

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

CHRONICLE

OLD TESTAMENT.

THE new edition of the Hebrew Old Testament to which Dr C. D. Ginsburg has devoted his life is rapidly approaching completion. The book of Isaiah, which has been sent as a specimen, is beautifully printed in fine bold type, pleasing to the eye. The text is that of the first edition of Jacob ben Ḥayim, with the correction of obvious errors, and with a collation of numerous printed and manuscript authorities. For the whole of the Old Testament Dr Ginsburg has examined over twenty printed editions previous to 1524, and over seventy MSS (most of them in the British Museum). The ancient versions have also been collated, and at the foot of each page are registered the variants of the *Keri*, the *Sebhürin*, accentual and other variations, and also some variants based upon the versions. In a few cases Dr Ginsburg has suggested emendations of his own. The greater part of the Old Testament is now in type and the whole is making rapid progress. The production of the entire work is part of the scheme for celebrating the centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and both the Society and Dr Ginsburg are to be heartily congratulated upon this fine undertaking.

Two new books by Prof. Kennett are mutually supplementary: *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah*, *Schweich Lectures 1910* (Frowde, London, 1910), and *The Servant of the Lord* (Arnold, London, 1911). Intended for the ordinary reader, they start from a conservative standpoint, and continually justifying the application of textual, literary, archaeological, and historical criticism, lead up to conclusions which, if sound, are a notable contribution to the Isaianic problems. These conclusions place a great wealth of material in the Maccabean age; the paucity of passages which can be assigned to Isaiah or his age, and the scantiness of the nucleus in Is. xl sqq. retained for the age of Cyrus being especially striking. This tendency, however, is familiar to students of Cheyne, Duhm, and Marti, and the rather novel attitude to Is. xl-lxvi is on the lines of the American scholars H. P. Smith and Torrey. Apart from his reliance upon metrical theory, Prof. Kennett's conception of the history of the sixth and fifth centuries B. C. is his main starting-point, and counter-criticism must concern itself with that rather than the details of emendation and reconstruction. Here it is enough to say that his position is essentially in harmony with that which is being reached independently by other workers, and that the conditions

after the seventh century and before the close of the Persian period inevitably affect the problems of Isaiah and indeed of the Old Testament as a whole. In *The Servant of the Lord* he naturally recognizes that the title may be old, but points out that the Isaianic passages which pass under this title must be taken in connexion with the thought and conditions which each involves. His discussion turns on the argument that the Servant personifies a section of Israel, and that Israel as an organized body has a mission. The historical background, as he urges, with weighty arguments, cannot be found before the age of Nehemiah and Ezra. Their policy was that of isolation, and one must look to the later period when wider interests, as in the book of Jonah, were prevalent. Finally, Prof. Kennett concludes that the Ḥasidīm meet the case, and that no other period than theirs answers all the conditions. In general it must be said that both books handle extremely intricate subjects concisely—perhaps too concisely—and will provoke criticism by the many points which are either too novel or still in debate. Some of the more obvious objections he already anticipates, and to his criticism of references cited as evidence for the existence of prophecies of Isaiah before the second century B.C. (*Schw. Lect.* 40 seq., 80 seq.), it may be added that later, in Talmudical references to the tractate *Eduyyoth* and the Midrash *Siphre*, the works cited do not appear to be identical with those now well known under these names (*Jew. Encyc.* viii 611, xi 331).

An interesting example of the value of the comparative method is provided by three lectures on *Early Ideas of Righteousness: Hebrew, Greek, and Roman* (Clark, Edinburgh, 1910). Prof. Kennett deals with the Hebrew conceptions of righteousness and sin, illustrating their range and the relation between their significance for Hebrew thought and that for modern Christian theology. Mrs Adam devotes attention to a few salient points in Plato, Pindar, Aristotle, Socrates, and other representatives of Greek thought. She shews that there was a recognition of the essential unity of man and God and a striving after harmony between man and his environment. Greek thought culminated in Plato, and his successors gave expression to his ethical ideals each in his own way. Prof. Gwatkin, in the third lecture, sees the ideal of the discipline of a state pervading Roman thought from ancient times to the present, and in tracing the stages of the successive developments in history explains the modern tendencies from their roots in the Roman Empire. These lectures are useful and the more suggestive when compared with each other, and one is tempted to wish that the lecturers could have reshaped their papers so that readers could more easily perceive the points of resemblance and difference in the three fields.

