
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 CHRONICLE

FATHER A.-G. BARROIS has written for the Bibliothèque Catholique des Sciences Religieuses a small, popular introductory account of the land of the Bible from the archaeological point of view (*Précis d'Archéologique Biblique*, 202 pp., Bloud and Gay, Paris, 1935). Among the subjects are population, excavation, burial places, industries, arts, metrology, society, and religion. The account is in the nature of the case a brief one, but the author has had first-hand acquaintance with the land and people, and aims at arousing in his readers a sense of the 'human realities' of the Bible. A few illustrations and a table of the archaeological epochs add to the utility of the little book.

Sir Leonard Woolley has written an original book, *Abraham: Recent Discoveries and Hebrew Origins* (230 pp., Faber, London, 1936). It is a new effort, on the basis of his famous discoveries at Ur, to estimate afresh the facts of the patriarch's life. The contents fall into three parts: (*a*) some valuable descriptions of Ur: the city, social conditions, civic and family cults; (*b*) methodological discussion; and (*c*) general suggestions and conclusions. In the first of these Sir Leonard is of course perfectly at home, and special attention may be directed to ch. vi on the religious conditions at Ur. As regards methodology, he emphasizes the significance of oral tradition and urges that a comparison of J and E proves that the common tradition of Abraham must go back before the monarchy. Finally, he points to a number of details in the narratives which appear to him to gain fresh verisimilitude, although ultimately he finds himself compelled to suggest that in what is recounted of Abraham probably two or rather three separate historical figures have been fused into one (p. 281). The well-worn question of the relation between the story of Hagar and the laws of Hammurabi comes up again with new detail. It is suggested further that a novel unhewn altar at Ur may be due to the early Habiru (or Hebrews); cf. the Hebrew practice in Gen. xxviii 18 and Ex. xx 25 (p. 47). The superiority of the townsman Abraham over the rude nomads of Palestine is thought to reveal itself also in Rebekah's contempt for the daughters of Heth (Gen. xxvi 34, pp. 144, 146), and the ladder reaching to heaven which Jacob saw in his dream surely goes back to what he had been told of the Ziggurat at Ur (p. 162). The superior ethics of Ur prevented the patriarch from falling in with the Canaanite custom of human sacrifice, and the '"ram caught in a thicket" seems to recall a figure stereotyped in Sumerian art . . . the

rampant he-goat tied . . . to the boughs of flowering shrubs' (p. 162). In the note on p. 48 as to the relation between the ancient term Habiru and the Habiru (the author calls them Habiri) of the Amarna Letters, Sir Leonard remarks that the latter cannot be identified with the Hebrews and the story of Joshua's campaigns; on the other hand, that the Biblical story may be concerned with the activities of one element in an inroad of far greater scope and the Hebrews (of the O.T.) were perhaps one of the loosely confederated Aramaean tribes which then overran Syria and Palestine.

Stephen L. Caiger, *Bible and Spade: an Introduction to Biblical Archaeology* (xii + 218, Oxford Univ. Press, Milford, London, 1935). This book will prove invaluable to Biblical students. It gives a concise and comprehensive survey, with illustrations, of the archaeological and monumental evidence relevant for O.T. history. There are excerpts from the Babylonian creation-story, the external evidence bearing upon Gen. xiv, pre-Israelite Canaan, the Assyrian period, the cylinder of Cyrus, the Elephantine papyri, and so forth. An introductory section on Hebrew writing and language is particularly welcome. The author is to be congratulated upon a book which so excellently illumines the O.T. *milieu*; even the recently found ostraka from Lachish find a place. Illustrations, maps, and bibliographical and other appendixes give the book completeness. It does not go deeply into matters, but it provides the reader with a starting-point. Thus we have a picture of the actual flood-line and Woolley's description of his discovery (p. 26 sq.); but it must not be forgotten that, as Woolley says in the book noticed above, this flood was a local Mesopotamian inundation (p. 170). As regards the date of the Siloam inscription (p. 155), reference should be made preferably to S. R. Driver, *Samuel*[2], *Introduction*, p. x. (I may add that against my argument, mentioned there, that *palaeographically* the Siloam script must be much later than the scripts of the Moabite stone, &c, it was pointed out that the two types must not be placed in a single evolutionary line; that is true, but the difference between the types still raises interesting questions.) Here and elsewhere Mr Caiger replaces the time-honoured P. S. B. A. by P. B. A. S. (see p. x); while the strange W. O. P., which has puzzled some readers, is evidently Hammerton's *Wonders of the Past* (p. 205). As regards the date of the Exodus (pp. 102, 191), though there may be 'younger' and 'older' schools, we still find that some 'acknowledged scholars' are far from being impressed by the landslide. On p. 97 n. Akhnaton's new capital was surely called Akhetaton: there is no reference given for the statement that it was called Akhnaton after its founder. But the slips are few, e.g. misprints on pp. 175 (Ps. civ, not cxiv), 199 (Tiglath-pileser III, as on p. 143).

