
A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE TEN BEST BOOKS ON THE PROPHETIC LITERATURE.

THE study of the Prophetic literature of the Old Testament has many aspects, and could be surveyed from many points of view. Within the compass of a single article it is only possible to touch upon some of these aspects, and to refer to the more important literature of the subject; and even this can only be attempted cursorily. The selection of "the ten best books," where so much that is important is involved, must, in any case, be open to the charge of a certain degree of arbitrariness, which can only be reduced, to some extent, by allowing the selection to emerge from a larger setting, in which some attempt will be made to indicate what is relatively important. It will be convenient to deal with the subject under three main divisions:—(1) The nature and historical development of Hebrew Prophecy; (2) the place of Prophecy in the development of Hebrew Religion; and (3) the critical interpretation of Hebrew Prophecy. The relevant literature, as the subjects themselves, cannot always be kept distinct, but will sometimes overlap.

I.

It has often been pointed out that the application of the historical-critical method of exegesis to the text of the Old Testament, and the critical reconstruction that has followed, has meant the recovery almost of something which had been lost, or rather of something which, if not actually lost, had been preserved in a state of suspended animation. This fact emerges clearly when we study the method of interpreting Scripture which, at a comparatively early date, became predominant in the Christian Church. The Hellenised Christian communities found it difficult to

assimilate the Jewish Scriptures. Yet the Old Testament, which had been the Bible of Christ and the Apostles, could not be rejected outright by the Catholic Church. Hence arose the allegorical method of interpretation, which still dominates the minds of countless numbers of Christian people, and is largely enshrined in the headings of the Authorised Version. The allegorical method was applied especially to Prophecy, and a study of it historically is very instructive. An excellent discussion of this subject is given by a competent Old Testament scholar in America, Professor K. Fullerton, in a volume entitled *Prophecy and Authority*, published in 1919.[1] The following passage will illustrate this line of treatment:

"The argument from prophecy was one of the most important factors . . . in the apologetics of the first two centuries. It was necessarily the burning question between Jew and Christian wherever they came into real debate with one another. It was the corner-stone in the system of the Greek Apologists. It played a fundamental part in what was one of the most critical struggles in the history of the Church, the struggle with the Gnostic and Marcionite heresies. These heretics attempted for the first time something like an historical criticism of the Old Testament. . . . They pointed out in particular certain features of Messianic prophecy which, though long denied, have been finally recognised by a scientific exegesis. But their criticism was carried on in the interest of theories fatal to the life of the Church. If they had succeeded in inducing the Church to reject the Law and the Prophets, they would have removed the foundation upon which Jesus himself claimed to build (Marcion significantly denied Mt. v. 27, a passage often cited against him), and would have smoothed the way for a complete Hellenisation of Christianity. Hence the apologetic importance for the Early Church of the argument from prophecy cannot be too strongly emphasised. *It saved the Old Testament to the Christian religion in the only way in which at that time it could be saved.* But in saving the Old Testament it preserved the organic connexion of Christianity with the previous history of revelation and prevented it from becoming evaporated into theosophical speculations, or distorted into a one-sided, because unhistorical, development."[2]

[1] The Macmillan Company (sub-title: *A Study in the History of the Doctrine and Interpretation of Scripture*).

[2] P. 38 f.

The revival of Hebrew studies at the Reformation gradually paved the way for a more real exegesis of the Old Testament, which, however, could not be attained in any effective way till the rise of modern Criticism.

The consideration of the essential nature of the Hebrew conception of the prophetic calling can best be approached by a study of the meaning of the term that is most characteristic among the descriptive terms applied to the order generally—viz. *nabî'*, pl. *nĕbî'îm*. There are excellent discussions to be found in the various introductory volumes dealing with Hebrew prophecy, of which the following may be mentioned here:—Robertson Smith's classical treatise, *The Prophets of Israel*[2], pp. 390 ff., Dr G. A. Smith's *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, I. ch. ii., and Cornill's *Der Israelitische Prophetismus*[6], pp. 9 ff. The discussion in the last two mentioned works is specially fresh and interesting. Cornill infers from the fact that *nabî'* cannot be explained from a corresponding verb in old Hebrew—no such root being used—that the term was originally imported into Hebrew from outside sources. The verbal equivalent in Arabic means "to announce," sc. a message; hence may be derived the sense of commissioned speaker.