The Book of Habakkuk by the Rev. G. G. V. Stonehouse, B.D. (Rivingtons, London, 1911), is substantially the successful Oxford Senior Kennicott dissertation for 1910. It consists of an elaborate introduction, a translation of the corrected text, and a very detailed philological commentary (pp. 149-257). If only for the last feature it may be cordially recommended to Hebrew students. The most interesting feature of the book is the championing of the essential genuineness of chaps. i and ii. The difficulties are indeed perceived, but the common view that chap. i at least is composite is combatted at some length. The troublesome allusion to the future in i 5 is overcome by emendation of a text which is certainly suspicious. The description of the existing Chaldean oppression in i 6 sqq. is dated shortly after the battle of Carchemish—a view which brings difficulties greater than those it removes. This also involves the rejection of the view that i 2-4 depicts the wickedness in Judah, and the arguments adduced seem exceptionally arbitrary. However, it is a distinct advantage to have a scholarly defence of a position which others may consider untenable, and subsequent workers at the problems of Habakkuk should take account of Mr Stonehouse's discussion. One thing is worthy of notice. The author's analysis amounts to this, that the original prophecy was taken by a later writer who reshaped i 5, 6*a* (p. 32); a psalm, iii 3-15, expanded with an introduction iii 2, and a new conclusion iii 16-19, was appended; ii 20 is an editorial 'transitional' verse and, with ii 18-19 (certainly) and 12-14 (probably), is due to a later hand. The point is that, even on the most moderate view, this small book was the subject of no little literary activity, and when we consider the general features of literary compositeness it would not be surprising if these later hands were responsible not merely for the phenomena which Mr Stonehouse recognizes, but also for those which justify the seemingly drastic analyses of, let us say, W. B. Stevenson and Marti. Excisions are not merely 'arbitrary and violent' (p. 77) by so styling them. See further *supra*, pp. 84 sqq.

Under the general editorship of the Rev. A. H. McNeile, D.D., the Cambridge University Press publishes a new series: *The Revised Version edited for the Use of Schools*. Two volumes lie before us, 1 Kings by the Rev. H. C. O. Lanchester, and Is. i-xxxix by the Rev. C. H. Thomson and the Rev. Dr Skinner. The aim of this little series is 'to explain the Revised Version for young students, and at the same time to present, in a simple form, the main results of the best scholarship of the day'. Each book contains a suitable introduction on the contents, authorship, and other features, and is well supplied with notes on the rendering, interpretation, and subject-matter. The student is familiarized with the standpoint held by modern scholars, and although

one may now and then ask whether the writers have adequately made use of the 'main results of the best scholarship', there is no doubt that the series, considering its size and aims, will be valued.

The Rev. Dr E. G. King contributes a volume on *Early Religious Poetry of the Hebrews* to the 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature'. The success of this series is thoroughly deserved, and Dr King's contribution is an interesting account of a subject the importance of which has been widely recognized of late. In the space at his command he is naturally unable to go deeply into the more difficult questions of metre, but he covers much ground and introduces the reader to the more important aspects of Hebrew poetry. Some of his remarks, especially on the alphabetical poems, deserve fuller study, while others deal with the theological and other ideas and concern content rather than structure. Students will find the volume stimulating, though its utility might have been increased by an index of the biblical passages.

