

CHRONICLE

OLD TESTAMENT AND RELATED LITERATURE

OF the books that call for notice since my last Chronicle—and for the delay in dealing with some of them I must express regret—the first place may be given to those on the historical background of the Old Testament. Here, the most important is the *Early History of Assyria to 1000 B. C.* by Mr Sidney Smith of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum (Chatto and Windus, 1928). His survey of the later history of Assyria (about 1000–610 B. C.) in the third volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* had testified to his deep knowledge of ancient Oriental life and policy, and he now continues the series in which the late Dr Leonard King, who died in 1919, had written the volumes *Sumer and Akkad* and *Babylon*. The present volume handles a period which, though much less familiar to us than the later, is of great significance for the ethnical and cultural problems of the second millennium B. C. ; and cuneiform tablets, seals, &c., from Cappadocia in the west and Kerkuk in the east, combine with new theories of the population of Mesopotamia to place the earlier period in a new though still rather uncertain light. Much is necessarily doubtful, and Mr Sidney Smith, who is not averse from a gibe or two at the “scientific” reasonings of modern scholars’ (pp. 81, 84 sq., 87), and who speaks refreshingly—to the ears of the ‘literary critic’—of the ‘ingenuity and imagination’ of archaeologists (p. 54), is very well aware of the ‘highly speculative’ nature—to use his words (Preface, p. xi)—of his own views of the western origin of the Assyrians, and of the interrelation between the Assyrian and Egyptian cultures (p. 128). Among special points may be noticed the new eastern location of the northern Muṣri (pp. 262, 389), his interesting remarks on the fixing of Assyrian art and literature in the twentieth to nineteenth centuries B. C. (p. 165 sq.), and his estimate of the spirit of Assyrian laws and religion (pp. 338 sqq.). There is a useful appendix on the chronological problems, and numerous illustrations, and although the volume is intended for the ordinary reader—and gives him a suggestive picture of the general conditions prior to and at the rise of Israel—there are full technical and bibliographical notes for the more advanced.

The Recovery of Forgotten Empires, by Prof. S. A. B. Mercer of Toronto (Mowbray and Co.), is an expansion of a popular lecture, giving a handy summary of the discovery of ancient civilizations and some of

their outstanding features. With photographs of some well-known scholars, illustrations, and maps, the little book makes agreeable reading. Popular also is Mr C. Leonard Woolley's lecture on *The Excavations at Ur and the Hebrew Records* (Allen and Unwin, 1929). It is the 'Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture', and includes the speeches by the chairman and others. Mr Woolley wisely remarks that his discoveries are illustrative rather than confirmative of Hebrew tradition (p. 15 sq.). This is especially true of the traces of a great flood. He notes how the royal tombs point to some belief in a future life, men and women being slain to accompany the deceased chief or king. He emphasizes the superiority of Sumerian over Semitic culture, thus reminding us of the indebtedness of the Arab to the Persian thousands of years later. And on the remains of the temple dedicated by Nebuchadrezzar II (c. 600 B.C.) he makes the interesting remark that certain alterations could only mean a change in ritual, 'the substitution of "congregational worship" for secret ritual' (pp. 47 sqq.).

Essays in Aegean Archaeology, presented to Sir Arthur Evans in honour of his seventy-fifth birthday (ed. S. Casson: Clarendon Press, 1927), include some which do not lie quite outside the Old Testament field. Dr Cowley writes a note on the decipherment of Minoan (on the basis of certain similar Cypriote characters). Dr Farnell deals with Cretan influence in Greek religion. The late Dr Hogarth, discussing Aegean sepulchral figurines (similar to those found in Palestine, &c.), suggests that some, like the Egyptian *ushabti* figures, were supposed to live in the Beyond and serve the dead. In this case the widespread practice would be a later softening of the earlier human sacrifice of the long-lost culture illustrated by the Ur of 3000 B.C. or before. Dr Myres, *inter alia*, treats of the close relations between Syria and Cyprus. Mr Peet writes critically on 'Keftian' and other names on an Egyptian writing-board of the early Eighteenth Dynasty: the Mitannian Arta-tama cannot be confirmed, an alleged 'Sisera' is non-existent, but Achish (later Assyrian Ikausu) stands the test. Prof. Sayce finds Kaftara or Caphtor and the 'tin-land' (Spain) in a tablet surveying the empire of Sargon (c. 2750 B.C.); the Cherethites are not only 'Cretans', but 'conceivably' connected with Gortyn, and as the brook Cherith was near Beth-shan and this city was once Philistine, its name and that of the Cherethites can be associated. Precarious speculations, it will be observed, are not confined to the 'literary critics'.

The Rev. J. W. Jack gives an excellent account of Samaria on the basis of the Harvard excavations (*Samaria in Ahab's Time*; T. and T. Clark, 1929). There is a full description of the important ostraka found there; the personal names and the place-names which they bear are most important for their contribution to contemporary conditions. The

book can be cordially recommended as a background to the history of the monarchy. It may be noticed that the view that the oldest Phoenician inscription in the tomb of Ahiiram at Byblus is as early as c. 1250 B.C. (pp. 53, 64) is still being questioned (e.g. recently by Ed. Meyer). In the discussion of the personal names reference should be made to Buchanan Gray in *The Expositor*, November 1915 (cf. *Quarterly Statement* of the Pal. Explor. Fund, 1916, p. 151 sq.). My own transposition of the Aramaean-Israelite wars—as distinct from *raids*—from the Omri dynasty to that of Jehu rests rightly or wrongly on much more than Mr. Jack specifies (p. 124). As regards the religious conditions it is necessary to remark that when Israel broke away from the anti-Assyrian alliance, and thus gave Damascus a real grievance—such action being invariably looked upon as abominable treachery—she would renounce not only the Baal of Tyre but more particularly the Aramaean Hadad. On pp. 20, 101 read Jehoiakim, p. 45 the *kaph* is doubtful, p. 66 read *er-Remleh*, p. 82, n. 1 read vol. ii, and on pp. 88, 98 are Hebrew misprints.

The British Academy Schweich Lectures for 1929 (*Palestine in General History*: Milford, 1929) are not, as is usual, by a single lecturer. Prof. Theodore Robinson of Cardiff leads off with a historical outline down to the fall of Nineveh. He comments in particular upon the place of Palestine among the nations, and gives a sympathetic account of the ideas of common brotherhood among the Israelites and the consequent nature of the monarchy. Archdeacon Hunkin carries on the history to the days of Titus, with a number of topical illustrations bearing on the external and internal history, the cultural relations and the religious vicissitudes. He points out how the centre of gravity of the Old World was shifting westwards (p. 57), and how 'the grand idea of a human family' was taking root in an age when art, too, was cosmopolitan. From the Zeno papyri and the painted tombs of Mareshah he brings interesting evidence, not so well known as it might be, for the internal conditions of Hellenistic Palestine. Finally, Dr Burkitt, with Judges v 6 as his text, deals with the importance of Petra and Palmyra when, owing to the wars along the seaboard, the routes east of the Jordan made these cities prosperous. Petra itself is picturesquely described, and there is an additional note on still obscure problems of the religion of the Nabataeans.