With this may be compared the Assyrian *nabû* "to call," "inform," "command"; cf. Nebo, Isaiah xlvi. 1; in Ethiopic *nabâba* = "to speak." The earlier view that *nābî'* could be explained from נבע "bubble up" (Kuenen, Wellhausen, Stade) is not now generally held.

König, in his interesting article, "Prophecy" (*Hebrew*), in Hastings' *Dictionary of Rel. and Ethics*, interprets the term as meaning "speakers," but in a unique sense, i.e. "they were heralds or messengers in the highest sphere of human interests, viz. religion." The word is never used in connexion with legal matters as if it meant "counsel" or "advocate." It may, therefore, be inferred that "the Hebrew *nabî'* was the 'speaker' in the religious sphere,

thus corresponding to the Greek προφήτης, originally 'the interpreter of the oracle,' and thus 'the expounder of divine revelation,' so that neither term at first connoted the idea of prediction." König brings out clearly the distinction of the prophets as such from priests and judges, and also from "the wise." It is important to emphasise the fact that the prophet is essentially a *speaker*; he delivers the "word" with the living voice. The writing down of the living word marks a later stage. And this is essentially true, of course, of the great prophets whose oracles have come down to us in written form. The delivery of the prophetic oracle would often be accompanied by appropriate gestures and active movements of the body, as well as certain striking and symbolic actions calculated, to impress the onlookers. In the last case, indeed, the action was the all-important element, while the spoken word only served to explain it (cf. e.g. Jer. xix., Ezek. iv.). The great prophets did not, of course, hesitate to avail themselves of the written medium, especially when they desired to make the message known to wider circles or preserve it for the future. In Jeremiah xxxvi. we possess a valuable account which describes the process by which the prophet produced a roll containing oracles spoken by him over a long period of years. Naturally what he wrote down was a summary of the spoken discourses, giving the gist but not a full report of what he had originally said. No doubt, also, the written form or book often owed much to the circle of the prophet's disciples.

The *nĕbî'îm* first appear in Israelitish history in the time of Samuel, and in contrast with the earlier "seers," who had hitherto represented prophecy, and from whom the new order is carefully distinguished (1 Sam. ix. 9). Whereas the "seer" had been a solitary, these, says Dr. G. A. Smith,[1]

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 21.

"went about in bands. They were filled with an infectious enthusiasm, by which they excited each other and all sensitive persons whom they touched. They stirred up this enthusiasm by singing, playing upon instruments and dancing: its results were frenzy, the tearing of their clothes and prostration. The same phenomena have appeared in every religion—in Paganism often, and several times within Christianity. They may be watched to-day among the dervishes of Islam, who by singing, by swaying of their bodies, by repeating the Divine Name, and dwelling on the love and ineffable power of God, work themselves up into an excitement which ends in prostration, and often in insensibility. The whole process is due to an overpowering sense of the Deity—crude and unintelligent if you will, but sincere and authentic—which seems to haunt the early stages of all religions."

With the new name, a new order of prophecy entered into the life of Israel. It was intensely loyal to Jehovah, and by making patriotism an essential part of the national religion succeeded in welding the tribes into a homogeneous nation. König, indeed, and some other scholars would deny that the *nabî'* was unknown in earlier Israel, and in the article already referred to attempts to explain away 1 Samuel ix. 9. This article should be read, but has failed to convince many scholars.

Another question that is the subject of considerable discussion at the present time is concerned with the place of ecstasy in Hebrew prophecy. Is the ecstatic experience the essential mark of a prophet as such? According to Hölscher, who has given a brilliant exposition of the thesis in his great work *Die Profeten*,[1] it is. A similar view is held by Dr. Theodore H. Robinson, and expounded, with much persuasiveness, in his stimulating book *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel* (1923). Dr. Robinson says:

"It is . . . probable that Isaiah, Amos, and Jeremiah were subject to the ecstasy, and the visions of Ezekiel and Zechariah may best be explained in the same way. It does not follow of

[1] Leipzig, 1914.

necessity that all their utterances originated thus, and yet it is at least possible."