A useful little contribution to exilic and post-exilic Judaism is made by Dr Samuel Daiches in Publication No. 2 of the Jews' College—*The Jews in Babylonia in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah according to Babylonian inscriptions*. It is mainly a discussion of the names, apparently of Jews, mentioned in the contracts of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., and inferences based upon their form and significance. It is very instructive to observe how many find parallels or analogies only in Chron.—Ezra—Nehemiah, and this fact, together with the similar feature in contemporary S. Egyptian papyri, stands in striking contrast to the names on the *ostraka* recently discovered at Samaria. Upon the meaning of these names (and especially of those wanting in the Old Testament) Dr Daiches lays considerable stress, and he would see in them the ideas animating the Jewish exiles. Thus, the names *Bani-ia*, *Bana-ili*, 'Yah[weh] has built', 'God has built', are referred to the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem. This, to be sure, is very hypothetical, and any discussion of the underlying ideas should be controlled by some study of other groups of names. Many interesting suggestions, however, are made and it is plausibly argued (p. 18 seq.) that the unintelligible name *Sherebiah* should be explained, in the light of the Ass. *šurubu* 'produce', to mean 'Yahweh has produced' (a child, family, &c.). Dr Daiches also points out that among nearly 4,000 tablets from Babylon and its neighbourhood for the period Nebuchadrezzar—Darius I, the Jewish names are very few; whereas for the reigns of Artaxerxes I and Darius II (465—404 B.C.), in the tablets from Nippur, the Jewish names are 'in great abundance' (p. 8). Why there should be this great difference as regards Nippur and at this later date is not clear, but the fact is to be noticed in its bearing upon the post-exilic

problems and upon the importance which Jewish history persistently attaches to the reign of Artaxerxes I.

The name of Alfred Loisy is so well known to English readers that his *Religion of Israel* (Unwin, London, 1910) perhaps hardly needed so complete an introduction as that prefixed by the translator, Mr Arthur Galton. None the less Mr Galton's Prologue has an interest of its own, if only for the suggestion (forgetful of Reinach's *Orpheus*?) that, when possible, theological discussions should be carried on in French, so that the language of urbanity 'may help to assuage the proverbial heat of religious controversy'. M. Loisy's book is an examination and exposition of the origin and historical development of Israelite religion on the basis of the criticism of the Old Testament. He himself is Professor of the History of Religions at the Collège de France, and consequently views his subject from the standpoint of comparative religion. The book is written and translated in a light and flowing style, and is readable and everywhere interesting. Unfortunately the tone is sometimes rather unsympathetic, and the criticism superficial. Thus on p. 26, 'Abraham never went into Egypt; but the fable which brought him there was made to support the Mosaic legends'. Again on p. 123, the alliance between Yahweh and the house of David 'was as profitable to the deity as to the dynasty'. Here and in his—to me—unintelligible treatment of Yahweh on pp. 101–105, M. Loisy is unnecessarily provocative of counter-criticism, and he writes too much from a point of view which is incomplete in that it does not take into consideration enough of the available evidence for the history and the religion of the land of the Old Testament.

It is a new reconstruction which is proposed by Prof. Westphal in *The Law and the Prophets* (Macmillan, London, 1910). This work, translated and adapted by Mr Clement du Pontet, describes (to quote the sub-title) 'the revelation of Jehovah in Hebrew history from the earliest times to the capture of Jerusalem by Titus'. It develops the theory that biblical history represents a persistent conflict between 'Elohism' and 'Jehovism'. This theory is unfolded ingeniously, but is unconvincing, since it is based too immediately upon the biblical narratives without a consistent investigation of their validity for the periods with which they deal. This failure to pursue the necessary preliminary criticism both literary and historical will not, however, prevent the discriminating reader from gaining much that is profitable and stimulating. The tone of the book is excellent, in spite of a certain one-sidedness, e.g. as regards Jewish legalism; but taken as a whole this attempt to trace anew the course of biblical history pays far too little attention to the background against which this history has to be placed (see further, *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, 1910, pp. 268 sqq.).

It is an encouraging sign that the subject is not pursued within the somewhat narrow limits possible and indeed inevitable thirty years ago; it has yet to be recognized, as Hugo Winckler has shewn, that the biblical problems demand a still closer attention to the thought and history of the Bible lands.