The intensive study of Hebrew personal names receives a new stimulus through Martin Noth's excellent monograph, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1928). As a result of a close analysis of the main types of personal names, he has some far-reaching theories of the ethnical and political factors in the development of Semitic nomenclature. Thus

the Ishmael-type (imperfect + El) is not Phoenician, it characterizes old Israelite names, and prevails again from the close of the monarchy onwards, when (about the seventh century) there was a new and gradual Aramaizing (pp. 49, 54, 98). The El-nathan type (divine name + perfect) is, on the other hand, Phoenician, and is characteristic of the period of the Judges, when Israel were mixing with the older population, and had not yet begun to make the Yahweh-names predominate. Full of interesting and valuable material—in a series of additional notes he is able to consider and criticize Baudissin's enormous work *Kyrios*—there is much that calls for comment. For example, he holds to the antiquity of some of the lists in Numbers, viz. i 5-15, and seems to have overlooked Gray's article in *The Expositor*, vi (1897) 173-190, where Hommel's statements in favour of their antiquity are refuted. As regards the custom of naming children after the grandfather (p. 57), it may be suggested that the practice, which is a relatively late one, belongs to social conditions where the old national and tribal systems were broken up, and it served to keep alive the feeling of family continuity. Of the names on the Samarian ostraka, those of the royal officials are chiefly in Yahu rather than Baal (5 : 2), while among the vintagers it is 6 : 8. No contradiction was felt between Yahweh and Baal. Of the triad of deities in the Hebrew colony at Elephantine (fifth century B. C.) he urges that in Anath-bethel and Ishm(?)-bethel we have Anath and *her son* Eshmun. But Bethel seems to be a female divine name, and since in Elephantine we find the Egyptian pre-eminent god associated with the goddesses Sati and Anuki, and these on a Greek inscription become Hera and Hestia (*Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, 1915, p. 372 sq.), it seems far more probable that the type of triad was not that which Noth's view presupposes. The monograph discusses both the forms of names and their meanings. Names in *Ebed* ('servant') imply, as he well remarks, not necessarily humbler status but honourable and responsible mission. Moreover, Semitic names in general are valuable testimony to ancient *individual* religion: they indicate (primarily) what the god is for the bearer, and they point to the belief in a typically friendly and benevolent deity who looks after the family, the individual, and Nature, by whose gifts men live. Peake is twice called 'Peace' (pp. 35 n. 2, 130 n. 4).

In the same series, Gerhard von Rad (*Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium*: Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1929) discusses the Deuteronomic conception of Israel as the people of Yahweh. So much has been written on the book in recent years that this rather novel line of approach is welcome. The question under consideration here is not that of the component elements of Deuteronomy and their earliest possible date, but the factors which give it unity: the doctrine of the 'holy people' and the covenant relation between Yahweh and Israel. The author does

not countenance any 'false evolutionary theory' of a development from a natural union of Yahweh and Israel to one made more moral and spiritual, rather is there a shifting of emphasis from the immediate political and worldly needs of Israel to those more spiritual and religious. In a sense Deuteronomy makes for a kingdom of heaven on earth. Although Deuteronomy as a whole is in line with the prophets, it has a certain uniqueness, but it has little that is positive to contribute to the practical policy of centralization of cult (p. 34 sq.).

Quite original, also, is Prof. Alt's study, in the same series, *Der Gott der Väter* (1929). It is an extremely interesting and suggestive attempt to illustrate and elucidate the pre-Mosaic religion, the god(s) of the patriarchs, by means of the Nabataean, Palmyrene, and Greek inscriptions which speak of the god of a tribe, family, or individual, a type of religion quite other than that of nation or state. Such a god may be of merely local importance, or he is a cosmic being, like Baal-shamin (the Baal of Heaven), the god of So'aidu, or the cult (like that of θεός Ἀἴμων) may spread outside its original home. For the material which he has collected Prof. Alt's study deserves close attention, and its value is enhanced if we recall the other evidence from coins, &c., for the persistence of many very archaic features of cult in the early centuries of the Christian era. The next step is to apply the evidence to the patriarchal period, and Prof. Alt concludes that the 'God of Abraham', the 'fear (*paḥad*) of Isaac', and the 'strong one (*ābir*) of Jacob' were distinct, unrelated deities, belonging to different sanctuaries, and subsequently co-ordinated and synthesized, and taken over into the religion of Israel. The argument is an interesting one, though to be sure the processes which he illustrates from the Semitic and Greek inscriptions are not necessarily peculiar to one or even two periods of the history of Palestine. Noth, it will be remembered, has independently argued for some new Aramaic (i. e. external, non-cultural and desert) influences of the seventh century, and certainly the conditions in the sixth century would encourage other than a national or state religion. Alt's argument involves some fundamental questions of the history of Israelite religion, and since Galling has recently worked out the difference in Israelite traditions between the Moses-Sinai covenant and the covenant with the patriarchs, it is to be borne in mind that the latter belongs more truly to the religion of the land, and not to a people newly come from Egypt or Sinai, who are to sever themselves from the heathen surroundings in which they will (or rather do) find themselves; this seems to be of fundamental importance when one is considering the history of the religion of Israel and the extent to which it converged with the old and native religion of Palestine.

For one of the most extensive of monographs on Amos we are in-

debted to Prof. Arthur Weiser of Heidelberg, *Die Prophetie des Amos* (Beiheft to the *Z.A.T.W.*; Töpelmann, Giessen, 1929). Little has escaped his attention, and in an appendix on the most recent literature he takes account of the new commentary by R. S. Cripps. Amos, he says, combined a rational self-consciousness and an irrational (? non- or supra-rational) religious experience, and he distinguishes the portions of the prophecy that might be due to personal experience—contrast the character of Zechariah's visions—and those that must be of transcendent origin. Amos was no passive ecstatic; he is more than a social reformer, and if opposed to the culture of his day he is without class-hatred; he is theocentric, and if he strikes a religious rather than an ethical note, it is because his religion comprehends a higher ethic than that of the contemporary religion. If he is opposed to current religion, it is the legitimate, accepted religion which he attacks, a man-made religion, for there is too much pride and self-sufficiency in Jacob. He has no programme: God is his premiss, His absolute *erhabenheit*; and one is reminded of Barth's line of thought (see pp. 291 sqq. for Weiser's general position). He emphasizes the prophet's *actualität*. Amos has a new consciousness of ultimate reality, and he gives a new direction to contemporary thought, taking the people away from national history to the *Weltgeschichte*. The prophets deal with intelligible and concrete situations, and Weiser, more critical than (e.g.) Sellin, does not accept the authenticity of the conclusion of Amos.

