

## CHRONICLE

### THE OLD TESTAMENT AND RELATED LITERATURE.

WITH the publication of the commentary on *Daniel* by Dr R. H. Charles, the 'Century Bible' (T. C. & E. C. Jack, Edinburgh) reaches completion. The series has been in preparation for some years; it was an ambitious undertaking, and recognition is due to the public-spirited publishers as also to the editor, Principal Adeney, and his contributors. The aim has been to present the results of modern research in a handy, concise, and cheap form; and the excellence of the little volumes has been acknowledged from the first. As evidence of the breadth and scholarship of the series it is enough to mention the names of such contributors as Bennett (Genesis, Exodus), Driver (Nahum-Malachi), Kennedy (Leviticus, Numbers, Samuel), Peake (Jeremiah), Skinner (Kings), and Whitehouse (Isaiah). All the volumes reach a high level and each has some distinctive features of its own. That by Dr Charles is especially attractive for its introductory sections on Apocalyptic (pp. xiii sqq.), in which he rightly protests against the attempt 'by advanced liberals' to differentiate prophecy and apocalyptic (p. xvi). The familiar problems of *Daniel* are briefly noticed, but I miss a treatment of Winckler's view touching the quasi-historical background. That a traditional framework underlies the first half of the book is also the view of C. C. Torrey, and is inherently probable; it must be admitted, however, that it is less important for the study of the book in its present form (dating from 167-165 B.C.) than for the study of the older traditions which have been utilized by the author.

From the completion of one series we turn to the commencement of another. The 'Oxford Church Bible Commentary' (Rivingtons, London), under the editorship of Dr Burney and the Rev. L. Pullan, will be by members of the Church of England connected with the University of Oxford. Among the prospective contributors are: W. C. Allen (Ezra and Nehemiah), Ball (Genesis, Job), Box (Jeremiah), Burney (Judges, Kings, Isaiah), Canney (Ecclesiastes), Charles (*Daniel*), and Driver (Psalms, Chronicles, Hosea). The volumes will contain a new translation, with introduction and notes, and if all come to the standard of the one before us they will be a valuable contribution to Biblical studies. *Wisdom*, by the Rev. A. T. S. Goodrick, is a compact work of 437 pages, of which a very full introduction alone

occupies more than one-fifth. The commentary is an elaborate one, with special reference to the text and translation, the interpretation, and illustrative material. It is a distinct advance upon all the current works on *Wisdom*, and will be especially valued for the light it throws upon Jewish 'Wisdom' literature in general. The author is particularly strong in his treatment of the relation between Jewish and Greek 'wisdom'; one would have liked a fuller attention to the evidence which has been adduced from older Oriental sources.

In *The Book of Job Interpreted* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1913), the Rev. James Strahan aims at presenting a critical exposition of the text—the R. V. is printed and used as a basis—with exegetical notes, 'intended not only for scholars, but for general readers who are interested in sacred literature'. His object is to present the book of Job as literature, in particular as an ancient treatment of a perennial problem. In certain respects the notes are more elementary than those found in any technical commentary, but they have that 'human' element which a purely critical work does not have. They are of wider general interest, and are enlivening with their illustrations drawn from Matthew Arnold, Coleridge, Chesterton, Pascal, and others. Hence the book is distinctly useful in correlating ancient and modern experience in a way that bridges the centuries and manifests the fundamental psychological identity of man—and this is exceedingly helpful for critical study. At the same time, it is throughout indebted to past criticism, and shews how the purely technical labour of criticism is only a step, and a necessary one, in the re-interpretation of old ideas to new stages of thought. It is a pity that the author was apparently unable to make use of Volz's original study of Job in the German series *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments* (1911).