It is true that the great writing prophets are classed among the *nĕbî'îm*, including even Amos, who indignantly disclaimed any connexion with the order so called (Amos vii. 14). What is the common element which will explain the use of the term *nĕbî'îm* to describe the earlier bands of ecstatics and the later canonical prophets? If the term *nabî'* meant "ecstatic" we should be compelled to concede Dr. Robinson's claim. But, as we have seen, the term really means "commissioned speaker" or "herald"; and while we can understand that one who spoke in the name of the Deity might be subject to ecstatic experience, especially in times of religious excitement, it does not necessarily follow that every *nabî*, would be similarly affected at all times. Some of the great prophets, like Ezekiel, may certainly have been ecstatics; but it is hard to believe this of Amos, or even of Jeremiah. Canonical prophecy, though the term "vision" (Heb. חזון) often occurs, constantly emphasises the content of the revelation as "the *word* of the Lord." The case against the ecstatic view has been put forcibly by M. Buttenwieser,[1] who roundly asserts in the chapter he devotes to the subject[2] that "the inspiration of the great literary prophets has nothing in common with the ecstasy of the prophets of the older type." One thing can be asserted confidently—the great prophets came before their contemporaries convinced that they had received a divine commission to proclaim a certain message which they had received directly from God. This claim depends upon an inward spiritual experience on which they lay special stress, and regard as their "call" (cf. Isaiah vi., Jeremiah i.,

[1] *The Prophets of Israel* (Macmillan Company, 1914), pp. 138 ff.

[2] "Inspiration as Opposed to Divination or Possession," ch. ii. in Part II.

Hosea i., Amos vii.). It was because of this inward certainty that they could declare with such assurance that their message came straight from God ("Thus saith the Lord," etc.). We have no space to pursue the discussion of this subject further here. The reader can be referred to Dr. A. B. Davidson's *Old Testament Prophecy*, ch. x., or Sanday's Bampton Lectures on *Inspiration*, Lecture III. (pp. 128 ff.). To those who can read German F. Giesebrecht's *Die Berufsbegabung der Alttestamentlichen Propheten* (1899) is an all-important monograph. One other point must be mentioned, the question of the relation of the canonical to the so-called "false" prophets. The latter apparently claimed to speak—and, in some cases, quite sincerely—in Jehovah's name. One of the best discussions of this subject in English is contained in Sir G. A. Smith's recently published *Jeremiah*, pp. 258 ff., and to this the reader is referred.

II.

The fundamental position of prophecy in Old Testament religion is insisted upon by modern scholars with practical unanimity. Thus Davidson entitles the second chapter of his *Old Testament Prophecy* significantly, "Prophecy the dominating Factor in Israel's History from the time of Moses onwards." The very first words of this chapter are: "The history of Israel is a history of prophecy." In a later paragraph he adds:

> "It is the conviction of the prophets and writers of Israel that the line of prophetic teachers has been uninterrupted since the days of Moses. Jeremiah (xv. 1) brings Moses and Samuel together: *Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people; cast them out of my sight and let them go forth.* Cf. also Jeremiah vii. 25 and Amos ii. 11."

That the prophetic element is primary in the development of the religion of Israel is one of the surest results gained by Old Testament criticism. However true it may be that

some of the more extreme critical positions have been successfully assailed in recent work, one broad result of criticism remains unshaken, that the Law, in the form in which we have it, comes after instead of before the writing prophets. "That broad change in the whole method of approach" (says Professor A. C. Welch) "to the study of the Old Testament is not seriously questioned in the many criticisms which are being urged to-day." [1]

The prophetic books and the prophetic teaching are the heart of Old Testament religion. The spirit of the prophets has inspired the Law itself, and raised it to a loftier standard of ethical requirement and made its ceremonial the expression of a sublime religion of holiness. How central the prophetic literature is becomes apparent at once when an attempt is made to construct an Old Testament theology. The most important material required must be drawn almost entirely from the Prophets. This is well illustrated from an early work of B. Duhm, published in 1875, but still important, under the title, *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der Israelitischen Religion.* In English, besides the manuals devoted to the History of the Religion of Israel, which include chapters on the prophetic religion,[2] the following works in English may be mentioned as specially concerned with prophetic religion: Dr. A. B. Davidson's *Old Testament Prophecy*, which surveys in a thorough and systematic way the questions that arise in connexion with the growth and development of prophecy. This book by a master hand is indispensable for serious study. Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel* is, of course, a classic. In spite of the fact that it was originally produced more than forty years ago,

[1] EXPOSITOR, December 1913, p. 518 f.