In another Beiheft Prof. Nicolaj Nikolsky writes on *Spuren magischer Formeln in den Psalmen* (1927). These are Psalms lviii sq., xci, cxli, and, in part, vii, xxxv, lxix, and cix. No doubt there is evidence enough for demonology and magic in Israel; and to the examples cited from the O.T. (e.g. the Red Heifer) there could be added the archaeological evidence, notably from Tell Sandahannah, where, by the way, a Greek *tabella* uses $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$. A magical interpretation was found in Ps. lviii 9 by the LXX, which thinks of waxen figures (p. 34), and the phrases in Ps. lix 8 and elsewhere may be more than mere similes; but one feels that the arguments are often too forced. Hence, although on good grounds we could not be surprised if there were Israelite magical formulae (p. 97) and traces of revision due to Babylonian influence, it is difficult not to feel that Prof. Nikolsky has not made out a strong case for the Psalms in question.

Another Beiheft contains a discussion by Dr Nelson Glueck (Cincinnati) of the meaning of *hesed* (*Das Wort Hesed*), 1927. The word connotes a relationship either in existence or desired; it involves a certain common behaviour, and is applied to the relations between man and man and man and God. In non-religious usage it is not employed, primarily, of any arbitrary grace or favour, and God's *hesed* has its conditions, and in

this respect differs from *rāhāmīm*. Dr Glueck surveys and classifies the usage of the term and suggests that it can best be translated *religiosität*, *pietas*, *menschen-freundlichkeit* (or *-liebe*). In an appendix he refers briefly to *hesed* and the Arabic *hashada*, which is used of friendly combination, joint hospitality. The opposite, *hesed* 'shame', &c., would denote, he suggests, the behaviour which offends communal ideals (p. 67 sq.). On the whole the two meanings may go back to a single root, cf. *shērēsh* 'uproot', and *shōrēsh* 'take root'; *sikhēl* 'to stone', and 'to free from stones' (we 'stone' raisins or cats!). In any case the group or social idea is fundamental, and we may recall how Robertson Smith (who, by the way, severs the two words) taught the conception of a social unit consisting of the empirical group and its god.

Melchisedek continues to fascinate the curious, and in a Beiheft to the *Z.N.T.W.* (1927) Dr Gottfried Wuttke supplements some recent studies of the priest-king of Salem with a study of the history of the exegesis. He discusses the varying types of interpretation in Philo, the Pistis Sophia, the Fathers, &c., and comes down to medieval and modern exegesis. He distinguishes between the allegorical and the more 'historical' interpretations: the latter already characterize the School of Antioch and culminate in the recognition that there is no difference between profane and sacred history, biblical history being part of the broad stream of what has happened. There is an appendix on Melchisedek in art.

Recent criticism of Deuteronomy has stimulated a re-examination of the book by Dr A. R. Siebens, *L'Origine du Code Deuteronomique* (Leroux, Paris, 1929). He gives a complete bibliography—it is astonishing how much has been written—and discusses the divergences from the orthodox view, on the one hand, those of the more conservative wing of criticism, and on the other, those of Kennett and Hölscher in particular, while remarking that the latter had their fore-runners in France (Havet, d'Eichtal, and others). Among his points are (1) the necessity of determining what we mean by a 'code' (pp. 18, 189 sq., 235), (2) the length of time that Josiah's reforms must have taken, (3) the composite nature of Deuteronomy, (4) the fact of earlier reforms (notably Hezekiah's), (5) the difference between xii–xviii and xix–xxiv (the latter being older than the former, which alone goes with 2 Kings xxii sq.), and (6) the contemporaneous redaction of the books of Jeremiah and Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy, in fact, was the cause and effect of Josiah's reforms, and in arguing for the orthodox view, Dr Siebens naturally relies upon the trustworthiness of the history in Kings. Here, however, it can be objected, he does not do justice to the *historical theory* that runs through Kings, and when he comments on the inconsistency of those who reject the reforms attributed to Hezekiah, the reply

is that the existence of the tradition that Hezekiah was a reforming king and the particular character of those reforms are two different things. Moreover, the *theory* of the vicissitudes of the high places until their destruction by Josiah finds an analogy when we read Ezra–Nehemiah and endeavour to visualize chapter by chapter and stage by stage precisely what steps were taken to purge Israel of its undesirable members. None the less, Dr Siebens has written a book of unusual interest and one that will repay the attention of all students.

The current orthodox position in Hexateuchal criticism is restated by Canon Battersby Harford in his reprint of articles which appeared in the *Expository Times*: 'Altars and Sanctuaries in the O.T.' (from the Author, Ripon, 1929). His aim has been to take the attacks of the late Mr H. M. Wiener *seriatim* and show that the views of critics have been misunderstood or misstated, and that they are not touched by his objections. As he remarks, Mr Wiener evidently believed that the only choice lay between the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuchal law and deliberate fraud, and clung desperately to the former, although recognizing that the law of the one central sanctuary was unrealizable from the moment that Israel entered into possession of Palestine. Canon Harford in his articles reprinted under the title *Since Wellhausen* (1926) had already done good service in restating and justifying the general literary-critical position—which, it must always be emphasized, is not to be confused with the reconstructions of the history based thereupon—and this new reprint may be commended to those who may have inferred from the language of that unfortunate gentleman—whose untimely end all alike will deplore—that modern criticism had collapsed. And those, too, who find the modern view the only intelligible—and intelligent—approach to the study of the Bible will be under a debt of gratitude to the Canon for undertaking a task which the usual weakness of anti-critical writings might seem to render wholly unnecessary.

Professor Causse of Strasbourg in *Les Dispersés d'Israël* (Alcan, Paris, 1929) writes on his favourite subject, the Diaspora and post-exilic Judaism. Most of us, as he says, tend to suppose that the Diaspora and its effective influence did not begin before the Hellenistic age. But the date must be placed earlier. The Diaspora had its rise in the pre-exilic period—I do not think Prof. Causse refers to the trading and colonizing activities of the Phoenicians and the Greeks—and the captivity of the northern tribes in 722 must have left its mark wherever the Jews were carried. He surveys in a highly interesting way the literary history of the post-exilic age and its social and political background, pointing out that the thought of that age had its roots in the past. As has been recently shown afresh, both by Eduard Meyer and by the late

Rudolf Kittel—and long ago by Stanley in his *Jewish Church*—the period of the Jewish exile was one of a veritable revolution of thought, and it is not easy to distinguish very clearly how much is really new and how much is old but in a new form. Thus the elaborate angelology of the later post-exilic age (pp. 143 sq., 153 sq.) cannot be divorced entirely from the ‘sons of God’ (Gen. vi 4) and the spirit-world of pre-exilic times, although the later contact with Babylonia and Iran will doubtless account for the new forms taken by the older ideas. It is no less difficult, at the outset, to clarify the relations between Hebrew and Egyptian proverbial literature (pp. 111 sq.), so that while such literature seems to admit of being carried back to Solomon and Hezekiah, the fact remains that the extant Wisdom literature of the Jews now associates itself with the Greek age and finds a place in the third part of the Jewish Canon.