The commentary on *Isaiah* in the 'International Critical Commentary', originally entrusted to the late Dr Davidson, is to be divided between Dr G. B. Gray (chs. i-xxxix) and Dr A. S. Peake (chs. xl-lxvi). The first volume is now published (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1912) and contains a very instructive introduction of nearly 100 pages, and the commentary on Isa. i-xxvii (472 pages); there are also two handy maps, the one illustrating W. Asia, the other, with reference to Isa. xv sq., containing Moab, N. Edom, and E. Judah. The work is solid and judicious, as was to be expected from the author of the excellent commentary on 'Numbers' in the same series. Dr Gray keeps an open mind on the problems of Hebrew metre, and is wisely sceptical of the finality of any existing theory (pp. viii sq., lix-lxviii). He has a valuable section on the political and social conditions of Isaiah's time (pp. lxviii-lxxx), and a clever survey of the literary history (pp. xxxii-lvii). Very boldly, but surely rightly, he insists that the starting-point in all

detailed criticism or interpretation of Isaiah is the fact that it is a post-exilic compilation, 'nor is it wise to minimize the significance of this conclusion' (p. xxxii). This is true also of the Minor Prophets (cf. *ib.* p. 43), but no less so of such other sources as Genesis and the books of Samuel (cf. *J. T. S.* xii 468, xiii 89 sq.). Very sound is his recognition that literary criticism is something more than the question whether a passage is 'genuine'—this applies to historical criticism as also to the criticism of the prophecies. There is a very just appreciation of Winckler on p. ix; indeed, whatever we may think of his theories, he has at least forced us to look more consistently at the Old Testament in the light of external conditions. As regards details, Dr Gray so invariably makes appropriate references to the comparative study of religions (e.g. p. 354), that we miss in Isa. vi 5 some account of the widespread conviction of the danger of looking upon beings or of heedless behaviour towards things where profound supernatural ideas were involved. On pp. lxxxviii sq. and 106 he appears to me too much under the influence of the modern one-sided notions of the non-ethical character of the ideas of 'holy' prior to the time of the prophets. Again on p. 94 when he refers to the 'original forensic sense' of צדק (righteousness), he does not realize that 'original' and 'forensic' are, sociologically speaking, incompatible—the 'original' sense of צדק must have been in harmony with the 'original' conditions (cf. *J. T. S.* ix 632 n. 1). Finally, on p. 255, the fall of the 'Shining One' (Lucifer) naturally has an astral colouring, but the essential feature is the penalty for presumption and arrogance: the underlying facts are psychological or psychical, and find numerous parallels; the astral-mythical formulation or expression is secondary, more accidental, and concerns the thought of the environment.

The third volume of *The Minor Prophets* in the same series is composite, like the second (*J. T. S.* xiv 146). Prof. H. G. Mitchell is responsible for Haggai and Zechariah (360 pages). His work is throughout careful and informing, and he gives the reader an excellent guide to the better understanding of these difficult sources. He prefixes a useful section on the historical background, adopting a somewhat moderate position. His argument that the Jews were allowed to return under Sheshbazzar in 538 is not conclusive; for example, the presence of royal princes, priests, and prophets at Jerusalem in the reign of Darius is no proof that they had been allowed to return (p. 9). It is quite true that we suppose that 'most, if not quite all, of the better class of inhabitants had been carried into captivity by Nebuchadrezzar'; but that this is not certain is evident from the account of the princes and others in Jer. xli 1, 10, who must have been left behind. Further, Ed. Meyer long ago advanced evidence for the view that there were

important families of native Judæan (Calebite) origin who had never gone into exile. It may be added that it is difficult to see how (p. 12 n.) the Elephantine papyri *by themselves* can be urged against the evidence for the offer of the Samaritans to assist Nehemiah (Neh. ii 20); it is because the Judæan bias is everywhere so strong that the fragmentary data (cf. Ezra iv 2), which represent the Samaritans in a favourable light (cf. 2 Kings xvii 28, 33, but contrast the secondary *vv.* 34-40), can scarcely be set on one side.

Malachi is handled by Dr J. M. P. Smith (88 pages), and he succeeds in bringing out very clearly the leading features of this little collection of prophecies. He agrees with the ordinary view: 'the book of Malachi fits the situation amid which Nehemiah worked as snugly as a bone fits the socket' (p. 7); but it is very difficult to associate the background of the prophecies with the grievous political conditions just before or at the time of this reformer: some 'anatomy' of the history of the time of Artaxerxes is necessary first, and this the author does not supply.