Along with this book may be placed the equally valuable book by Dr W. L. Wardle, *The History and Religion of Israel* (xii + 228, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1936). It forms the first volume of the Clarendon Bible and is, in effect, a general survey of the whole of the O.T. from the historical and religious points of view. It thus constitutes a useful prelude to the rest of the series and is admirably suited for class purposes. Like the other volumes it is well illustrated; specially interesting are the air-views of Palestine, of the uplands of Moab, and of an oasis. There is a good introduction on the physical features of Palestine, and throughout the treatment is measured and informing. Such special problems as that of the Return from Exile are carefully noticed (p. 118 sq.), and there is an instructive concluding chapter on Israel's debt to other nations. There are well-reasoned pages on the vexed question whether the Habiru of the Amarna Letters were or were not Hebrews, or rather Israelites under Joshua (p. 31), and as for the date of the Exodus Dr Wardle considers the reign of Merenptah (*c.* 1225–15) the most probable. In passing, it may be questioned whether the subject of totemism (p. 128) is usefully introduced unless the treatment is more philosophical. There are wise remarks on the laws (p. 168): 'the whole of the Near East . . . possessed laws with the same general principles, varied to suit the particular circumstances of the countries to which they related . . .' On the Psalms as a whole what would be called a 'conservative' view is taken, and Dr Wardle entirely agrees with Gressmann that there are 'no Maccabean psalms whatever in the Davidic Psalter' (p. 205 sq.). There is no bibliography, and readers who are attracted by Mr Sidney Smith's explanation of the teraphim (p. 156) must consult the *J.T.S.* xxxiii (1931) pp. 33 sqq.

One of the works of the late Prof. Max Loehr of Königsberg has been translated into English and included in the International Library of Christian Knowledge, edited by Dr W. A. Brown and Dr B. L. Woolf: *A History of Religion in the Old Testament* (pp. ix + 192, Nicholson and Watson, 1936). It is a running summary from the pre-Mosaic period onward, and, being confined to the O.T., it differs from most modern books in ignoring the external evidence, and in concentrating upon the Book and not upon the Book in its *milieu*. A special feature in Loehr's treatment is the line he draws between the religion of Judah and that of its northern neighbour (pp. 43 sqq.). Owing to the unfortunate death of the author before the revision of the proofs, certain solecisms remain uncorrected, e.g. Asasil (p. 28), Byblis (p. 57), and the j in Serajah (p. 146), &c.; also such phrases as 'brass sea' (p. 61), 'no mere remainderless ascension' (p. 66), and the curiously worded statement that 'Josh. xix 8 refers the name Baalath

Beer to a female demon' (p. 22). In another edition the bibliography could usefully be overhauled; it is partly antiquated and it leaves out some of the best-known modern English books.