[2] One of the most important and original of these is Dr. Wheeler Robinson's *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament.*

it is still wonderfully fresh and stimulating. A new edition, by Dr. T. K. Cheyne, appeared in 1907 with a valuable new introduction, expounding the developments of criticism, and with additional notes. But the substance of the original lectures remains unchanged. Of more recent works the following are important: A posthumous volume of sermons by Dr. Driver (1915) with the title *The Ideals of the Prophets*. This collection has all the well-known marks of Driver's work—careful scholarship and cautious and lucid statement. Though cast in the form of sermons, and, therefore, in a sense popular in form, this volume brings out clearly the main religious ideas of the prophets of Israel. An older work by the present Dean of Ely (Dr. Kirkpatrick), entitled *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, ought to be mentioned in this connexion as a cautious and conservative treatment in systematic form which has been found very useful. There are, however, two works of outstanding importance to which attention ought to be directed, viz., Sellin's *Der Alttestamentliche Prophetismus* (1912), and Dr. A. C. Welch's "Kerr Lectures," published in 1912 under the title, *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom*. This stimulating book, full of the results of first-hand study and research, has hardly received the recognition due to it. The book deals with the stories of JE, Prophecy before Amos, and has chapters devoted to Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Deuteronomy. Sellin's book consists of three lectures, devoted to (*a*) "A Sketch of the History of Old Testament Prophecy"; (*b*) "Age, Nature and Origin of Old Testament Prophecy"; and (*c*) "Ancient Oriental and Old Testament Revelation." The influence of recent work, especially Gressmann's, on eschatology is strongly marked in both books. Sellin, it is true, regards the eschatological element as much older than the time of Amos, tracing it back to the age of Moses, and looks upon it as a native Israelitish growth. Welch in-

sists that it is essentially characteristic of the prophets, and is a fundamental postulate of their thought:

"Elijah works upon it; Amos develops it clearly; every other prophet bases upon it. . . .

"From the beginning they work not with the thought of a new political order which is the outcome of the conditions of their time, but with the conception of a new world-order which Jahveh is to bring in. And the new world-order is determined in its character by the nature of Him who ushers it in. One may allow that not until the nation was settled in its land, and had answered the problems set by its conquest, did the people need to conceive some world-order. One may further allow that they were influenced by similar conceptions as to a world-order which came to them from the outside. But the prophets brought to meet the new moral and religious needs of their people, and to meet the vague unethical conceptions which were passing into Israel's thought from outside, the conceptions of God, His nature and His will, which they had already learned from their own faith. They make patent the power and the width of the great ideas which Israel had already learned; and all that came from the outside was only admitted so far as it would conform with these. The greatness of Amos lies in the fact that he is so loyal to the old, so open to the new situation." [1]

If, as Gunkel, Gressmann and Sellin, and, we may add, Welch insist, the eschatological element in the prophetic literature is old, some important consequences follow. Many of the passages depicting a brighter future may be older than the original writings in which they occur. Sellin even regards Amos ix. 8b ff. as due to Amos, though misplaced.[2] Welch is more cautious. He says: "While there are elements in this which appear old, and may even date from Amos, the passage has received so much alteration that it is practically useless for determining the early view." [3] On the other hand he rightly recognises Hosea xiv. 1–8 as genuinely Hoseanic.

Another consequence of this view on which Welch insists

[1] *Exposit. Times*, xxiv. 209 (February, 1913).

[2] *Introduction* (E. T.), 168 f.

[3] *Religion of Israel under Kingdom*, p. 261. For an interesting explanation of Amos ix. 11, cf. Abrahams' *Studies in Pharisaism*, etc., 2nd series, p. 51.

is that, if it be accepted, "we are done with the idea of the prophets as a species of superior politicians."

"They were what they claimed to be, religious men. They were not dealing with Israel in face of the accidental factor of an Assyrian invasion; they were dealing with Israel in face of an eternal factor, its God. They were working not on a little question of policy, but on the profoundest question of all, the question of the relation of God to His world. Has God an order for the world? And does He give any man, in the uncertainty of everything else, a knowledge of it? Their eschatology was the means of expressing the thought that there is a world-order, which cannot remain in the background, but which, at whatever time God wills, may break in on the world."[1]

Welch, in the volume referred to above, has given us a fine series of studies of the eighth century prophets, characterised by independence of judgment backed by full knowledge. Among many other points his handling of the question of the prophets' attitude towards sacrifice may be referred to briefly. In discussing Amos v. 25 the author declares that if Amos believed that no sacrifices at all were offered in the wilderness,

"his view is simply incorrect; and J who makes sacrifice not only as old as the desert but as old as the race has a true historical vision as compared with the prophet.