Finally, Jonah is dealt with by Dr J. A. Bewer (65 pages). It is an interesting piece of work, illustrating what criticism has done for this favourite book. It is no longer necessary to discuss at length any improbabilities or impossibilities; we approach the book more in the spirit of the old-time readers, and find its chief value in its kernel. I may note in passing a misunderstanding of the Targum of i 4 (p. 34): the use of  $\text{בְּעֵינַי}$  ('on the point of being [not "sought to be"] wrecked') can be easily paralleled, see e.g. W. Wright *Jonah* p. 10 sq. and his *Comp. Gram. of the Semitic Lang.* p. 21 top.

To turn to *Das Buch Jona* by Dr J. Döllner of Vienna (C. Fromme, Vienna, 1912) is to go into another world. The author discusses the historical and related questions gravely and learnedly from the Roman Catholic standpoint; he does not depart from the old traditional point of view (p. 31): if the book contains marvels and wonders, they are no greater than those in other books of the Bible (p. 27 sq.). Thus criticism is disarmed! Useful features are the full bibliography, the printing of the Hebrew text with a translation, and a commentary (pp. 59-107) especially helpful for younger students. The traditional position is also upheld by Dr E. Kalt in a monograph on *Samson* (Herder, Freiburg i. B., 1912). It belongs to the Roman Catholic series of *Freiburger Theolog. Studien* (no. viii); cf. Allgeier's monograph, *J. T. S.* xiii p. 140. His view is that Judges xiii-xvi may be regarded as a literary and historical unit, and that their contents fit all the conditions of the age. Samson emerges as a doubtless interesting individual, but his exploits are so rationalized and watered down, that he ceases to interest us. Little wonder that this method of 'criticism' presents difficulties to critical Roman Catholic scholarship

{cf. Father Dhorme's notice of the book in *Rev. Bibl.*, April 1913, p. 313}.

Father Jean's little book *Jérémie* (Gabalda, Paris, 1913) is a handy sketch of the political situation, of Jeremiah's place in it, and of his theology. It is very tentative in its textual, literary, and historical criticism (e. g. pp. 20, 25, 36, 71), but ventures upon suggestions the consequences of which are unnoticed. Thus he favourably notes Sayce's dangerous view that the Elephantine papyri do not prove that the Law did not exist, but 'simplement qu'on l'interprétait d'une façon spéciale'. This sort of argument is futile.

Of Roman Catholic origin, like the preceding, are two admirable monographs upon the prophecies of Ezekiel: one by P. Cheminant on the prophecies against Tyre, chs. xxvi-xxviii 19, the other by J. Plessis on those against Egypt, xxix-xxxii (Letouzey, Paris, 1912). Each discusses the metrical, textual, literary, and historical questions, and provides a new translation and an excellent commentary. Indeed the commentaries are a special feature, for little has escaped the attention of the writers, and one is glad to have their elaborate notes. The two books, each of 120-130 pages, are examples of the best Roman Catholic scholarship, and, if 'conservative', are of that very rare type of conservatism from which the most 'radical' can profit. Plessis's worst heresy is to persist in prefixing the article to a Hebrew noun which already has a suffix (p. 29 sq.)! Cheminant's treatment of the literary-historical problems is promising but inadequate. The advance of Nebuchadrezzar (xxvi 7-14) requires an introduction (p. 89), but this can hardly be found in xxvi 1-6, 19-21, where Tyre gloats over the fall of Jerusalem (v. 2). Besides, no good reason is given for Tyre's attitude, and Cheminant weakly supposes that it expected to profit from Jerusalem's extremity (p. 92). But this oracle is dated in the eleventh year (i. e. about 586), and consequently associates itself with those in which Moab, Ammon, and Edom are condemned for their hostile behaviour (Ezek. xxv, cf. Zeph. ii 8 sqq.). This behaviour is historically doubtful (as regards Edom, see *J. T. S.* xiv 147), although it is quite conceivable that the situation actually arose at a later period. In fact, the point in the punishment of Tyre is the intervention of Yahweh to manifest His might and to defend His people (cf. Ezek. xxvi 6). It is not the punishment of a guilty Judah, but of an arrogant enemy, and we move in a later circle of ideas (cf. the parallels in *J. T. S.* xiii 87 sq.). Tyre is condemned for its overweening pride, and it is instructive to notice that both sections of ch. xxviii agree in representing that blasphemous confidence which accounts for the denunciation of the Babylonian monarch in Isa. xiv (see above). Especially noteworthy in this connexion are the rich allusions to some fuller *corpus* of myth