In the next book, by W. C. Graham of Chicago and H. G. May of Oberlin, we pass into an entirely new world: *Culture and Conscience, An Archaeological Study of the New Religious Past in Ancient Palestine* (xviii + 356 pp., Univ. of Chicago & Camb. Univ. Press, 1936). It deserves more space than can be given it here, for it is inspired by the conviction that a reinterpretation of the distant past is one of the most pressing needs, and that the new knowledge of the past which witnessed the growth of the O.T. does, in fact, give us a 'new religious past'. It is written amid to-day's uncertainties and repudiates alike any impatience with or contempt for the past and any reliance upon a purely humanistic social idealism. Three main lines can be distinguished in its pages: (*a*) the more technical presentation of the purely archaeological data, (*b*) the conception of the 'regenerative conscience', i.e. in essence, the work of the prophets, and (*c*) more general discussion of the interrelation between religious, social, and historical aspects of man's developement. This last is a topic for which we have already been prepared by Prof. Graham's earlier book on *The Prophets and Israel's Culture* (see *J.T.S.* xxxvi 438). As regards (*a*)—in connexion with which there is a useful appendix on the history of Palestinian archaeology ('Pioneering the "New Past"')—the writers have furnished an excellent account, including such matters as temples and shrines, burial cults, cult-objects (snakes, doves, horns, &c.), indications of fertility-cults, and of the belief in Mother-earth. All that can be used to illuminate the old religion is collected and interpreted with the fullest use of the Ras Shamra tablets and other written evidence. The significance of these tablets (*c.* thirteenth century) is increasing as the decipherers come to a common understanding upon their meaning, and as archaeological research in Syria brings the whole land—and more particularly the littoral—within the Egypto-Cretan world. We now have, in this book, the fullest and latest record of the archaeological evidence for Palestine with a map of the ancient sites and fifty-six illustrations. At every step the interpretations need scrutiny and, even though opinions will differ in various cases, the writers do succeed in drawing a very imposing picture of the past and one to be studied attentively by Biblical students.[1] Palestinian culture, it is well suggested, probably

[1] As for novelties, what shall be made of an allusion in the Ras Shamra tablets to a Daniel—some 600 years before Ezek. xxviii 2 (p. 135)? As for difference of opinion, the view that the *dōd* in the story of Saul (1 Sam. x 14) was an official, a sort of local *shaman-king*, is more suggestive than convincing (p. 170). Yet we may note the various meanings of *'am* (uncle, people, and the title of a god).

owed most to Hyksos influence. Later on came the period of 'political upheaval and tribalism', culminating in the rise of an independent Israelite monarchy. It is held that there were two conquests of Canaan, a view that combines the evidence for the great movements illustrated by the Amarna Letters and the archaeological evidence for some catastrophic changes nearer the time of the 'Philistine' invasion (pp. 70 sqq., 305). The writers agree with T. J. Meek that the Joshua of history preceded the Moses of history, a view which becomes more intelligible when we remember how we treat Gen. ii as earlier than Gen. i. In a word, we should have to suppose that the whole of the Sinaitic corpus of tradition was superimposed upon and given preference to an older tradition of Joshua at Shechem (Josh. xxiv). In any event it should be mentioned that ever since the work of E. Meyer and Luther (*Die Israeliten*, 1906) the historical significance of the Ephraimite hero Joshua and the covenant at the old Samarian sanctuary of Shechem has perplexed all scholars who go beyond the elements of ordinary conventional orthodox criticism. Next, the writers, discussing the circumstances of the purifying or ethicizing of the old religion, urge that there must have been something in the ancient cults that could admit of being spiritualized; thus they point to the social value of the cults and to the fact that in nature-worship itself there lay the germs of universalism and implicit ideas of Divine Immanence and Transcendence (pp. 136, 215, 231, 246 sq., 305). What they style 'regenerative conscience' comes to this, that, as the old patterns of belief and practice were disintegrated, and men, thrown back upon themselves, went to both the lowest depths and the finest heights of human nature, the great creative prophets were seizing the kernels of spiritual truth, and thereby inaugurating those movements that gave the O.T. a permanent value as the prelude to Christianity. It is through the modern realistic and thoroughly historical treatment of the O.T. that it is possible to attempt to correlate the cultural continuities and discontinuities in Palestine from the earliest known times to the opening centuries of the Christian era. The writers rightly lay considerable emphasis upon the individuality and tenacity of Palestine (pp. 310 sqq.). The O.T. is 'Canaanite'—throughout I should prefer the term 'Palestinian'—and even 'the roots of the Christian religion will be found to lie more deeply in the Hebrew and Canaanite ideology than is commonly supposed' (p. 312). There was an old pre-prophetic Israel, after the Hyksos and Amarna periods, and Yahweh did not clearly emerge from the nature-cult *milieu* till late in the pre-exilic period (p. 284). There was, one may say, a 'reformed' Israel, thanks to the prophets, and after the lapse of centuries there was once more a new 'Israel' which, however, became a new religion. But the old