Recherches sur les sources Égyptiennes de la Littérature sapientiae d'Israël, by Prof. Paul Humbert (University of Neuchâtel, 1920), is another result of the stimulus given by the discovery of the Egyptian papyrus of the ‘teaching of Amenemope’ and its close resemblance to Prov. xxii 17–xxiii (see *J. T. S.* xxix 100). The author points out that so perfect is the adaptation that an Egyptian origin was never suspected (p. 29). In general, there are material and formal parallels between Hebrew and Egyptian proverbs, and the Wisdom of Solomon finds a parallel in the didactic works of even the early Pharaohs (p. 62 sq.), to which might be added the royal party in the late *Letter of Aristeeas* or the Story of the Three Youths in 2 Esd. iii sq. Prof. Humbert finds a number of Egyptian parallels or analogies—differing in value, it must be said. He includes the great words in Job xix 25, and Hebrew passages on the pre-eminence of God in Nature. He finds the Egyptian *mryt* ‘crocodile’ in Job xli 9 (Heb. ver. 1, *marâw*), and recalls that the Ibis-Thoth has already been discovered by Father D'orme in xxxviii 36 (*tûhōth*).

Professor Oesterly's commentary on Proverbs, in the Westminster Commentaries (Methuen, 1929), is well suited for both general readers and students; there is a full introduction, and in a series of Excursuses he discusses such questions as the subject-matter of the Jewish Wisdom literature, its relation to other similar literature, its attitude to women, to retribution and reward, and to immortality, &c. He takes a wide view of the interrelations and presents in double columns a good and comprehensive selection of parallels or analogies drawn from Egypt and from Babylonia. Neither he nor Toy in his commentary seems to refer to Malan's collection of miscellaneous parallels (cited, however, by Toy in *Ency. Bib.*). As he remarks, ‘the Wisdom Literature of the Hebrews formed a part of the much larger Wisdom Literature of the

ancient East as a whole' (p. liii). He inclines to follow Gressman, who reads in the first collection of proverbs (Prov. x-xxii 16) enthusiasm for the monarchy and confidence in it, whereas in the second (xxv-xxix) there is scepticism. Both are taken to be not later than 700 B. C., though I find it difficult to agree that post-exilic Jews could hardly be expected to take much interest in foreign potentates—what of the *Letter of Aristeas*? Again, in Prov. xvi 11, if we read (with Toy) that balances and scales are the *king's* (the text has *Yahweh's*), we may surely think of the royal weights, not only in Nineveh (eighth to seventh century), but also among the Jews of Elephantine in the Persian period; and if with Prof. Oesterly we keep the text (on the strength of a passage in Amenemope where *Thoth* has a similar function), the supposition that the Hebrew 'borrowed' this Egyptian conception (which Oesterly and Toy regard as without a parallel in the O.T.) implies a readiness to regard Yahweh, like *Thoth*, as 'the ordainer of commercial transactions' and accords not only with other conceptions of Yahweh's abhorrence of false weights (Amos viii 5-7) but also with the commercial success promised if Israel obey Yahweh (Deut. xxviii 12, 44).

Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah, by the Rev. Melville Scott (S.P.C.K., 1927), consists of numerous text-critical notes, with an exposition of his principles and methods. He has many shrewd observations upon typical errors in the Massoretic Text, and for his emendations relies chiefly upon the substitution of consonants obviously alike in their present form and the rearrangement of the original or of substituted consonants. He favours the insertion of the best conjectures in the pages of a new version of the O.T., since a probable conjecture is better than a demonstrable corruption. The late Dr Scott was a keen exponent of emended texts, and it may suffice to quote a few examples: Prov. iii. 4, find a good *reward* (*sākār*, for 'understanding'); vi 26, the *price* of a harlot is a piece of bread (עֶרֶב for עֶרֶב); Ps. ii 12, kiss *the hand* (בִּיד for בֶּר 'son'); vii 7, the company of *angels* (אֱלֹהִים for לְאֵלִים); xxii 16, they *bound* my hands (כַּאֲרִי for אֲכַרִּי); Isa. vi 1, a song of *long ago* (רִוִּי for רִוִּי).

Dr. Millar Burrows, inspired by Prof. Torrey, who regards the book of Ezekiel as one of the pseudepigrapha of the Greco-Roman period, has made a close study of the book from a purely literary point of view (*The Literary Relations of Ezekiel*, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1925). The earliest writer demonstrably acquainted with Ezekiel is Ben Sira; and as the book is dependent upon Is. xl-lxvi, the whole Pentateuch, Joel, and the Aramaic parts of Daniel, &c. (p. 102), 'much at least . . . was written during the closing decades of the third century B.C.' Either Ezekiel is composite, in which case an analysis

more radical than Hölischer's is necessary, or it is entirely of the late Pre-Maccabean age. Even the crucial passage on the Zadokites (xliv 6-16) could be later than P (pp. 64 sqq.). Dr Burrows confines himself to the literary relations; a final decision, he observes, will have to take account of considerations which on principle he has for the present kept out of sight.

The little English commentary on Ecclesiastes by a Swedish scholar, Dr Hugo Odeberg (Almqvist and Wiksell, Upsala, 1928), claims as its sole originality the endeavour 'to reach the inner meaning of the Qohælæth . . . that would give coherence to the many baffling discrepancies of thought and wordings, and at the same time furnish a clue to the real purpose of the book.' The commentary itself is commendably concise, and besides a translation there are short sections on the general subject-matter. Dr Odeberg regards the book as a real unity (interpolations are vii 19, ix 17-x 4, x 8-13, xi 7-xii 7), the discrepancies being due to the author's way of picturing vividly two different modes of life. Here and elsewhere he finds himself in agreement with Dr Lukyn Williams and Prof. Podechard. He dates the book (noting specially the allusions to the king) between 330 and 250 B.C.; the author was essentially a Jew, God was the centre of his life, and although he has forsaken the old faith, the old religion was still a power in his life. The commentary, the proofs of which have been read by Prof. Box, is a model of scholarly brevity.

In *The Book of Isaiah in the light of the Assyrian Monuments* (S.P.C.K., 1930) the Rev. Charles Boutflower has collected a good deal of historical and other information illustrating or confirming, as the case may be, chaps. i-xxxix. With a map and some 17 blocks, this handy introductory sketch presents a thorough-going conservative treatment of the prophecies. Even chaps. xxiv-xxvi are Isaianic—the Apocalypse of Isaiah—for old men dream dreams (Joel ii 28). There are good accounts of Têma, el-Jowf, and Edom (pp. 169 sqq., 182), and the external evidence of archaeology and the monuments is more helpful than the use made of it. But there is a curious mixture of antiquated and up-to-date translations of the Assyrian sources, and several solecisms, e. g. that the divine name was Jau or Yau, 'for the J was pronounced as Y' (p. 21).

The unity of *all* Isaiah is urged by the Rev. W. A. Wordsworth (*Sawn asunder: a Study of the Mystery of the Gospel of Isaiah*, Moring Ltd., London, 1927). Written in a spirit of mysticism and in a style that disarms all criticism, it urges that the identification of Immanuel with the Servant is the really great creative idea giving unity to the book. The book of Isaiah should be interpreted by poets and not by scholars. He makes a good point with the remark that Sennacherib's deportation

of over 200,000 Judaeans was a colossal disaster—it must have meant more than we can guess—and since the king also carried away 208,000 of the inhabitants of Babylonia, Mr. Wordsworth suggests that he sent ‘at least a considerable proportion of his Jewish captives to fill up the depleted population of Babylon’ (p. 50 sq.). Elsewhere, ‘David,’ he says, ‘is out of the question for a large proportion of the Psalms’ (p. 158), Isaiah and the Servant being the authors of many. So also Isaiah wrote Exod. xv and Deut. xxxii, and Joel is of the time of the regency of Jehoiada the priest.