in Ezek. xxviii 11 sqq. which recall the 'astral' ideas in Isa. xiv 12 sqq.

Prof. Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1913) is the second edition of a work which on its first appearance in 1890 set a standard in Hebrew philological scholarship. The new edition is larger by a hundred pages; the commentary alone covers nearly four hundred pages. This is due not only to the expansion of old notes and the addition of new ones, but also to the attention paid to topographical questions. The characteristic 'went up' and 'came down' of the Bible vividly reflects the physical features of Palestine; and the desire to illustrate this has led Prof. Driver to add notes on the sites mentioned in the Books of Samuel. He rightly emphasizes the inadequacy of current maps, owing to the many highly questionable identifications, 'except those in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, which are above reproach' (Pref. p. x), and he has had useful maps of Palestine prepared, which will be valued by all. The topographical side is the special feature of this new edition. The introduction (now 96 pages) has been carefully revised and brought up to date. Twenty-three years ago it supplied a real want with its sections on Hebrew orthography, the versions, the Moabite inscription, and other matters illustrating the Hebrew text. Today it is none the less useful for its concise, convenient, and authoritative treatment of introductory questions, which are extremely important for the Hebrew student, who must otherwise hunt through a large variety of sources—and because of the pains taken to cite or to refer to everything at all germane to the subject.

A new volume on *Judges and Ruth* has been prepared for the Cambridge Bible by Prof. G. A. Cooke (University Press, 1913). The notes are well adapted to the object of this series, and care is taken to provide a map where, by the way, greater attention is paid than usual to the identifications. Canon Cooke's general position is a very fair one. It is interesting to observe on p. xxix that 'the Canaanites held a barrier of strongholds in line with Jerusalem, which would effectually check an invasion descending from the Central Highlands to the South'. This is quite in accordance with certain evidence, but its importance for the history of the relations between Judah and Israel is rarely considered. Another serious question is involved in the fact that we can find, on external grounds, no dislocation of conditions when the Israelites entered; but the conditions as represented in the book of Judges—e.g. the Baals and Astartes (p. xxxvii)—are not what we should expect from the picture given us by the Amarna Letters: in other words, serious changes have apparently intervened, but we cannot attribute them to the Israelites. Finally, I note Prof. Cooke's remark: 'historical

criticism relieves us to a great extent of the moral difficulty created by the wholesale slaughter of the Canaanites' (p. xxxi). Yet, if, as he says, 'the patriotic imagination of a much later day' is responsible for the idea, Dr James Orr is perfectly right when he points out that we merely 'roll the burden upon the shoulders of prophets [or, of other later writers] when the higher morality is presumed to be developed' (*Problem of the Old Testament* p. 468 sq.). Admirable and adequate as Prof. Cooke's treatment is, considering the series, it is evident that here are complex questions which sooner or later make themselves heard—the last, in particular, involves a reconsideration of the ordinary conservative and critical theories of the development of Old Testament religion.

An interesting addition to the same series is *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus* (1912). This very important book has been entrusted to Dr Oesterley, whose scholarly introduction and commentary will be much appreciated. The text printed is, as is usual with this series, that of the R. V., but since many fragments of the original Hebrew were discovered (between 1896 and 1900), it has naturally been necessary to give a careful discussion of the variant texts. As a consequence of this a relatively considerable amount of space has to be given to matters of text, and here one misses necessary references to Prof. Bevan's notes on the Hebrew text in *J. T. S.* i 135 sqq. (1899). As against a certain weakness in handling the text may be placed the illuminating sections in the introduction, those on the teaching of the book being especially instructive.

