself lived under the sixth. *But who is the sixth?* Are we to reckon Julius Cæsar or Augustus as the first Roman emperor? The partisans of the *Nero redivivus* hypothesis say Augustus, and then the sixth is Galba, or Vespasian, if one leaves out of account the three usurpers—Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. Bruston, on the contrary, starts with Julius Cæsar, the founder of the empire, and then the sixth emperor is Nero, under whom (towards the end of his reign, after the great persecution of 64 A.D.) the author of the Apocalypse wrote. He argues that Bousset can least of all, upon his theory of the seven heads and the ten horns, postulate that Nero is symbolized by the head wounded to death. Further, any argument he offers to prove that Nero was dead when the Apocalypse was written, is declared to involve a *petitio principii*. And as to the other partisans of the Nero hypothesis, Bruston argues, as we have seen above, and as has been maintained also by Düsterdieck and B. Weiss, that the wounding in Rev 13³ is of the *Empire* and not of the *Emperor*. In short, as our readers are aware, he holds that the wounding to death of one of the heads refers to *the assassination of Julius Cæsar*, and the healing of the wound thus inflicted upon the Beast to the *reconstitution of the empire by Augustus*. He finds no force in Bousset's objection that upon this theory the 'as it were wounded' (ὡς ἐσφαγμένην) is unintelligible. Why, it is neither more nor less intelligible than the same expression applied in 5⁶ to Jesus, 'a lamb as though it had been slain' (ὡς ἐσφαγμένον). Both Jesus Christ and Julius Cæsar were *really* slain, but in the *vision* of the Apocalypticist they *appear* (ὡς) so.

Upon the whole, Bruston is inclined to think that Bousset, had he intended it, could hardly have produced a more convincing proof that the

Nero redivivus hypothesis is unworkable in the interpretation of the Apocalypse.

The Sumerian Question.

Readers of the new *Dictionary of the Bible* may have noted that the article 'Accad,' written by Professor Ira M. Price, contains some views that are out of harmony with those of Assyriologists like Hommel (cf., e.g., the articles on 'Assyria' and 'Babylonia' in the same work). The divergence, indeed, was felt to be such as to call for an editorial note explaining the position of the controversy. Professor Price more than insinuates in his article that the so-called 'Sumerians' and 'Accadians' are but 'figments of an over-zealous scientific spirit,' and that the Semites invented the cuneiform characters instead of taking these over from the 'Sumerians.' Now it so happens that a work, entitled *Die Sumerische Frage*, by F. H. Weissbach, has been published this year (Leipzig: Hinrichs. Price M. 10), of which a review by Dr. A. Jeremias appears in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* for 17th September last. The book contains, first of all, an exhaustive history of the Sumerian question, from its commencement in 1850 down to the present day. Weissbach is pronounced by Jeremias to have thereby rendered invaluable service to Assyriologists now and in time to come, for without this sketch it would take much time and trouble to gather a thorough acquaintance with the complicated history of the important problem—important alike for the history of the world, of religion, and of civilization.

Hitherto, says Jeremias, the problem has been examined almost exclusively from the philological view-point. Is the so-called Sumerian an Assyrian secret character (or artificial language), or is it the natural speech of a non-Semitic Babylonian primitive people? As is well known, the Jewish scholar, Joseph Halévy, who may be called the father of anti-Sumerianism, has since 1874 strenuously denied the existence of a non-Semitic primitive people and a Sumerian language. Weissbach, on the other hand, expresses the firm conviction that the Sumerian question has ceased on the two main points to be a question; that is to say, he believes that the cuneiform characters were the invention of a non-Semitic people, and that they are rightly designated 'Sumerian.' Jeremias is unable to assent to the verdict in this categorical form. He points out that it has been unfortunate

for the treatment of the problem from the first that the chief representative of anti-Sumerianism has been unable to conceal the philo-Semitic tendency of his investigations. For Halévy it is a point of honour that the Jews should have the credit of inventing the art of writing, and this although a co-religionist has reminded him that such a claim might be waived, seeing that the world owes to the Semites a still greater discovery, that of monotheism. Yet Jeremias thinks that a justifiable aversion to the 'tendency' of Halévy's researches has perhaps made Weissbach somewhat blind to the real merits of the great anti-Sumerist. (For instances see the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*.) Jeremias points out quite candidly the linguistic objections to the anti-Sumerian position, but, on the other hand, remarks that the existence of a primitive Sumerian people would occasion one of the riddles of history. How is it conceivable, he asks, that the Babylonian civilization, which dominates the whole of Western Asia as far back as our information reaches, and which possesses such an original power as completely to absorb the civilization of conquering races like the Kossæans, Elamites, Chaldæans, and Assyrians, and such an invincible power that after an existence of many years it could still impress its traces deeply on Western civilization, how is it conceivable that this civilization should be of a secondary character?