Commandant Armand Lipman’s *Authenticité du Pentateuch ou la Critique devant la Tradition* (Leroux, Paris, 1929) is purely anticritical, and will hardly achieve its aim. There is the old fancy that the use of the masculine *hu’* for ‘she’ in the Pentateuch is a real archaism (p. 11). Among the arguments difficult to follow is one based upon the use of *yē’or* for the Nile in Exodus and by Ezekiel, a proof that the prophet knew Exodus since Homer uses the word *Aiguptos* and Herodotus calls the river *Neilos* (p. 272). There is also the argument (p. 60 sq.) that Exod. xvi. 16 and Deut. iv. 34 contain each all the letters of the Hebrew alphabet and in practically the same proportion as in the 304,805 letters which the Massorettes counted in the Pentateuch—a proof of the homogeneity of the language of the Pentateuch.

Much has been heard recently of *Nabonidus and Belshazzar*, by Prof. R. P. Dougherty (Yale Univ. Press [Milford], 1929). It is a painstaking compilation, culminating in the conclusion that among non-Babylonian records dealing with the fall of Babylonia, Daniel v ‘ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy so far as outstanding events are concerned’. It is ‘characterized by such an accurate historical perspective’ that it must be ‘much nearer in time to the reliable cuneiform documents’ than the date(s) to which it is usually assigned. Frankly, the book and the argument are disappointing. It is commonly admitted that a certain recollection of reliable history lies behind Dan. v, and that Dan. i–vi are older in their ultimate origin than chaps. vii–xii. Controversialists who themselves do not take Dan. v *au pied de la lettre* have confused the date to which scholars assign the book of Daniel as a unit with the date or dates of the traditions utilized. It is true we now know that Nabonidus spent much of his time in Têma, so that his son must have held a prominent position; but although we learn that the father, *in his third year*, entrusted the kingship to his first-born, he and he alone was ‘king’. The old Cyrus cylinder speaks of Nabonidus as the real and effective king (similarly Berossus), and Belshazzar is not named in the cuneiform texts. The names Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar are good but not perfect spellings of the original names, and when the book of Daniel uses ‘Chaldeans’ in the sense of soothsayers,

and clearly looks upon Belshazzar as the son (not the grandson) of Nebuchadnezzar—the Book of Baruch is only more explicit (p. 190)—and when Belshazzar is followed by the Medes and Persians, no one can regard Dan. v as other than a historical romance. It centres, as is clear, in the fate of the temple-vessels, a favourite theme (see my note on 1 Esd. ii 10 in Charles's *Apocrypha*). Were it not for apologetic considerations and mistaken ideas of inspiration, it could hardly occur to any one at all acquainted with the vicissitudes of history to treat Dan. v—or, equally, Gen. xiv—as a historical record.

Noteworthy, also, from the apologetic point of view, is the elaborate work of Dr A. S. Yahuda, *Die Sprache des Pentateuch in ihren Beziehungen zum Aegyptischen*, vol. i (Gruyter, Berlin, 1929). It is an erudite collection of Egyptian words and phrases to prove the essential relationship between the language and contents of the O.T. and Egyptian, and to deduce therefrom a complete vindication of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. The array of learning on the one hand, and the completely traditional conclusions on the other, combine to make it one of the most intriguing of recent publications, and it has naturally been the subject of a penetrating criticism, especially from the Egyptian side. According to Dr Yahuda, the Hebrew language and style were created under immediate Egyptian influence, namely, when Israel was in Egypt, from the time of Joseph to Moses. The early chapters of Genesis shew an Egyptian treatment of the material which Abraham had brought from the East; then there are Canaanite and Pre-Egyptian traits (pp. 281 sqq.); and finally, with the story of Joseph, we enter upon the Egyptian epoch of the Hebrew language, and its permanent influence upon the O.T. Of the author's sincerity, zeal, and industry there can be no doubt, but repeatedly one feels that the literary parallels between Egyptian and the O.T. do not justify his conclusion—who could build upon the French and German parallels to 'old chap' or 'how goes it?'? Quite apart from the purely Egyptological side of the question—and here grave doubts have been expressed—even if Dr Yahuda's parallels were significant, they would not prove his case. Thus phrases derived from parts of the body, e.g. to lift up the head, are found not only in Egyptian and Hebrew (pp. 59 sqq.), but also in Akkadian, as Father Dhorme pointed out in the *Revue Biblique* a few years ago. There are certainly some very suggestive phrases in Egyptian (e.g. 'the sand on the sea-shore'), but Egypt and Palestine-Syria were in close intermittent contact from very early times. The substantial grammatical relationship between Egyptian and Semitic is prehistoric, and must be due to factors which could influence their idiomatic usages. And while, on the one side, sons of Palestinian chiefs were sometimes taken to the Egyptian court, on the other the Egyptian colonies or garrisons in

Palestine, before the Israelite period, could have influenced the native language. Moreover, the phraseology of the Amarna Letters (c. 1400), and their occasional parallels in even relatively late Biblical literature, prove that Hebrew or Canaanite diction was already established before the days of the Israelites. In a word, the evidence, on the most generous estimate, does not justify the paradoxical view that the creative period of Biblical Hebrew was when Israel was in Egypt. But Dr Yahuda has achieved something more important and of more permanent value. He has shown beyond all doubt that in spite of the profound linguistic differences the ways of thought and speech were very similar in Egypt and south-west Asia. We must look to Egypt no less than to Babylonia for the possible origin, or source of influence, of various legends and myths (e. g. the serpent conflicts, p. 193); and the more obvious differences, and even the psychological differences, between the Hebrew and the Egyptian must not obscure the close relationship which is borne out by the political interrelations, the links between Jerusalem, the Delta, and the Nile, and notably by the archaeological evidence for the preponderating influence of Egypt—in contrast to Babylonia—in some important departments of material culture. It is here, and not in his supposed support of conservative or traditional views of the Pentateuch, that Dr Yahuda has made a permanent contribution, and the second volume of his work will be awaited with interest.

Roman Catholic literature on the O.T. appears to be on the increase. In the series *Biblische Zeitfragen* (Aschendorff, Münster i. W.) Prof. Eberharter of Salzburg writes *Der Dekalog*, giving a concise argument in favour of its absolute Mosaic origin with some attention to the arguments against it. He lays stress upon the ethical beliefs and practices among primitive peoples and the evidence for the sublime, or at least elevated, ideas of deity outside Israel. Radin's booklet on *Primitive Monotheism* is especially mentioned (p. 28 sq., see *J. T. S.* xxix 331 sq.). Obviously he has to consider the relation between the Prophets and Moses: what, on the traditional view, did the prophets really achieve? This is the touchstone of Biblical criticism, indeed of the philosophy of religion, for most of us are convinced that there has been some development in religion hitherto, even though many scholars will agree with Prof. Eberharter in his dissatisfaction with crude theories of 'Darwinian Evolutionismus'. But his own treatment is far from satisfactory. The Nehushtan in the very Temple itself (2 Kings xviii 4) is said to be *eine Verirrung des Volkes*, and had nothing to do with the cult of Yahweh (p. 36). Very well; but how could the priests tolerate this? We do not forget Hosea's condemnation: 'like people, like priest'. Furthermore, the statement that there is no trace of serpent cult in Israel (*ib.*) is contrary to the facts, as archaeology has shewn.