Dr Oesterley also contributes *1 Samuel* in 'The Revised Version edited for the use of Schools' (University Press, Cambridge, 1912). It is a handy little book, with many useful notes; but such is the (enforced) brevity of the introduction and the scope of the book that one questions the wisdom of hinting at features of literary-critical interest. Thus on pp. 6, 12 we have 'later insertions', and if 1 Sam. xiv 47-51 is also a 'later insertion', is the passage to be used for the history? Dr Oesterley apparently follows the current view that Saul had no authority over Jerusalem (see his note on xvii 54) and Judah (xv 4); but when writers agree that Jerusalem and the district were in alien hands until David's time (2 Sam. v), they usually overlook the bearing of this upon narratives referring to Nob (1 Sam. xxi sq.), Gallim (xxv 44), Saul in S. Judah (xxiii sq., xxvi) and his interest in S. Judaeans (xxvii 10). Saul was a great and powerful king, as 1 Sam. xiv 47 sqq. and the ancient poem in 2 Sam. i testify, but a number of pro-Davidic narratives represent another picture, and our ordinary conception of this period is built up by the explicit rejection of pieces of evidence which point to another view of the age.

In the *Smaller Cambridge Bible* the Rev. T. H. Hennessy undertakes 2 Kings. There is a good little introduction and the notes will be helpful to young students. It is taken as an 'obvious conclusion that the "main compiler" of Kings wrote somewhere between 621 and 586 B. C.'; in the larger edition, to which there is a general reference for fuller information, Prof. Barnes more cautiously holds that 'Kings could not have been compiled before *circ.* 561 B. C.' (p. xxi). It is an important difference. On p. 151 there is a reference to 'totem ideas among the Hebrews', very unnecessary in view of the rather tentative remarks elsewhere on the religion and the religious development. It cannot be said (on xxiv 1) that Nebuchadrezzar 'seems to be a more accurate form' of the name Nebuchadnezzar; it would be much better to tell young readers that the latter is quite inaccurate. There are a few small misprints: on p. 106 read Tiglath-pileser III (to agree with pp. 13, 177), though strictly speaking it should now be everywhere IV, and on p. 176 read *keui* in Boghaz-keni. A curious archaism is the printing of the A. V. everywhere—hence the notes are rather loaded up with the readings of the R. V.

*Deuteronomy: its Place in Revelation* (Longmans, London, 1912), by Dr A. H. McNeile, consists of a restatement of arguments already accepted by the great majority of modern Hebrew biblical scholars, 'unfortunately, however, it is still necessary not only to state these results, but to defend them against some writers who continue to cling in the face of evidence to the Mosaic authorship of the book'. It is of course much to be regretted that energy should have to be spent upon such a question as this, when there is so much to be done in other directions; but Dr McNeile's book puts the case so clearly that it will be useful not only to those who are by temperament opposed to criticism, but also to those who are more familiar with the critical conclusions than with the grounds upon which they are based.

To turn now to 'the other side', J. Dahse in his *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage I* (Töpelmann, Giessen, 1912) deals with (a) the divine names in Genesis, (b) the alternating use of Jacob and Israel in chs. xxxvii sqq., and (c) P in chs. xii-1. He is among those who, attacking the modern literary hypothesis of the Hexateuch, dispute the validity of the criteria on the strength of the Septuagintal variations. He himself, however, is far from denying the presence of additions, glosses, and signs of compilation; indeed he has pretty theories which rest upon all that combination of induction and deduction, inference and speculation, which is found in those theories to which he is opposed. This is inevitable and legitimate; the important question being whether this theory or that is more in accordance with all the relevant data. And here there can be no doubt that Dahse,

though exceedingly ingenious, does not cover the field which has to be covered, and his conclusions are scarcely to be commended to those who are opposed to modern criticism. If he is right, our book of Genesis, *in its present form*, is due to the 'Kompilator und Exeget' Ezra (p. 161); and obviously this will be the starting-point for that criticism of the internal difficulties which he, in his somewhat one-sided zeal for purely textual matters, tends to ignore. Apart from this, Dahse—like Mr H. M. Wiener—is opening the way to a singularly arbitrary and revolutionary type of criticism, in that both are tending to destroy the reliance usually placed on the Massoretic recension of the Old Testament; and this will be disturbing to Jew and to Gentile alike. Here may be mentioned another volume of reprints by Mr H. M. Wiener, LL.B. (*Pentateuchal Studies*, Elliot Stock, London, 1912): they do not call for any special note, and it must suffice to refer to my remarks on the earlier volume in *J. T. S.* xiii p. 135 sq.