Valuable contributions are made by Roman Catholic scholars in three recent monographs in Bardenhewer's *Biblische Studien* (Herder, Freiburg i. Br.). *Das Buch des Propheten Sophonias* (1910) by Dr Joseph Lippl is a very welcome and thorough study of the small book of Zephaniah. Writing in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (9th ed.) in 1888, Robertson Smith was able to say that 'the genuineness and integrity of the short book of Zephaniah do not seem to be open to reasonable doubt'. But, as Prof. Driver has pointed out in his supplement to Smith's article in the *Encycl. Biblica*, subsequent opinion has not assented to this view, and at the present day secondary portions are recognized to a greater or less extent by all scholars. Dr Lippl himself takes a somewhat conservative position as regards the literary questions and the text. After a brief *résumé* of the contents he discusses the date, the historical and religious conditions, and various features of thought (pp. 7-41). A useful chapter is devoted to the text and versions, and there is a new and emended translation of the book. A small section deals with the metrical problems, and the second half of the monograph (pp. 72-140) provides a full and useful commentary. Dr Lippl's work has been carefully prepared, he has acquainted himself with the modern literature, and he has taken pains to understand the views of those from whom he feels obliged to differ.

Dr Torrey's *Ezra Studies* (noticed in *J. T. S.* April) may be usefully supplemented by the monograph of P. Edmund Bayer, O.F.M., *Das Dritte Buch Esdras und sein Verhältnis zu den Büchern Esra-Nehemia* (*Bibl. Studien*, 1911), which contains an elaborate discussion of the textual relationship between 1 Esdras and the parallel canonical passages (pp. 11-86), and of the origin and general value of the former (pp. 87-161). Fr Bayer urges that 1 Esdras is not a fragment, but a complete work, having for its main object the history of the post-exilic temple. This view involves an artificial treatment of the concluding fragmentary verse and of those passages where 1 Esdras is noteworthy for its references to the temple (pp. 88 sqq.); and it does not pay sufficient heed to other cases where there are readings which point to a recension (in parts at least) older than the Massoretic. Moreover, Fr Bayer is obliged to prefer the apparently simpler sequence of tradition in Ezra-Neh. to the extraordinary chronological confusion in 1 Esd., and in accepting the historical value of Ezra-Neh. he overlooks the persisting confusion and obscurity in Herodotus, Ctesias, and Josephus,

and in Daniel, Esther, Judith, and Tobit. Fr Bayer thus appears to be misled by the relative straightforwardness of the 'canonical' tradition; but it is significant that the chronicler's compilation should ignore material elsewhere incorporated in Kings and Jeremiah or underlying the traditions of Daniel and Esther. Very instructive is Fr Bayer's survey of the literary points of relation with Esd. iii 1-v 6—the *crux* of the book—and he shews satisfactorily that the section must be viewed along with Daniel and Esther. He confirms (after Torrey) the Semitic origin of this section, but argues (against Torrey) that it is of post-Maccabean origin and part of the original book. Fr Bayer certainly advances the problems of 1 Esdras and indirectly proves that they are more complex than has been previously recognized; his own conclusions are often inadequate, but they are always stimulating.

Of more general interest is the study by Dr Simon Landersdorfer, O.S.B., *Eine Babylonische Quelle für das Buch Job?* (*Bibl. Stud.* 1911). It deals with a series of Babylonian tablets which, it has been claimed, find parallels in Job, if indeed they do not represent its source. A king for no apparent reason has undergone the most severe sufferings, he was unable to obtain help from priest or sorcerer, or from his protecting god or goddess; consolation came to him through a dream, he was healed and restored to his former happy state, and he concludes with a paean of praise. The tablets illustrate a Babylonian treatment of the problem of sin and punishment. Dr Landersdorfer very properly devotes considerable space to the editing of these remarkable texts with philological notes and a translation. Unfortunately the tablets are not quite perfect, the account of the vision is rather obscure, and it is difficult to trace the solving of the problem. Dr Landersdorfer has a tempting explanation of the sin which is attributed to the king. He points to the passage where the speaker (or rather writer) affirms that he had made the exaltation of the king like God, and had instructed the people in the fear of the palace, believing that this was pleasing to God. This is quite in keeping with the old theory of the divine king (pp. 56 sq., 67). But, as the text proceeds, what seems good to man is evil to God, what seems evil to man is good before God; God's ways are incomprehensible, man is transient and weak; now he makes himself God's equal and would mount to heaven (cf. Is. xiv 13 sq.), and now he talks of descending into the lower world. Here Landersdorfer finds the clue—the divine king has forgotten that he owed his position to the favour of his gods—his sin has been self-pride (p. 74). The texts certainly belong to the seventh century B.C., the contents may even go back to a time before 2000 B.C. (p. 79). But though older than the book of Job there is no clear trace of borrowing or of direct influence. The relationship is carefully discussed, and it is shewn that the resemblances are rather