This leads Jeremias to examine the historical evidence. It is generally admitted that we have no 'pure Sumerian' text in the Babylonian literature hitherto discovered, not even in the Telloh tablets, which in part are even older than the newly discovered Nippur texts, and on which such hopes of a solution of the Sumerian problem were once placed. Everywhere it must be conceded that we find at least 'Semitisms', i.e. the inscriptions belong to an epoch when the supposed invasion of the Semites and the adoption of the old Sumerian civilization by Semitic Babylonians had already taken place, and they are all written by Semites. We are told that the pure Sumerian civilization, including the invention of writing, goes much farther back. But, asks Jeremias, do not the oldest Babylonian discoveries awaken partly the impression that we are face to face with almost the beginnings of human writing? And must one yet assume that already the bloom of pure Sumerian civilization was left so far behind that the memory of the non-Semitic primitive

people was lost? Not a trace of literary evidence for the Sumerians from pre-Assyrian times,—the memory of this far-advanced highly cultured people, to which one owes everything, had vanished from history! And where are the traces of the famed Sumerian culture? If they were the inventors of writing, what had they to write in their forgotten antiquity? No sufficient evidence is present, according to Jeremias, for attributing to them the ancient epics, the statue-heads of Telloh, or the ancient mythology.

Weissbach and Jeremias thus differ materially as to the present position of the Sumerian question. The former considers it to be solved, and only laments that our knowledge of Sumerian is still so meagre. The other thinks it is still far from solved, and does not expect it ever will be solved by purely philological methods, but he trusts that as the deciphering of the cuneiform characters has been the crowning achievement of the nineteenth century, it may be reserved for the twentieth century to find a satisfying answer to the great Sumerian question.

The 'Theologischer Jahresbericht.'¹

The second and third *Abtheilungen* of this year's issue have appeared since we last noticed the

¹ Berlin and Braunschweig: Schwetschke & Sohn; Edinburgh and London: Williams & Norgate.

above-named invaluable record of theological literature.

The second *Abtheilung* has for its subject *Historische Theologie*. It includes (1) Church History down to the Council of Nicæa—by Lüdemann; (2) from the Council of Nicæa to the Middle Ages, including the Byzantine literature—by Krüger; (3) Church History of the Middle Ages, exclusive of the Byzantine literature—by Ficker; (4) from the beginning of the Reformation to 1648—by Lœsche; (5) from 1648 down to the present day—by Hegler. All this is followed by two interesting and exhaustive sections on Inter-confessional Theology (by Kohlschmidt) and the History of Religion (by Professor Tiele of Leiden).

The third *Abtheilung* is devoted to *Systematische Theologie*, and is distributed amongst Meyer (who deals with *Encyclopædie, Apologetik, Kosmologie*, etc.), Troeltsch (*Religionsphilosophie und principielle Theologie*), Sulze (*Dogmatik*), Dreyer (*Ethik*). As is always the case with this indispensable work, not only is the literature carefully catalogued, but an astonishing amount of information about, and criticism of, the contents of the various books is compressed into small compass.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS i. 26, 27.

'And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God created man in His own image: in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.'

EXPOSITION.

'Let us make man.'—As the last and highest of the animate creatures, man is created. His creation is indeed thrown together with that of the land animals into one day, and in this way a certain connexion between the two is acknowledged. But much more does the account aim at making prominent his dissimilarity and his high dignity, as

contrasted with these and all other beings. This is indicated by the place assigned him at the end of the whole series, and it is expressly stated by the assertion of his divine likeness and rank as ruler. Even in the introductory formula the importance of this last act is emphasised, since it does not continue as before: 'And God spake, Let man come into being,' but his creation is represented as the result of a special decision by God.—DILLMANN.

'Man.'—*Man* (Heb. *adam*), the genus *homo*, the race as such, not the individual man, as is plain from the plural which follows, 'let them have dominion,' and again in the next verse: 'So God created man in His own image: in the image of God created He *him*; male and female created He *them*.'—PEROWNE.

'In our image.'—The idea of man is expressed in the statement that he is created in the image of God. This divine image is propagated. The dignity of the divine image is a second time ascribed to man (9^b), from which it