land continued—and still continues—to display its individuality and tenacity. The Bible is 'Palestinian', although the debt to Israelite and other external factors must not be obscured. Research continues to demonstrate the archaeological independence of the land.[1] In fact, archaeological evidence comes in to 'confirm' the *perspective* of the old Biblical writers who look back to the age of Abraham (*c.* 2000 B.C.)—cf. Josephus on the Canaanite origin of the Temple (*War*, vi 10. 1, § 438)—but it gives us new ideas and brings new problems.[2] Finally, as regards their interest in modern social and other problems, the writers lay emphasis upon the way in which men may dangerously overstress human supremacy: 'man will never subdue the earth until he subdues himself' (pp. 99, 312 sq.), and it is the greatest error to suppose that the 'god conception' merely grew out of the social process (p. 256 sq.). From their reading of the O.T. they are led to condemn what they call the nationalistic or provincialistic attitude to life; we must understand the present and must condition the future in the light of the *relevant* past: history as a social science is not to isolate itself from the contemporary scene (pp. xxii sq., 299). This anxiety for a speedy solution, this demand—what has *your* special study to contribute?—is symptomatic: the important fact is that Biblical studies are slowly being drawn in. But there is an obvious 'snag': precisely what is relevant? What we now know of the Bible—in particular of the O.T.—we do not owe to men who had first to shew that their researches were socially useful or relevant! There is an intelligible impatience with 'source-criticism' (p. 301 note); but I can only say that it is more important than ever, though there are fundamental problems that come first, and pave the way to a clearer treatment of J^1, J^2, E^1, E^2, and the rest of them. It is undoubtedly necessary to *select* one's material; but it is more necessary for X to justify his selection as against that of Y. Earnest advice on 'seekers after truth', &c., fires us to start off and 'bow unafraid at the shrine of truth' (p. 299)—but we go in different directions! While cordially subscribing to their enthusiasm we cannot help feeling that the writers leave off too early. We cannot confine ourselves, as they do, to a part of the O.T., or even to the whole of it to the exclusion of the N.T., or even to the Bible excluding

[1] The conclusion I reached in my *Schweich Lectures* (p. 229 sq.) is confirmed and supplemented by Hempel, *Orient. Lit. Zeit.* 1936, col. 373.

[2] The Amarna and Ras Shamra tablets, in bringing out the 'Canaanite' (or rather 'Palestinian') character of the O.T., also bring the problem of the date of what we may call its specifically 'Israelite' character; for this, reference may be made to p. 306 for Olmstead's view, to *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1936, p. 168 sq., for Alt and Albright, and to my own book on the O.T., p. 217 sq., and an essay in the *Mélanges Cumont*, pp. 123 sqq.

the great movements that are still enabling us to understand it. It will be seen that the book is highly thought-provoking, in the very best sense of the term; and it is proof—if proof were required—that something more is needed of Biblical students than interest in 'the contemporary social process' (p. xxii) and the most uplifting of exhortation (ch. ix).

To the *Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures* (see *J.T.S.* xxxvi 403), Father Cuthbert Lattey now adds a short commentary on Ruth (xl + 25 pp., Longmans, London, 1935). There is a very good introduction on the Go'el, and a discussion in favour of emending into *lāhem* ('for them', i.e. the sons) the word *lāhēn* in i 13, the one word which, as S. R. Driver observed, is 'most difficult to reconcile with an early date' (p. xxxv). He argues further that the place of the book of Ruth after Judges, as in LXX, Vulg., &c., is more original than its place in the third division of the Hebrew Canon. He does not, however, take into account the absence of any 'Deuteronomic' redaction in the book, which is one of the arguments for the view that it is easier to understand why the LXX should have removed Ruth and placed it after Judges than why the Hebrew should have placed it in its present position in the Hebrew Bible.