superficial and that the differences outweigh the parallel features (pp. 119 sqq.). It will be obvious that this monograph is of distinct value in any study of the ancient conceptions of evil, sin, and punishment. It is also instructive for comparative religion in that these Babylonian texts tend to correct a certain one-sidedness which occupies itself with the unfamiliar, the strange and the quaint in religion. Such texts as these shew that old thinkers searched for the solution of problems deep in the recesses of their hearts and necessarily expressed themselves in the thought of their age. The data of their religious experiences are objective data testifying to a reality; it is the expression and formulation of this which has varied through ages, lands, communities, and individuals; and if those who handle the phenomena of comparative religion would consider more carefully what is meant by the 'evolution' of religion we should have less of the unscientific use of that favourite term 'survival'.

Conservative in standpoint and restricted in aim is the Rev. U. Z. Rule's *Old Testament Institutions, their Origin and Developement* (S. P. C. K., 1910). The book analyses and describes the law and ritual with some attention to comparative studies and with some recognition of the literary criticism of the Pentateuch. The author accepts the composite origin of the Pentateuch and the priority of JE to P—though he places all the sources too early—and asserts that the date of the sources matters little unless it 'affects our confidence in the truth of their contents' (p. 15). 'But', he continues, 'the dating of the laws stands upon a very different footing', and he argues for the Mosaic authorship of the Law, determining, however, what this does and does not involve. He endeavours to maintain the essential accuracy of the book of Genesis as a record of the growth of religion and of the origin of Israel; and is consequently obliged to 'read between the lines' (his words), and, e. g., to treat Abraham as the personification of the community of which he was the head (pp. 42, 46). The difficulty of bridging the gap between Genesis and Exodus is very inadequately handled. He upholds the interval of four centuries, and interprets 'generation' in Gen. xv 16 as 'period' (p. 49); he conjectures also that the numbers in Ex. vi 16, 18, 20 mean that the families of Levi, Kehath, and Amram had a separate and undivided existence for (137 + 133 + 137) 407 years (p. 52). He does not appear to notice that Joseph lived to see the children of Machir (Gen. l 23), although Machir received Gilead from the hands of Moses (Num. xxxii 42), nor does he sufficiently recognize the serious historical difficulties pervading the narratives. In dealing with the intricacies of the tribe of Levi he remarks that 'the simple and obvious course of accepting the statements of Holy Scripture as correct statements will prove, after all, to be the most free from per-

plexities' (p. 293); yet it was no such unmethodical form of study that led to the recognition of JE and P, which he himself shares. To those who hold a thoroughgoing traditional position Mr Rule's book may prove a useful step towards one more consistent, and they will find the attempt to vindicate the Mosaic authorship of the Law combined with the candid perception that the task of vindication is rendered difficult by those who 'from lack of discrimination' leave 'no room for post-Mosaic development' and make 'Holy Scripture to affirm more than it really does affirm' (p. 158 seq.). Three pages of commendation are prefixed by Dr Sayce, who observes that the archaeological side of the question is left to others.