Two volumes from the untiring pen of Dr Cheyne next claim attention: *The Mines of Isaiah Re-explored* and *The Veil of Hebrew History: A further attempt to lift it* (A. & C. Black, London, 1912 and 1913). The former deals with Isa. xl-lxvi; the latter consists of a series of discussions on ethnical, biographical, geographical, and other points. Both belong to that long chain of works in which Dr Cheyne has been elaborating his North-Arabian theory, and whatever may be thought of that theory, one cannot but admire his energy, his keen survey of even the latest discoveries and discussions, and his undaunted and persistent confidence. He is rightly convinced that the ordinary positions of criticism to-day are untenable, but his own solution is along lines which have not found acceptance; yet it is only fair to emphasize the fact that his theory is scarcely more extreme than those favoured by thorough-going conservatives, and that the tendencies of such scholars as Ed. Meyer, Alex. Gordon, Gressmann, and others strikingly confirm the words of the late Dr W. R. Harper: 'every year since the work of W. R. Smith brings Israel into closer relationship with Arabia'; see also *Encycl. Brit.* ed. xi, vol. xx p. 615.

The Rev. F. E. Spencer's *Short Introduction to the Old Testament* (Longmans, London, 1912) is a descriptive account of the several books from a conservative point of view. Unfortunately it shews many signs of haste. Thus: 'the Goel is an ancient custom of the clans. It disappears in the time of the kings' (p. 56). Again, when Gideon is called Jerubbaal, we read: 'a slight indication of ancient writing—not so much as Wellhausen makes it—Jerubbaal is changed to Jerubbesheth, 2 Sam. xi 21' (p. 89). Of his many dark sayings I quote his utterance on Zech. ix-xiv: (they) 'present a literary question of interest and some complexity which in the result has the probable moral that a little tradition of

a cultivated nation is a more certain ground to go upon than the subjective opinion of scholars, however well equipped'. And the footnote proceeds 'this is an axiom which is quite safely laid down for all other literary traditions of civilised peoples. The exceptions are few' (p. 152). The book is well meaning, but hardly achieves its object. Another work of this class is *The Building Up of the Old Testament*, by the Rev. R. B. Girdlestone (Scott, London, 1912). It belongs to the 'Library of Historic Theology', which proposes to present 'a general survey of the present position of thought and knowledge in various branches of the wide field which is included in the study of divinity'. The book is a reverent and professedly conservative book, written from a standpoint and in a tone that precludes criticism. There are some familiar conjectures—horribly wild, did they appear in some 'critical' work, but less striking to the reader who haply finds in them a support for some traditional position—note, e.g. the exceedingly arbitrary and hazardous theory of the cuneiform origins, p. 20 sq. Critics are reproved for finding the work of later writers in the magnificent prophecies ascribed to Isaiah—'their view is conceivably true but is probably erroneous' (p. 28)! Perhaps it is as well to pass on to the useful excursus 'a study on Inspiration' (pp. 293-311), a careful perusal of which will convince the reader that the author clearly recognizes the more essential principles of criticism:—it is the particular application he distrusts.

To an American scholar, Prof. H. T. Fowler, we owe *A History of the Literature of Ancient Israel from the Earliest Times to 135 B.C.* (Macmillan Co., New York, 1912). It describes and illustrates the writings of the Old Testament in their historical connexions on the basis of the general conclusions of modern criticism. In nearly 400 pages we have a most useful synopsis of the different forms and styles of the literature. Care is taken to explain the characteristic features, and to point out, with some instructive parallels, the slow development of those sources that survive in the Bible. Even those who cannot agree with his theories will find much that is profitable and interesting. The greater insistence upon the books as *literature* is a very welcome trait, which however is perhaps carried too far in current German work.