Father Condamin issues a third and corrected edition of his commentary, *Le Livre de Jérémie* (xlv + 380 pp., Lecoffre, Paris, 1936). An Introduction gives a good survey of the historical conditions, the chronological order of the prophecies, and the LXX arrangement and differences from the Massoretic Text. Here he is attracted by the argument of the late H. St. J. Thackeray (*J.T.S.* 1903, pp. 245 sqq.) that there were two collections (i–xxviii and xxxii–li in the LXX) which were not united before 200 B.C. The Introduction also includes a brief account of the prophet's theology and a fuller study of the style, noting, without discussion, the question how much of the book is really due to Baruch. The commentary is sensible, and is occasionally scathing, especially when Duhm and *la critique chirurgicale* (p. ii) are pilloried. On v 17, where Duhm omits the words 'they shall eat thy sons and daughters' on the ground that the Scythians were not cannibals, we are reminded of Deut. vi 16 'and thou shalt eat all the peoples': yet the Hebrews were no *anthropophages*! Among points of interest may be mentioned the argument that l 2–li 58 is not, as is usually thought, a single prophecy, but is composed of three poems, l 2–20, l 21–46, and li 1–37, to which add li 38–58.

Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Mohr, Tübingen). To this new commentary the only English contributor is Dr T. H. Robinson who is responsible for the Minor Prophets, Hosea to Micah. This portion, together with Nahum by F. Horst (who will continue this section), has

now been published (160 pp.), and will not be ignored by students who would keep abreast of the progress of O.T. scholarship. Die-hards like myself, however, will continue to jib at the new practice of printing e.g. שׂ׳ד for שָׂדֶה, and one misses a preliminary list of abbreviations, e.g. B.R.L. (Galling's *Biblisches Reallexikon*), Z.M.R., &c. But the general style is good and the arrangement (translation, textual notes, and concise commentary on unit-passages) all that could be desired. If an English contributor had to be chosen for the series every one will agree that the Editor (Eissfeldt) made the best choice, for Dr Robinson has made the prophets his special study. His introductions to the several books are fresh and clear, and nothing of importance escapes him (e.g. Nyberg on Hosea; see *J.T.S.* xxxvi 442). Characteristic of him is his emphasis upon the twofold line of tradition in Israel, one native, the other of external Aramaean origin (pp. 3, 72, 78). As regards the problem of Hosea's marriage, he suggests that the prophet married a *kĕdeshah*. But is it not much simpler to bear in mind the twofold view of Israel's youth in Jeremiah and Ezekiel: Yahweh married an innocent Israel who proved faithless, *and* Israel had been faithless from the first? As regards Edomite attacks upon Judah (p. 110), (*a*) the archaeological evidence cannot, of course, be dated within some decades, and (*b*) a case can be made for an Edomite invasion after the time of Zerubbabel (see S. H. Blank, *Heb. Union Coll. Annual*, xi 172 sq., 182). Finally, the identification of Sepharad is left untouched (Ob. *v.* 20); it is tempting to think of Sardis and its Lydian-Aramaic bilingual and later Jewish associations: the exiles were to return from Sardis in Asia Minor and, in Is. xlix 12, from Syene (or Elephantine) in Egypt.

H. Schmökel, *Altes Testament und Heutiges Judentum* (28 pp., Mohr, Tübingen, 1936) has no sympathy with ignorant attacks upon the O.T.; his main points are (*a*) that modern Jewry is not to be identified with the Israel of ancient Palestine, and (*b*) that the O.T. means more to Christians than to Jews. Quite apart from polemics and anti-Semitism, it is worth noticing that even on the sociological side a writer like Max Weber has felt that there is a real problem as regards Palestine, Israel, and the Jews of the Diaspora.