Distinctly more uncompromising is the attitude of the four following writers. Dr Arthur Allgeier in *Über Doppelberichte in der Genesis* (Herder, Freiburg i. Br., 1911) combats a recent work by Dr Schulz in the *Biblische Studien* which both admitted the presence of double narratives in the Pentateuch and was able to reconcile this with dogmatic theology. Dr Allgeier simply argues that there are no doublets—the apparent evidence in their favour is explained away by the familiar hypothesis of textual corruption and interpolation. Moreover, he proceeds to urge that real doublets cannot be reconciled with the Roman Catholic doctrines of Inspiration and Infallibility (pp. 111–142). This part of the book is the more interesting and contains many useful observations on the nature and 'Tendenz' (his own word, p. 125) of the Old Testament writings. Next, the Rev. G. S. Hitchcock, in *The Higher Criticism of Isaiah* (Burns and Oates, London, 1910), undertakes to maintain 'the truth of the Biblical Commission's decision that the division of *Isaiah* among two or more authors is still "not proven"' (p. 6). The book 'is designed to meet the arguments of Protestant rationalists' and it is truly remarkable for its superficial treatment of the Isaianic problems. Like all books of its class it 'proves' the thesis it sets out to prove with almost ridiculous ease. A greater compliment is paid to the labours of biblical critics by Dr Hugh Pope's more detailed book *The Date of the Composition of Deuteronomy: a critical study* (F. Pustet, Rome, 1911). It is written to prove the traditional Mosaic authorship (apart from chaps. xxxiv, iv 41–49; x 6–9) in accordance with the Decrees of the Biblical Commission, and the Decrees are cited in full at the commencement of the book, and subjected in part to a necessary interpretation at the close (p. 190 seq.). Dr Pope deals with a foregone conclusion without making a new contribution to the subject. He relies, for example, upon parallels in Deuteronomy with Amos and Hosea, but overlooks the significance of those in Jeremiah and in the editorial portions of the historical books. He clutches at the book of Job, 'no one yet has given satisfactory reasons for rejecting its early date' (p. 81); but Dr Landersdorfer (see above)

places it not earlier than 722, and his book has received the *imprimatur*. While recognizing that archaeology is 'a two-edged weapon', as even conservative scholars have found (p. 177), Dr Pope does not hesitate to commit himself to the belief that Moses may have modified and adapted the Code of Hammurabi to Israelite needs (p. 183). He shares Hommel's surprise that P, if post-exilic, should contain no Babylonian loan-words, although if P is Mosaic it would be equally surprising from his own standpoint. Indeed, Hommel himself, in the passage referred to, finds many words in the ritual language of the Old Testament which can only be explained from the Babylonian, and he dates them back to the early Babylonian period. None the less, Dr Pope has much to say concerning the 'uncritical procedure of critics, particularly where they indulge in special pleading'. A particularly vexatious example is held up on pp. 72-74, where he cites Driver (*Deut.* 212 seq.), on the twofold and conflicting accounts of the monarchy, viz. (a) 1 Sam. ix 1-10, &c., and (b) 1 Sam. vii 2-17, viii, x 17-27 a, xii. He selects for his purpose and prints side by side viii 4-22 and x 17-19, 25, and urges that the latter is the sequel of the former. Since *both* passages are admittedly from (b), it is really difficult to understand why Dr Pope treats the severance of (a) and (b) as 'a typical example of the "critical" mode of investigation—or, shall we say, "assertion"?' Nor is it clear why he styles x 17-19, 25 the older narrative in direct opposition to Driver's words. Dr Pope seems to be characteristically unfortunate in his attempt to condemn a criticism which, he says elsewhere, is 'based upon Hegelianism and upon an impossible and unphilosophical view of religious evolution' (pp. xi, xv). If, however, it is due to a pure misunderstanding—and an inserted slip in the book regrets the 'deplorably large' number of errata, due partly to the unfortunate illness and absence of the author—surely it would be advisable to replace the book by a new edition where the numerous examples of hasty reasoning and of incorrect judgement may be replaced by a more scholarly support of the position which the Decrees desire to maintain. It is left for the fourth writer, Mr H. M. Wiener, LL.B., to assail the critics with scorpions. His *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism* and *The Origin of the Pentateuch* (Elliott Stock, London, 1910) will be in large measure familiar to readers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and *The Churchman*, where in a series of articles he has adopted a tone which is quite a novelty in modern biblical study. Mr Wiener is a Jewish Barrister of Lincoln's Inn, and he pleads his cause in support of the traditional position with all the skill of his profession and all the zeal of his faith. Every one will sympathize with the sincerest feelings of Orthodox Jews in the matter of Pentateuchal criticism; yet, even those who most welcome his outspoken attacks upon the critics of the Wellhausen school will