From Dr A. Büchler we have another of his little monographs: *The Economic Conditions of Judaea after the destruction of the Second Temple* (Jews' College, London, 1912). It is an instructive contribution to the period interesting for the vicissitudes of the text and the canon of the Old Testament. Although over a million Jews had perished in Jerusalem, yet, in a couple of generations, a hundred thousand could again rise in several hundred places of Judaea against the Roman rule. If Dr G. A. Smith has illustrated the significance of the persisting geographical

conditions for understanding history, Dr Bûchler—like Winckler—emphasizes the persisting similarity of historical vicissitudes, for not only does his pamphlet throw new light upon the years after 70 A. D., it also allows one to realize in some measure the conditions after the fall of Jerusalem in 587, and to perceive that this disaster was not quite such an overwhelming annihilation as was and is often supposed.

Dr C. H. W. Johns writes on *Ancient Babylonia* for the 'Cambridge Manuals'. He provides a clear and concise account of the land, people, conditions, and history. It is interesting to see that he holds that the Semitic invasion came, not directly from Arabia, but from the north-west: the bearing of this on the theory of the influence of Babylonia upon Palestine is considerable. A special feature are the illustrations which, with the much-needed map at the end, enhance the value of the book, and enliven the necessarily rather dry sections where the writer has to summarize the bald historical outlines. This and his *Ancient Assyria* in the same series (*J. T. S.* xiv 149 sq.), are especially suited for the Old Testament student interested in the external history, and are by an admittedly foremost authority.

The appearance of two Hebrew grammars for English students is a welcome sign. One, by the Rev. C. T. Wood, with the co-operation of the Rev. H. C. O. Lanchester, caters for beginners (*A Hebrew Grammar*: Kegan Paul, London, 1913). It has many distinctive and useful features, especially noteworthy being the endeavour to introduce the student to the Old Testament itself at as early a stage as possible. If only on this account one may be permitted to regret the sometimes curious modifications of the original which appear here and there in the exercises: after all, the main object is to understand the Old Testament in Hebrew and Hebrew modes of thought and expression. As this handy grammar is likely to prove a boon, it is worth noting that § 7 on p. 4 ('four fragments of papyri brought from Egypt') needs adjustment—it rests upon a very second-hand source, and the fragments are the 'Nash papyrus' in the Cambridge University Library. Page 60 (*h*), with its מִן־הַיָּם (and an unnoticed misprint on the last line) is needlessly confused. On p. 91 § 5, the weak *wāw* is, of course, *not* 'always pointed with vocal *sh'wa*' (so p. 89 *b*), and there should be a fuller note on its use, in view of the examples on p. 92 sq. No light is thrown upon the vocalization of [י] in the index; the information is given in a section on the Comparative, where, however, we miss the important fact that before the article the full form is more common than the form which the students are encouraged to use in the sentences on pp. 33, 36. Other little details to be noticed are the precarious view that שָׁנָה (read שָׁנָה) suggests man's frailty (p. 185), the failure to point out that the use

of consonants to express figures is post-biblical (p. 198), and the treatment of ׀ and ׀ in oaths (p. 202). Among the many valuable features must be mentioned the suggestive notes on the vowel system from the lecture-notes of Prof. Kennett (pp. 212-222).

The second grammar is by the Rev. D. Tyssil Evans (*The Principles of Hebrew Grammar*, Luzac, London, 1912). It is intended to serve for the intermediate stage between a purely introductory work and the classical 'Gesenius-Kautzsch'. It extends to nearly 500 pages, of which nearly 120 are devoted to exercises (with grammatical questions and pointing). The printing is not everywhere so clear as might be desired, and references to the O. T. might have been more freely inserted. The introductory pages on the position of Hebrew are useful, but some of the sentences are extremely difficult. On p. xxiii, after stating that monuments of 'Assyrio-Babylonian' exist to about 500 B.C., he remarks that the language may have existed after the time of Alexander the Great in a literary form—the precise meaning of 'monuments' and 'literary' is the crux. It is too loose to say that the Moabite stone dates from about 900 B.C. (*ib.*), and on p. xxiv the two inscriptions from Damascus are, I suspect, those from Nerab near Aleppo. The grammar is admirably full, but is sometimes unnecessarily complicated; e.g. on p. 203 the verbal suffixes in the case of verbs with impf. in pathah could have been much more simply expressed (as e.g. by Wood, p. 151), and this criticism applies also to the treatment on pp. 204 sq. and 267 sq.