M. Buber and F. Rosenzweig, *Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung* (351 pp.; Schocken Verlag, Berlin, 1936). This is a collection of articles, addresses, and letters turning not upon a 'translation' of the O.T., or a 'return to the Bible', or a *Modernisierung*, but rather, the necessity of a *Vergegenwärtigung*. Its chief value for us lies in the discussion of the meaning of the more significant Hebrew terms and in the recognition that the common renderings, e.g. of Luther, are no longer helpful. The O.T. is not a 'Book' but a 'voice', and the aim

must be to get behind the 'dictionary meanings' and comprehend the thought of the Old Hebrew writers. Thus the aim will remind readers of Pedersen's unusually stimulating book, *Israel.* Hebrew students will find many interesting remarks upon words for sin, uncleanness, sacrifice, &c., but they must be read critically (e.g. *pāḳad,* p. 158). *Es gibt nur Eine Sprache,* says Rosenzweig (p. 124): this is the fundamental idea, and it is symptomatic. It is enough to recall the Viennese philosophical school and its belief, not merely in a unified science, but in the possibility of a single 'intersubjective' language (cf. R. Carnap, *Unity of Science,* 1934). What with an essential physiological and psychical similarity among men, and the modern comparative study of fundamental religious and mystical experiences, these days of a dream of internationalism make one consider the story of the Tower of Babel with renewed interest (cf. *J.T.S.* xxx 305, n. 4). Thus the book by Buber and Rosenzweig is as suggestive for what it reflects as for what it actually contains.

Ludwig Köhler, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (xi + 252 pp., Mohr, Tübingen, 1936) is simpler and less spacious than Eichrodt's great work, and can be recommended to younger students who wish to master the general subject-matter. It covers the whole ground, some sections being fuller than others (e.g. on ideas of Judgement and Salvation), and makes a point of giving statistical information (e.g. on the occurrences of 'Lord of Hosts', 'choose', 'sin', &c.) Among many interesting points the following may be noticed: *Ein Mensch ist kein Mensch* (pp. 113, 148 sq.): a real man is a *socius.* The idea of Yahweh's marriage to Israel is purely symbolical—Yahweh had no accompanying goddess (p. 3): but contrast Graham and May (p. 283) on the name Anath-Yahu at Elephantine (fifth century B.C.), with which we may certainly compare the Moabite Ishtar-Chemosh (ninth century), and possibly Anath-Bethel, also at Elephantine—it is known that there was a deity named Bethel. Köhler is to be added to the list of those who interpret Shaddai as 'mountain (god)': the old name El-Shaddai is therefore exactly parallel to the El-gabal whence the notorious Elagabalus received his name. Köhler seems to regard temple-singing as post-exilic (p. 187); but there were court-singers, male and female (2 Sam. xix 35), and Sennacherib removed them when he ravaged Jerusalem (cited by Caiger, p. 160).[1] Serpent-cults, fully illustrated by

[1] In reference to the relation between Midianites, Kenites, and Israel, Köhler rightly draws attention to the identification of the name Ephah with the modern *gaipha* (p. 234, n. 40); but it is incomprehensible to me why he, along with so many others, ignores the Assyrian statement that Khayapa (i.e. Ephah) and other Arabians were settled by Sargon in Samaria in 715 B.C.; on this see, as early as 1885, Whitehouse's edition of Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O.T.*, pp. 132, 370. The fact is of great importance for the constitution of Samaria.

Graham and May, have left barely a trace in the O.T., and old serpent-myths have become almost meaningless (p. 243, n. 134). There is no reason to assume an El-religion distinct from the 'Yahweh religion of later Israel' (p. 235, Köhler is opposing Gressmann). In O.T. theology 'creation' is an eschatological conception: hence God is both First and Last (p. 71). The 'hornet', which Garstang interpreted as a symbol of Egypt (see *Joshua, Judges,* frontispiece), disappears from history if, as Köhler suggests, the word means 'discouragement' (p. 232, n. 12).

Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments (viii + 240 pp., Töpelmann, Berlin, 1936). The volume consists of papers read at the O.T. meeting at Göttingen, Sept. 4–10, 1935, and is edited by Volz, Stummer, and Hempel. The harvest is a rich one, and only the briefest statement can be made of the papers, which, for purpose of convenience, I arrange according to subject, adding in brackets the length of each. Purely philological is Prof. Rowley's discussion of the Semitic sources of the word 'cipher' and its cognates (16 pp.); the explanation of the diverse meanings of the word leads into unsuspected fields—birds, books, and cabbalists—and a vast amount of important material is collected by the author. Two papers dealt with excavations. Father Bea discussed the significance of the work at Telēlāt Ghassūl (near the Dead Sea) for prehistoric Palestine (12 pp.). Not only are the wall-paintings remarkable; the general culture, which as a whole is exceptional, illumines the cultural relations of Palestine of the third and fourth millennium B.C. Although at this distant date Palestine shews traces of contact with surrounding regions it manifests an individuality of its own. This paper is illustrated, as also is that by Prof. Badè on new discoveries at Tell en-Nasbeh (7 pp.). One of the most interesting of these is a well-preserved Astarte sanctuary whose architectural history throws light upon what is styled the 'Baal-Yahweh' sanctuary. Some inscribed jar-handles brought palaeographical problems, and it is noteworthy that the author is not convinced by Dr Sukenik's view that the old reading 'Yahu' (in particular on a famous coin in the British Museum) should be 'Yahud' (see on this, *Quart. St. of the P. E. F.*, April, p. 79, n. 1). Some seal-impressions of a certain Shebna were found—one was in the Astarte temple: if this be the Shebna of Isaiah's day (xxii 15 sqq.), and 'if he was a devotee of the "Syrian goddess" the fact may explain some of the animus of Isaiah's denunciation'. Prof. T. H. Robinson dealt with 'anacrusis' in Hebrew poetry (4 pp.): by this is meant slight introductory words outside the metrical scheme; e.g. 'hark' (Jer. iii 21) 'lo!' (Ps. xxxix 6). There are cases where it appears that a regular metre can be secured only by conjectural emendation unless we may assume this phenomenon. The paper, though

brief, is an important contribution to the understanding of Hebrew poetical literature. Dr Junker writes on textual criticism (13 pp.) with particular reference to the transposition of consonants, and concludes that the Massoretic Text is frequently by no means so hopelessly corrupt as is often assumed. Dr J. Fischer argues from the biblical quotations of the scholastic Odo that he had access to a type of text other than that handed down by the Massoretes (9 pp.)—irresistibly one recalls the fine critical examination of another presumed pre-Massoretic text by the late Prof. Burkitt (*J. T. S.* xxii 165 sqq.): how one misses his judgement in a case like this! The vocalization, too, seems to represent an older system of vocalization than the Tiberian. Dr H. W. Hertzberg shows how glosses and additions point to a *Nachgeschichte* of the O.T. texts within the O.T. itself (12 pp.). To determine the sources of a book and sever the early and late portions is only the beginning of criticism, and in this, one of the most suggestive of all the papers, a line is indicated upon which relatively little has as yet been done. Prof. G. Bertram deals with the relation between the Hebrew text and the LXX and illustrates the *religionsgeschichtlich* importance of the latter (13 pp.). How ideas in the O.T. Psalms were developed in Christian exegesis is illustrated by Prof. Puukko (6 pp.); the process which we find e.g. in Ps. xix, where an old hymn is adjusted to Israelite monotheism, is continued further in the Christian interpretation of the Psalms. Here may be added Dr Stummer's paper on the main problems in the study of the O.T. Vulgate (7 pp.). Prof. Alt investigates the historical substratum underlying the story of Joshua (17 pp.). Certain narratives are purely aetiological, in others Joshua is a charismatic leader like one of the 'Judges': a secondary feature is his present inclusion in a Benjamite cycle of tradition. The paper is extremely suggestive, the more so when we proceed to compare the traditions encircling *both* Joshua and Saul (see *Ency. Brit.* xith ed., *s. vv.*). Prof. de Groot handles the early history of Jerusalem (7 pp.). He argues that in David's time the Jebusite city was under Philistine suzerainty—this surely makes the contacts between Judah and the North in 1 Sam. more difficult!—and, after reviewing the evidence, considers that only further excavation on the western hill can determine whether it was then a double city. Prof. Rudolph, in a literary analysis of Exod. xix–xxxiv (8 pp.), reaches the conclusion that there is no trace of E in these chapters: the connexion between them and Num. x 29–36, xi sqq, is not, however, taken into account. Prof. W. B. Stevenson, of Glasgow, correlates relevant passages in Is. xl sqq. with the course of events at and after the Persian capture of Babylon in 539 B.C., and finds in xli 8–20 valuable testimony to the reality of the Return in the reign of Cyrus (8 pp.). Prof. Causse deals with a period which he has made