The true explanation, Welch thinks, is that the prophet regarded sacrifices as secondary and comparatively unimportant:

"What Amos seems to mean is that then the nation were in such a relation to Jahveh . . . that they could rejoice in His immediate presence.

"So insignificant was it [sacrifice] in comparison with the other sense of their unity with their God, that it could be said that Jahveh gave no command about it at all. But now it bulks to them as though it were everything, for it is conceived by them as the chief means by which they seek to realize their dependence upon their God and to fulfil His will. They have substituted this comparatively trivial affair for the greater thing which Jahveh had in view when He made them a nation."[2]

[1] *Exp. Times*, as cited above. [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

Considerations of space will not permit more than a brief reference to the importance of the prophets in connexion with the idea of revelation. The matter is discussed in the third of Sellin's lectures (*Der Alt. Prophetismus*), where the revelations of other Semitic religions are compared and contrasted with that of Israel; and also in a masterly sketch by Dr. W. R. Matthews, *The Idea of Revelation* (1923), pp. 9 ff.

III.

A survey of the criticism of the prophetic literature, if it could be carried out on the scale of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, would be almost as fascinating a study as Schweitzer's famous monograph. Such a work has yet to be written. Here all that will be attempted is to call attention to some of the more important works which reflect the movement of criticism as regards the prophetic literature of the Old Testament. "In recent times," says Cheyne,[1] "advance in the understanding of the prophets has moved on *pari passu* with the higher criticism, especially the criticism of the Pentateuch, and with the general study of Hebrew history; and most works on the subject, prior to Ewald, must be regarded as quite antiquated, except for the light they cast on detailed points of exegesis." One of the older commentaries still worth consulting is Lowth's *Commentary on Isaiah* (1778), which is interesting because of its treatment of the rhythm of the prophecies, its textual criticism and philology. The illustrations from classical literature are also interesting, and sometimes valuable. Cheyne regards Lowth's work as marking "the beginning of a tendency to look mainly at the æsthetic aspects of the prophetical books, and to view the prophets as enlightened religious poets." The real work of criticism could only

[1] *Encycl. Biblica*, col. 3900.

begin when the prophets were put in their historic setting, and so studied critically. This was really begun by Ewald, whose great work on *The Prophets of the Old Testament* (E. T. 5 vols., 1876–7) is still well worth study. Of the scholars who have worked in this field since, the greatest services have been rendered, perhaps, by Kuenen, Wellhausen, Duhm, Marti, and Cornill. Wellhausen's volume on the Minor Prophets,[1] without a word of Preface or Introduction, plunges at once into the translation, which occupies 64 pages; this is followed by the "notes," which fill 156 pages. Not a word is wasted—every word tells. The work is a masterpiece of scientific criticism by a scholar of genius. The text and its analysis are dealt with throughout. Sometimes a whole critical problem is illuminated in a few brusque sentences, and it may safely be said that it has largely determined the lines of criticism since and has continued to exercise a powerful influence.

Further great advance has been made in the work of Duhm, Marti and Cornill. In particular the great commentaries of Duhm on *Isaiah* (2nd ed., 1902) and *Jeremiah* (1901) must be singled out. Duhm is both versatile and brilliant—and, sometimes, wayward. But even when least convincing, he is always extraordinarily stimulating and suggestive. Duhm's special contribution is in the restoration of the text largely on rhythmical principles. He articulates the poems in symmetrical form, and largely restores the text. But he is equally brilliant and suggestive in exegesis and in other forms of criticism. The careful study of this scholar's work is a real discipline which no serious student, who can devote extended study to the Old Testament, can afford to neglect. Marti's work, especially his commentaries on *Isaiah* (1900) and the Minor Prophets (1904, *Dodecapropheton*) exhibits fine scholarship and critical acumen;

[1] *Die Kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (Berlin, 4th ed., 1898).

but its criticism sometimes seems arbitrary and unconvincing. These commentaries, however, are indispensable. With these aids before him the student can see the whole range of literary criticism.[1]