The appeal is being made to archaeology and comparative religion, and we must all accept the consequences. Again, to say that Elijah did not inveigh against the bull cult because there were more important things at stake, is to say that the worship of Yahweh, and not Baal, was more essential than *how* he was to be worshipped. Also the argument that nomad shepherds stand nearest to primitive culture and that the Israelites, in the Mosaic age, could preserve lofty conceptions of God (p. 30) must be taken with the recognition (p. 46) that neither the patriarchs nor the Israelites of the Exodus were pure nomads. In any case it relies upon a philosophy of evolution as truly as do those scholars whose conclusions Prof. Eberharter rejects.

In the same series Dr Storr writes on *Das Frömmigkeitsideal der Propheten* (1926). It gives an interesting conspectus of the ideas of righteousness and an estimate of the significance of the prophets' teaching. Here he throws together the earlier and ante-cultic prophets with the later (e. g. Isaiah and Malachi), ignoring the essential differences between them. He has a suggestive treatment of the question of their mysticism, and he makes the point that the content of mystical experience implies doctrine (so p. 52). To the prophets the Jews owe their moral superiority over other nations (p. 47 sq.), and he well observes that there was individualism before Jeremiah (p. 49); for it is necessary to understand what is meant when we speak of the teaching of Jeremiah and Ezekiel as regards the individual (cf. *The Religion of the Semites*, p. 590).

The prophets also form the subject of a monograph by Dr Jos. Ziegler, *Die Liebe Gottes bei den Propheten*, in Schulz's series of *Alltestamentliche Abhandlungen* (Aschendorff, Münster i. W., 1930). He very properly condemns the reconstruction of O.T. religion which makes Yahweh *primarily* a jealous, explosive Deity: after all, these attributes are found in late literature, and in early times other deities are not devoid of ethical attributes. He surveys the Hebrew words for love, pity, &c., and of special interest is his study of the marriage-idea in Israelite religion. But he makes a rather forced distinction between Israelite and Canaanite ideas, in order to disclaim, as it would seem, Canaanite or non-Israelite influence in the origin of the conception of Yahweh's marriage with Israel. The book well repays deeper study, since it forces us to reconsider our theories of the development of religion. Dr. Ziegler clearly and freely recognizes that the prophets are a landmark in the religion of Israel, and goes more deeply than some other writers into this fundamental question of the relation between Yahweh and Israel, and the differences between (a) Canaanite religion, (b) old Israelite religion, and (c) the teaching of the prophets.

To the same series belongs Dr Jos. Kremer's *Die Hirtenallegorie im*

Buche Zacharias auf ihre Messianität hin untersucht (1930). It is distinguished by the attention that it pays to English literature. It is a study of the history of exegesis, beginning with Matt. xxvi 31 and xxvii 3 sqq. As regards the name 'Jeremiah' (*ib.* 9) he does not follow Jerome's words concerning Christ (*cui curae fuit non verba et syllabas aucupari, sed sententias dogmatum ponere*), but takes Kahle's view that there was once extant a late popular text of the Pentateuch, and suggests that there was also a popular text of the Prophets (p. 27). Elsewhere he collects twenty different reasons why Jeremiah's name should have been used (pp. 97 sqq.), and he has an Appendix on the thirty pieces of silver and their treatment in art.

Dr. Franz Feldmann of Bonn publishes a third and enlarged edition of *Geschichte der Offenbarung des alten Testaments bis zum Babylonischen Exil* (Hanstein, Bonn, 1930). It is a résumé of the biblical narrative with surveys of the records, history, religion, and culture of the successive main periods. It is written from a thoroughly traditional standpoint—Gen. i 1–ii. 3 is Mosaic (contrast Heinisch below)—but takes some cognizance of critical work. Both Judges and Ruth were probably *abgefasst* in David's time (p. 107). The discrepant accounts of Saul's rise are frankly admitted, and when Dr Feldmann observes that neither of the two sources gives a complete representation of the actual course of events (p. 116), this is equally true, on the modern view, of J, E and P in the Hexateuch, where conservative writers are wont to object that these sources are not complete taken separately, as though this proved that the whole narrative was not composite. The priestly functions of David's sons are explained away (p. 139), and the story of the census-taking in 2 Sam. xxiv is explained on the lines that the famine in ch. xxi : *hatte Jahves gerechten Zorn über Israel noch nicht besänftigt : er sann auf eine neue Strafe* (p. 154). It is a dangerous method to decry Samaritan religion in favour of Judah, Jerusalem, and the Temple, for when we come to Josiah's reign Dr Feldmann follows Chronicles and argues that the good king began to seek Yahweh in the eighth year of his reign and started the reforms in the twelfth; then, turning to Kings, he suggests that the reforms assigned to the eighteenth year must have taken some time, and indeed began six years earlier (p. 216 sq.). If so, when in the eighteenth year the king began to repair the temple and found the Book of the Law, 'the king's solemn repentance and covenant of reformation', as Robertson Smith long ago remarked (*O.T. in Jew. Church*, p. 145), comes 'ten years after the reformation itself'; it is 'an inconsistency which seems never to have struck him', i.e. the chronicler—or Dr Feldmann. To add to this, 'the Book' must have been a known book, 'even though its contents were not known outside priestly circles' (p. 219). This makes it worse for the religion of the temple-priests! Dr Feldmann

asks, Why did Josiah send to the prophetess Huldah? But he has already implied that the priests of Jerusalem were the last men one could approach for ethico-religious instruction. And so it is that the modern view of the O.T. turns upon the work of the prophets of Israel, and though the current theories may seem drastic at times, the upholders of tradition have not yet succeeded either in explaining away the internal difficulties of the O.T. or in presenting an alternative hypothesis of the religious history of Israel.

Under the editorship of Dr Feldmann and Dr Herkenne of Bonn, the series *Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (Hanstein, Bonn, 1930) has received an important accession in the bulky commentary on Genesis by Dr Paul Heinisch of Nymwegen. The commentary is a rich one, written with a good knowledge of archaeological and literary-critical research. There is full and up-to-date bibliographical information, and the discussions are so instructive that biblical students should take note of the use made of modern research by a scholar whose whole *Weltanschauung* is along traditional lines. The Papal Bible Commission on the Pentateuch is therefore to the front, and there are interesting and instructive pages on the attitude (or rather attitudes) to it of Roman Catholic scholars. Dr Heinisch, for his part, recognizes that the Pentateuch is of composite origin: there are double accounts (p. 28) and unevennesses (p. 68). The Laws have had a history (p. 33), and the post-Mosaic laws so truly represent a development of the Mosaic law that they can be called an *Ausbau mosaischer Gedanken*, just as—he says—we speak of a 'Psalter of David', though 'many' Psalms are not David's, and may belong to the post-exilic age (p. 42). As regards the book of Genesis, of chapters i-xxi the following are said to be Mosaic (an asterisk denotes important additions): ii 4 b-vi 8, vii*, viii*, ix 18-27, xi-xiii, xiv*, xv, xvi, xvii*, xviii, xix, xxi. After the Bible Commission one distinguishes among the additions (a) those inspired (p. 72, cf. p. 28), and (b) the uninspired (glosses, &c.). Altogether in several respects the commentary is an instructive example of the best Roman Catholic scholarship.