Dr H. Lindemann's *Florilegium Hebraicum* (Herder, Freiburg i. B., 1912) contains a selection of passages for the use of students, printed with the ordinary Massoretic apparatus, but with no notes even when, as in the case of Judges v, some textual help is needed. Every book is represented, and thus we have passages from Chronicles (e.g. 1 Chron. xiii 1-14, xvii 1-14), but *not* the earlier parallels (in 2 Sam. vi sq.), the comparison with which is so helpful for the student. An appendix contains a few passages for pointing, a few verses from Ben Sira, the Siloam inscription, a specimen of the supralinear vocalization, and a few lines of *Faust* in Yiddish (German in Rabbinical characters).

In conclusion, I have to express regret for accidentally overlooking the two volumes of Dr Peter Thomsen's *Palästina-Literatur* (vol. i Haupt, Leipzig, 1908; vol. ii Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1911). These contain the literature for 1895-1904 and 1905-1909 respectively, and the total number of items amounts to nearly 7,000. They are to supplement earlier bibliographies, and are divided under six headings: (1) general, (2) historical, (3) historical geography and topography, (4) archaeology, (5) geography (with flora and fauna, &c.), and (6) modern Palestine.

Those who are engaged upon studies where Palestinian research is involved will find Dr Thomsen's encyclopaedic work exceedingly useful. In order to facilitate the preparation of the next volume, publishers and writers, it is hoped, will forward copies, or at least details, of relevant works to the author at Dresden A 1, Christianstrasse, 37.

STANLEY A. COOK.

*L'Ecclésiaste*, by E. PODECHARD. (V. Lecoffre, Paris, 1912.)

FRANCE has not in recent years contributed much to the study of Ecclesiastes, but the deficiency has been amply supplied by Prof. Podechard's commentary, which is issued as a volume of P. Lagrange's *Études Bibliques*. It is written with a lucidity and a sureness of touch which make it very pleasant reading. The long Introduction starts with the question of Canonicity, the reasonable conclusion being reached that the book was revered as sacred before the school of Shammai raised their opposition to it, i. e. not later than the first century B.C. After a sketch of the history of its interpretation, and a short analysis of its contents, the vocabulary of the book is examined, its late words, Aramaisms, and neo-Hebraisms are noted, and the supposed Graecisms which some have found are decisively rejected. There follows a comparison of Ecclesiastes with B. Sira and the Book of Wisdom: its priority to B. Sira is shewn to be probable, and the antagonism which the writer of Wisdom displays to the spirit of Koheleth is well drawn out. In chap. vii the author is at pains to slay the dead in opposing P. Condamin's explanation of Eccl. iii 19-21 by reference to the beliefs of the Essenes and to the eschatological teaching of the apocalypses. The valuable sections on Greek philosophy lead to Zeller's safe conclusion that Koheleth 'did not come into direct and immediate contact with the works of the Greek philosophers, but he did not entirely escape the effects of the spread of their methods and ideas'. With regard to the date of the book, M. Podechard thinks that the allusions in it to contemporary historical events suggest broadly the period of its composition, but that the meaning of the allusions can in no case be precisely determined; the Solomonic authorship is dismissed in a few words, and the writing is assigned to the period between 290 and 190 B.C., probably in the second half of the third century. M. Podechard prudently opposes the idea that Ecclesiastes is a poem, and that numerous drastic emendations must be permitted in order to make it such; some rhythmic passages are, of course, discernible, especially in the *m<sup>e</sup>shālīm* inserted