his own in a paper on 'Wisdom and Jewish propaganda in the Persian and Hellenistic ages' (7 pp.). He emphasizes the non-Palestinian origin of Wisdom, the depth of Jewish humanism, and the part played by the Jewish sages in spreading ideas of a moral idealism, of a God who could be served by righteous living as well as, or more easily than, by the cultus and the observances of the Torah. If Wisdom owed most to Egypt, it was in Alexandria that Jewish tradition and Greek philosophy were wedded, with decisive results for the history of culture. Prof. Lindblom, discussing the distinctiveness of O.T. religion (10 pp.), lays stress upon the importance of studying the leading ideas, the idea of God being the most vital. He analyses the ideas and points out, *inter alia*, the difference between the N.T. conception of God's love for the sinner, and the O.T. conviction of His love for those within the Covenant. But this is to forget the tremendous vicissitudes in the actual history of the people we call 'Israel', and this must also be said of the characteristically psychological paper of Principal H. Wheeler Robinson on the Hebrew conception of corporate personality (14 pp.). This, a favourite subject of his, deserves the most careful attention if one is to understand the developement of ideas of group, nation, Church, &c., and the sentiments that unite them. Nowhere is individual freedom entirely suppressed, and the individual who is in direct antithesis to the group is apt to be worse than eccentric; but, when Dr Robinson holds that 'it is quite wrong to place the individualism of Jeremiah and Ezekiel in direct antithesis to the group conception which had hitherto prevailed', we must certainly take a more historical view of the total conditions of their age. Tremendous vicissitudes like the present should teach us to treat the O.T. historically as well as psychologically. Dr J. Begrich writes on the priestly Torah (26 pp.): an elaborate discussion of the use and connotation of the term, certain moments in its developement, and the philosophical importance of a thorough study of this and other conceptions for O.T. theology. Prof. von Rad argues that the O.T. stories of creation are ancient material used to serve theological and soteriological purposes (10 pp.). Old cultic lore has been taken over, and not merely adjusted to Israelite monotheism, but given a pivotal position in fundamental conceptions of the relation between Israel and Yahweh, the God of the Universe. The Paradise myth is discussed by Prof. Staerk (8 pp.), who brings weighty reasons for associating it with old Persian tradition. Prof. A. Weiser writes on the theological task of O.T. research and its place in the *Universitas Literarum* (18 pp.) He comments on certain aspects of the O.T. (e.g. the sense of dynamic reality), the necessity of a *concrete* understanding of its import, the danger of eis-egesis as distinct from sound ex-egesis, and the combination of critical-historical with theological

work, the avoidance of antiquarianism, and the inevitable interrelation between the age of the O.T. and that of the man who studies it. Finally, Prof. Eissfeldt deals all too briefly with the relation between the study of antiquity and that of the O.T. (7 pp.). The O.T. should have a higher position in the study of the ancient Near East than it has at present. Scholars have much to contribute to one another, and a closer comparative study of the O.T. with the old world and the ancient methods of treating such questions as God and people, God and ruler, have much to suggest to us in our present efforts to find our own solutions.

Looking back over the books noticed in this Chronicle we cannot fail to observe the intense interest in the Old Testament, the excellent introductory books for students, the prominence of a new feature of far-reaching importance, namely, the significance of a 'Canaanite' or—as I prefer—a 'Palestinian' Bible, and, not least, the relation between the Bible, Bible studies, and this age. The Bible—in particular, here, the O.T.—is linked up with a variety of lines of study that go to constitute 'culture' in the best sense of the word. It has also something to contribute to our ideas of religious, social, and other developement. Hence it has more than a solely 'religious' significance—it has a real cultural value.

S. A. Cook.