Last among the Roman Catholic books to be noticed are two volumes of the *Institutiones Biblicae Scholis Accommodatae*, ii 1 *de Pentateucho*, by Aug. Bea, and ii 3, *de Libris Didacticis*, by A. Vaccari (Rome, Pontifical Institute, 1928 and 1929). The former treats the Pentateuch as a single work. Moses, as author and redactor, used oral traditions of the antediluvian and Patriarchal history, hence the different divine names. Modern criticism is based on an erroneous philosophy (pp. 25, 28, 30, 32 sq.). The Pontifical Commission looms large: there are interesting remarks on Roman Catholic writers before and after that event (p. 28 sq.), and interspersed are warnings that passages are not to be interpreted to

contradict dogma (p. 154). The latter volume is not so tied. It is interesting to find that Bellarmine treated Pss. xliii, lxxiii, lxxviii, lxxxii as Maccabean (p. 16, cf. p. 21). Protestant books on the Psalms are to be received *cum cautela semper*. (The same might be said of some of the spellings of English names.) Job is not later than the Exile (p. 77), but Koheleth is perhaps of the third century B. C.: scholarship has a free hand (p. 85). It is difficult to believe that the series can have other than a very restricted appeal.

Prof. Theodore Robinson reprints his Presidential Address to the Society for Old Testament Study, 1927, *The Genius of Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1928). 'A people's grammar is one of the windows through which an outsider may peer into its soul.' The subject is an attractive one, and in the course of a few pages we have a rapid summary illustrating the way in which phonetics, grammar, syntax, and style may be made to reveal the mentality of the Hebrews. Prof. Robinson comments on their failure to dwell upon the distinction between past, present, and future, and we recall the readiness of the prophetic and other writers to see past or future history in the present. On the other hand the Semite did distinguish between process and event. It may be noticed that he disposes of the analogy, sometimes asserted, between the Semitic 'construct state' and Celtic usage. He also suggests that the greatness of the Authorized Version is due in part to the fact that it was an attempt to give a literal translation of a Hebrew original, copying its directness and love of the concrete, and its sparing use of adjectives.

Dr E. F. Miller of Columbia University writes a pamphlet, *The Influence of Gesenius on Hebrew Lexicography* (New York, 1927). After a brief account of the life-work of the great lexicographer (1786-1842), he passes to his general principles and their application. With his *Manual* (1810-1812) Gesenius marked an advance upon all his predecessors. The Latin edition of 1833 was marked (or rather marred) by rash comparisons with Indo-European languages. Of the later editors, Mühlau and Volck used Assyrian for the first time, in the 8th and 9th editions (1878-1893), relying upon Fried. Delitzsch and, for Old Testament exegesis, upon his father. Buhl, beginning with the 12th edition, made a radical revision, and Ancient Egyptian found a place in the 14th (1905). The 16th (1915, with anastatic reprint in 1921) is perhaps the final one (p. 93). Dr Miller also surveys the English editions, and adds a bibliography, wherein he seems to have overlooked C. C. Torrey's elaborate review of the 16th edition in the *Amer. Journ. for Sem. Lang.*, xxxiii (1916) 51-70. Meanwhile, as Dr. Miller points out (p. 93), glossaries are being prepared for separate portions of the O.T. Of the series edited by Prof. Baumgärtel (Töpelmann, Giessen) we now have Genesis,

Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms, and—most recently of all—the Minor Prophets by Dr Nicolaus Fries. The words are arranged alphabetically with occasional references to Gesenius's grammar and textual notes. They are extremely cheap (1.20–2 marks). For English students, however, the S.P.C.K. has published *Genesis* by Prof. Robinson (in 1923) and *Ruth* by Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy (in 1928), each with text, grammatical notes, and vocabulary. The latter gives also notes on the subject-matter, e. g. iv 5, 7. It is to be hoped that the project will be sufficiently successful—each costs only half a crown—to encourage other volumes, whether on separate books (e. g. Joel) or portions (e. g. the story of Joseph, the Elijah and Elisha narratives).

Kurze gefasste Biblisch-Aramäische Grammatik mit Texten und Glossar, by Bauer and Leander (Niemeyer, Halle a. S., 1929), is a handy edition with fuller reference to the authors' larger grammar on the same subject. I notice that the demonstrative *ēlēh* in Jer. x 11 is explained as indicating the close of the Aramaic passage cited there (p. vi)—nothing is said to justify this. On *uššarnā*, Ezr. v 3, I cannot help being attracted by Torrey's observation (*Ezra Studies*, p. 175 sq.; cf. Charles *Apocrypha* i 42) that both Greek versions evidently point to אגרא, read and interpreted differently. This being so, it is tempting to go a step further and to assume that the original text had אגרא(י) 'shrine' or 'temple'.

Here may be mentioned a reprint from the *Harvard Theological Review*, xxi, Jan. 1928, on the inscriptions from Serabit in the Sinaitic peninsula. First made known by Sir Flinders Petrie (1906), their script is regarded as the, or an, ancestor of the Semitic alphabets. Grimme's claim to have found in them references to Moses and his royal deliverer seized the imagination of the public—or rather of the press; and although Grimme found little if any support, more accurate information was desirable. In this reprint Prof. Kirslopp Lake and Mr. Robert Blake describe the rediscovery of them in 1927; and Mr R. F. Butin discusses at some length their decipherment and general significance. Unfortunately there is as yet insufficient agreement among the various decipherers to justify our confidence in any one of them. A start has certainly been made, and it is generally agreed that Gardiner and Cowley with him are right in deciphering the name of Baalath—superseding partial identifications by Ball in 1908 and Bruston in 1911 (p. 33). Dr. Cowley has recently offered a fresh decipherment of the inscriptions in the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, November 1929.—Another reprint that may appropriately be mentioned here is *The Site of the Biblical Mount Sinai* by Dr Ditlef Nielsen (Copenhagen, 1928). It is a strong claim for identifying Mount Sinai with Petra. The traditional site in the peninsula is of post-Jewish date; native tradition associates Moses and Aaron with the Petra district, and there are traces of the

cult of a moon-god at Petra; there are independent reasons for the view that Yahwism sprang from a moon-religion, and Sinai itself at once suggests the moon-god Sin.—Prof. Kaminka reprints his contribution to the new *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, article 'Bibel', § vii. He deals with exegesis, beginning with 'exegesis within the Bible', and ending with 'the critical commentaries', and the remark that the long-dominant Wellhausen hypothesis has been powerfully shaken at the present day by Protestant as also by Jewish investigators.

Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams, by the faculty and visiting teachers of the Jewish Institute of Religion (Press of the J.I.R., New York, 1927), will be read with sympathy by those who knew one whom Canon Box in *The Legacy of Israel* described as 'admittedly the greatest Jewish scholar that England has produced'. A speaking portrait of him forms the frontispiece, and the editor (Mr G. A. Kohut), the President of the Institute (Mr. Stephen Wise), and Dr Foakes Jackson (on Abrahams at Cambridge) unite with Mr Claude Montefiore and others to describe his place in Liberal Judaism, in the Reform Jewish Movement, &c. Among the twenty-seven contributions that follow may be named the posthumous publication of Gressmann's sketch of Jewish life in ancient Rome (illustrated), H. S. Lewis on the 'golden mean' in Judaism, Kirslopp Lake on the Council of Jerusalem in Acts xv, G. F. Moore on Simon the Righteous, Travers Herford (to whom S. B. Maximon refers with highest appreciation, p. 324 sq.) on the separation of Christianity from Judaism ('the hard things spoken and written of old belong to the old time alone . . .'), and Mr Montefiore on the mutual need of religion and learning in Judaism ('research is needed for the sake of the religion, and if it is to be for the sake of the religion, it must always be for its own sake').

Mr Montefiore's Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture is on iv Ezra (Allen and Unwin, 1929). It is 'a study in the developement of universalism'. We begin with 'the sublime and yet ludicrous paradox', the consoling words of the angel to Ezra perplexed at the doom of the greater part of mankind ('dost thou love the creation more than I its creator?'), and we end with Origen (*non est insanabile aliquid factori suo*). The eloquent and pointed address handles, as might be expected, with perfect frankness and understanding, some phases in the history of ideas of universalism, resurrection, election, and the usual indifference to those outside the pale. The Rabbis had no fixed dogma—though R. Levi asked, Where is the potter who seeks that his vessels should be broken?—and among the Christians the disadvantages of narrow fixed dogmas have been only too painfully evident. The booklet includes Mr. Herbert Loewe's interesting remarks upon the reason why iv Ezra was not accepted by the Jews.

Volume V of the *Hebrew Union College Annual* (Cincinnati, 1928) contains eleven contributions on O.T. and Jewish topics. The longest, by J. G. Morgenstern, on the Book of the Covenant (151 pp.), is too detailed even for a summary. It is an important and original study of the vicissitudes in the history of the ark, and the varying conceptions of Yahweh's relation to the temple, and it offers a theory of the main details in the reformation when Jehu became king of Israel in 842 B. C. P. F. Bloomhardt, of Springfield, presents a fully annotated translation of Haggai. V. Aptowitz of Vienna concludes his study of traces of the matriarchate in Jewish writings. A. Cronbach's essay on 'Divine Help as a social phenomenon' (pp. 583-620) is of general interest. He contends that for Judaism 'not causation but value is the meaning of Divinity': a causal God must be anthropomorphic (p. 618). Causation must always have been less essential than value (p. 589), and 'the age-long struggle against anthropomorphism may in a measure have been due to a perception, however dim, that causative categories fail to compass the Divine.'

Dr Gaster's *Asatir, the Samaritan book of the 'Secrets of Moses'* (Royal Asiatic Society, 1927), is a collection of legends, parallel to those in the Jewish Midrash and pseudepigraphic literature, but of Samaritan origin. He claims that the 'Secrets of Moses' is the oldest known book of its kind, and that it was compiled about the middle or end of the third century B. C. It points to a fixed text of the Pentateuch, a text even then holy and immutable. Whatever may be thought of his conclusions, Dr. Gaster has done his utmost to collect all the material that would illustrate the legends. Josephus has especially attracted him, and it is suggested that much of the novel matter in his writings came from a source closely approximating to the *Asatir*. Dr Gaster conjectures that Josephus wrote a *Greek* Targum to the Pentateuch, parallel to the Aramaic Targum used among the Jews. This and many other topics (Balaam and the Antichrist, Demonology, Mandaean affinities) are discussed in the Introduction.

The Parsi scholar, Cursetji Erachji Pavray, the author of numerous Gujurati works on Zoroastrianism, publishes an English translation of a selection (*Iranian Studies*, Bombay, 1927). He writes on the Avesta, its astronomy, the golden age of Jamshid, ceremonials connected with the dead, the haoma plant, &c. We are told that he is a man of independent views, holding a central position as regards Avestan matters. He has devoted himself to the study and restoration of the text of the Avesta, and he very modestly dedicates his researches to 'the scholars of the West, patient and tireless students of the lore and learning of ancient, medieval, and modern Iran'. The book is full of interesting material on the old religion, and, as he has been an ordained

Zoroastrian priest since 1872, he has a knowledge and authority which few could equal.

L'Œuvre de Bahā'ullah, by Hippolyte Dreyfus (Leroux, Paris, 1928), is a re-edition of a French translation of the *Kitābū'l-Iqān*, the 'Book of Assurance', first published in 1904 (*Le Livre de la Certitude*). It is one of the chief polemical works of Baha'ullah, written before he claimed to be 'he whom God shall manifest', and M. Hippolyte, who has written other works upon the Bābī religion, is best known to English readers for his popular account of it published in 1929 (*The Universal Religion: Bahā'ism, its Rise and Import*).

The Vedānta philosophy is of more general interest than most of the other systems of eastern thought, and Prof. Radhakrishnan, of Calcutta, who has written extensively upon India, here reissues, from the second volume of his great work, *Indian Philosophy*, the chapters dealing with the systems of the two great interpreters, Saṃkara and Ramanuja. The author is at home in both western and eastern philosophy and psychology; he has a perfect command of English, and is one of the finest exponents of modern Hinduism and its metaphysical basis. No one can fail to see the necessity of realizing that there are Indians whose knowledge of western life and thought far exceeds that which the West has of the East, and in an age when East and West need to learn more of each other, it is to be regretted that our European thinkers make such little use of eastern thought. Prof. Radhakrishnan's volume should do much to remedy the defect (Allen and Unwin, 1928).

The series *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*, under the editorship of Prof. Bertholet (Mohr, Tübingen, 1927), has issued two new pamphlets: no. 7, *Die Jainas* (by Prof. W. Schubring of Hamburg), and no. 8, *Die Eingeborenen Australiens und der Südseeinseln* (by Prof. R. Thurnwald of Berlin). Each contains a selection of typical texts with annotations. In the case of the latter there are passages from modern travellers and others; for example, Central Australia is illustrated almost entirely from Strehlow.

The Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Congress of Orientalists, Oxford, 1928 (Oxford, 1929), summarizes the papers, meetings, and social functions on the occasion of a gathering which, had it not been for the War, would have taken place in 1915. As it was, it was an impressive reunion of Orientalists of all countries, and one of the most successful of Congresses. Numerous papers were read (some illustrated by lantern slides), and full references are made in this volume to those which have been subsequently published in whole or in part.

S. A. COOK.