

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

'The Code found in the Temple'

READERS of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* who have been attracted by Prof. G. R. Berry's article called *The Code found in the Temple* may be interested to know that his most important conclusion had been independently advocated in a little book published last year by my colleague, Prof. R. H. Kennett (*Deuteronomy and the Decalogue* by R. H. Kennett, Cambridge University Press, England, 1920). The two scholars have written in entire independence of one another, and as their common conclusions are in direct opposition to "the practically unanimous opinion of adherents of the documentary theory of the Hexateuch" — I quote Prof. Berry's words — their agreement appears to me to be worth emphasizing.

Their common conclusions are that the 'book of the law' found in the temple at Jerusalem in the eighteenth year of King Josiah, 621 B. C., was not the book of Deuteronomy or even the Deuteronomic Code, and that the Deuteronomic Code is later than Jeremiah, i. e. that it is "as late as the exile or later."

Prof. Kennett's tract is concerned with many other matters deserving a full review (see the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxii, pp. 61—65 [Oct. 1920]), including a sketch of the evolution of Jewish religion and cultus during the period of the Exile. In fact it is obvious that this later date for the writing down of the Deuteronomic Code will necessitate a quite drastic rearrangement of our ideas about the Israelitic religion of that period, if we happen to have any. For that very reason I wish

to draw attention to the importance of Prof. Kennett's little book, now that the question has been so judiciously reopened in America as well as in England.

I am not going to repeat Prof. Berry's arguments or to quote Prof. Kennett's. Both of them very rightly bring forward the remarkable ordinance of Deut 17 15, forbidding the election of a non-Israelitish king, an ordinance inconceivable while the heir of David was actually seated on his throne. I would only here remind my readers that it was actually during the exile that a Jewish Prophet acclaimed a heathen monarch as the LORD's Messiah. "Thus saith JAHWE to his Messiah, to Cyrus" (Isaiah 45 1): it gives an added point to Deut 17 15, if we may regard it as a protest from Palestine against a too facile abandonment by the exiles in Babylon of the hope of national independence under a native dynasty.

Cambridge, England

F. C. BURKITT

Hidalgo and Filius Hominis¹

Son of man is generally supposed to denote Christ as the promised Messiah. But Jesus Himself never used this term in this sense. Nor does this phrase emphasize His relation to humanity as a whole (EB¹¹ 15, 349^b).² Jesus spoke Aramaic, and *son of man* is the common expression for *man* in Aramaic. The original meaning, however, was not *filius hominis*, but *filius viri*, the son of a man, in contradistinction to *the son of a nobody*. The Spanish term for a gentleman by birth, *hidalgo*, Portuguese

¹ The following six brief communications are abstracts of papers presented at the meetings of the Johns Hopkins University Philological Association on Oct. 15, Dec. 16, 1920; Jan. 20, Feb. 17, March 17, and April, 1921, respectively.

² For the abbreviations see this *Journal*, vol. 38, p. 142. G²⁹ is the 29th edition of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar by G. Bergsträsser; i = infra; s = supra.