Duhm's *Jeremiah*, like his *Isaiah*, carried criticism to an extreme which failed to commend itself to subsequent scholars. He leaves to the prophet about 270 4-lined stanzas, and to Baruch about 200 Masoretic verses. Thus, almost two-thirds of the book are assigned to later supplementers and editors. The commentaries of Cornill and Giesebrecht (2nd ed.), though deeply influenced by Duhm's work, make clear that their authors consider that this criticism has gone too far. It is a fortunate circumstance that within the last two years two important books on Jeremiah have been published in English: one by Dr. Skinner under the title *Prophecy and Religion*, contains 19 chapters dealing with various aspects of Jeremiah's life, character, and religious thought. The book presents the mature reflection and ripe scholarship of its distinguished author on some of the deepest themes of the Old Testament. It is also furnished with a large number of new translations of the poetical pieces. The other volume on the same theme by Sir George Adam Smith is a fine piece of work. It, too, gives a number of new translations, but the best part of the book is contained in the last three chapters, especially the differentiation between true and "false" prophecy, the story of Jeremiah's inner life, and the defence of the authenticity of the great prophecy of the New Covenant. Before we pass from Jeremiah, it is worth while to call the reader's attention to an older work, which is well worth reading—Cheyne's *Jeremiah: His Life and Times* (1889).

[1] The present writer has largely embodied the results of Duhm's and Marti's criticism in his translation with notes and introductions of *The Book of Isaiah* (1908, reprinted 1913).

This, with the companion volume on Isaiah by Driver, will be found both interesting and useful.

For Ezekiel, Davidson's well-known commentary still remains the standard volume of its kind in English. It is, of course, a first-rate piece of work; but much has been done on Ezekiel since it was written—and work of very great importance. Till the volume which is being prepared for the International Critical Commentary on this prophetic book appears, the student who wishes to get abreast of modern investigation will have to consult German works, such as are indicated below.

Finally, a word may be added about the commentaries on the Minor Prophets. The importance of Wellhausen's great work has already been alluded to. Sellin's volume, which has only recently appeared, is one of a series of commentaries which that scholar is himself editing.[1] The volume contains much that is fresh and important, and ought not to be overlooked.

Perhaps the difficult task of selection from the large available literature that is important may be effected in ten divisions (several containing alternatives) as follows:—

A. GENERAL.

1. Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel* (2nd ed., 1907).
   T. H. Robinson, *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancien Israel* (1923).
2. G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* (1896–8).
   A. R. Gordon, *The Prophets of the Old Testament*, 1 vol. (1916).
3. Cornill, *Der Israelitische Prophetismus* (6th ed., 1906). English translation, Chicago, 1898.
   Sellin, *Der Alttestamentliche Prophetismus* (1912).

[1] An important commentary on Jeremiah by P. Volz has already appeared in this series, and one on Ezechiel by D. Johannes Hermann has just come to hand.

B. Prophetic Religion and Theology.

4. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy* (1903); the article, "Prophecy and Prophets," by same writer, in Hastings' *D.B.*, vol. iv.
5. A. C. Welch, *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom* (1912).
6. Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah* (1922).

C. Commentaries and Translations.

7. *Isaiah*, Cheyne (new translation in Sacred Books of O.T.). Commentaries by Skinner (Camb. Bible, 2 vols.) and Whitehouse (Cent. Bible). G. B. Gray (i.–xxvii. in I.C.C.).
8. *Jeremiah*, G. A. Smith, *Jeremiah* (1924); Peake in Cent. Bible (2 vols.). [See also No. 6.]
9. *Ezekiel*, by A. B. Davidson (Camb. Bible), 1882. (German commentaries by Smend, 1880; Cornill, 1886 (textual); Kraetzschmar, 1900).
10. *The Minor Prophets*, G. A. Smith (as 2 above); Wellhausen, 1898; Sellin, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch* (Leipzig, 1922).

G. H. Box.

THE BELSHAZZAR OF DANIEL AND OF HISTORY.

One of the most important tests of the historical trustworthiness of the Book of Daniel for the period in which the hero is represented as having lived has always been the account of Belshazzar. Until modern times this person was entirely unknown, save from Jewish sources. The Greek writers knew Nabonidus, or Labynetus, as Herodotus calls him,[1] but nothing of Belshazzar. Josephus, therefore,

[1] *Hist.* i. 77.