share the wish of Dr Griffith Thomas (late editor of *The Churchman*), that the author 'had kept his adjectival propensities a little more thoroughly in hand' (*Bibl. Sacra*, April, p. 345). Quite apart from his terminological impetuosity, Mr Wiener can make relatively little impression, because the views of critics rest upon a larger basis of biblical evidence than he has yet surveyed. It is only fair, however, to point out that the author is gradually recognizing the nature of the 'conservative task in Pentateuchal criticism', and in an article on certain aspects of this task (*Bibl. Sacra*, Jan. 1911) he realizes some of the weaknesses of method among the conservative writers. Under the circumstances, the present collection of notes and essays with their varied features of interest must be somewhat provisional, and one will await the necessarily more comprehensive treatment of the recognized problems, not of the Pentateuch alone, but of the Old Testament. The new solutions which Mr Wiener proposes can then be seen in their proper perspective, and their value appraised with greater justice to himself. There is no doubt whatever that a new starting-point, which could afford a clearer insight into the biblical problems than the Graf-Wellhausen theory does, would win acceptance in the long run; but no alternative hypothesis has as yet appeared, and it is impossible to perceive the germ of any, even in Mr Wiener's very confident lucubrations.

Finally, I must mention *The Earliest Cosmologies* (Eaton, New York, 1910), by W. F. Warren, S.T.D., LL.D., which deals with the cosmological ideas of the Hebrews and others. The book is styled 'A guide-book for beginners in the study of ancient literatures and religions', and has for sub-title 'The Universe as pictured in thought by the Ancient Hebrews, Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Iranians, and Indo-Aryans'. Its object is to explain the 'world-view' which lies behind all religion, philosophy, and science; and it is to be treated as an introduction to Comparative Cosmology, with special reference to the Oriental systems. I must refer readers to the book for the rather intricate proof which Dr Warren adduces. It culminates in the conclusion that the universal world-concept was an 'all-inclusive geocentric, upright-axled, polyuranian cosmos' (p. 109); and that it must have originated in prehistoric times among a people who inhabited the Arctic circle (pp. 127 sqq.). The entire argument is worked out plausibly, with the help of a great deal of illustrative matter, and the author has certainly laid under contribution numerous specialists in their particular fields (p. 15 seq.). The book is dedicated to Dr C. H. W. Johns, who has expressed 'his unqualified approval of its fundamental positions' (p. 17). Its appearance is symptomatic. It recalls the publications of the New Berlin Society for the Study of Comparative Mythology and the new school of 'astral-mythological' interpretation inaugurated by the Assyriologists

Winckler (a historian), and Jeremias (a theologian). It is a reaction against too narrow specialization—the study of a subject for its own sake—and is part of the persistent desire to co-ordinate and unify. The conclusions and methods of application may appear as extravagant as did the all-explaining systems of the past; but they rest upon a larger body of material and appeal more persuasively to accepted data. The exponents take a natural position—they ask for refutation or a better explanation of their evidence. The works are of great value in that they collect evidence from all quarters and place it at the reader's disposal; but they make comparisons which often seem irrelevant or useless, and draw conclusions which appear paradoxical. Their fundamental weakness appears to be that they deal with different bodies of thought or ideas without taking sufficient account of their complexity and variation, and that they confuse organic connexions of ideas with those that are more casual. Dr Warren's book is throughout extremely interesting and suggestive, and it is an urgent reminder in this age of 'reconstruction' how little we know of the features of the growth, spread, and adjustment of groups of ideas. This is true whether such groups are the object of research (e. g. ancient cosmologies) or the system of research itself, and it is through this that it is possible for writers to argue that the refutation of, e. g., Wellhausen's *Prolegomena* would be the overthrow of Old Testament criticism, or that the latter is 'based' upon Hegelianism. There seems to be need for a special department of research to deal with the masses of objective data which as yet are merely 'compared', and that in a fashion too often promiscuous and superficial.

STANLEY A. COOK.

PATRISTICA.

Patrologie, von O. BARDENHEWER. Dritte, grossenteils neu bearbeitete Auflage. (Herder, Freiburg i. Br., 1910.)

THE fame of this invaluable companion to the student of the Fathers has been so great that it has had to be translated into French, Italian, English, and Spanish. The English translation, published in 1908, was welcomed in the *JOURNAL* for October 1909 (vol. xi pp. 135 f). We have now to record the appearance of a third edition of the original, in great part rewritten. The author speaks very modestly of his increasing consciousness of the defects of his book. In the present edition the Greek authors of the fourth century receive entirely fresh treatment,