RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In complying with the wish of the editor of the Expositor, that I should furnish a periodical review of the more recent foreign literature bearing on the Scriptures of the Old Testament, I must appeal, as regards this opening paper, to the indulgence of my readers in consideration of the very limited space available for my purpose. Moreover, it is only in a second or third contribution that a review of this kind can hope to correspond, as far as possible, to the aims of the Magazine and the wishes of the readers. Lastly, there is not at my disposal, at the present moment, the amount of leisure I would fain have devoted to the accomplishment of this task.

The books and articles noticed in this review were published, almost without exception, during the year 1883; yet I have thought it well to refer to some few writings of greater importance which appeared in the year 1882. As regards the literature of 1884, I hope to furnish a review thereof in the course of a few months.

For the earlier period the following writings are to be recommended: (1) Joh. Geo. Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica selecta.* Jenæ, 1757–65 (Four thick vols.). Idem, *Bibliotheca Patristica.* Jenæ, 1770 (New ed. improved and greatly enlarged. Ed. J. T. L. Danzius. Jenæ, 1834; pp. 804). (2) Geo. Bened. Winer, *Handbuch der Theolog. Literatur, hauptsächlich der Protestantischen.* 3rd ed.; 2 vols. Leipzig, 1838–40. (3) E. A. Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica.* [List of writings in the domain of Protest. Theology, or of importance for the same, published in Germany during the years 1830–62. In alphabetical order.] Göttingen, 1864; pp. 1560. (4) Edward Baldamus u. Rich. Haupt, *Die lit. Erscheinungen der letzten 5 Jahre,* 1865–69, *auf dem Gebiet der Prot.* [und Kathol.] *Theologie.* Systematisch geordnet. Reudnitz [now, Leipzig], 1870; pp. 140 [Kathol., pp. 100]. E. Baldamus, *Die Erscheinungen der deutschen Lit. auf dem Gebiet der Prot.* [u. Kathol.] *Theologie,* 1870–1874. Leipz. 1875. Idem, *Die Ersch. der deutsch. Lit. auf dem Geb. der Prot.* [Kath.] *Th.,* 1875–1879. Leipzig, 1880; pp. 144 [Kath., 1881, pp. 92]. As regards the period from Oct. 1876 to the end of 1881, the report has been so ably prepared by Prof. Emil

Kautzsch,[1] that even all the non-German literature, so far as known to him, has been included in his account. His notices, bearing the stamp as they do of diligence and scholarship, are worthy of careful attention; although, as regards the Pentateuch-criticism, the author unfortunately belongs to the school of Wellhausen. In like manner the historic surveys prepared by Prof. Carl Siegfried,[2] though written from a pretty radical standpoint, in more than one respect merit our gratitude. Be it further observed that Kautzsch and Siegfried enter more fully into details than it is possible for us here to do. He, therefore, who wishes for more complete information, should consult the work of one or other of these scholars.

We begin with the AIDS TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Among these, the 9th edition of Gesenius' Lexicon (Wilhelm Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament.* Neunte Aufl., neu bearbeitet von F. Mühlau u. W. Volck [Professors at Dorpat]. Leipzig; Vogel, 1883; pp. xlvi. and 978), has been unfavourably criticised by four scholars of very different theological leanings: E. Schürer, *Theolog. Literaturzeitung* 1883, No. 23; Friederich Delitzsch, *The Heb. Language viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research*, Lond., 1883, Preface; P. A. de Lagarde, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 1884, Pt. 7 [reprinted in *Mittheilungen*, Göttingen, 1884, pp. 208–239]; H. L. Strack, *Theolog. Literaturblatt* 1884, No. 22. The main fault found is that the editors have far too little turned to account the labours of such explorers as, de Lagarde, Dillmann, Hupfeld, Nöldeke, and have made too little use of the ascertained results of Assyriology; while in the etymological parts they have followed Fleischer in quite a one-sided way. H. Strack, in his exposition of the doctrine of the Hebrew forms (Hermann L. Strack, *Hebräische Grammatik, mit Uebungsstücken, Litteratur, und Vokabular.* Karlsruhe u. Leipzig; H. Reuther, 1883; London, Dulau & Co.; pp. xv., 163; 2 Mk. 70 [Part I. of the *Porta linguarum orientalium*]), has endeavoured to combine brevity and distinctness with a scientific

[1] Comp. *Wissenschaftlicher Jahresbericht über die Morgenländischen Studien von Oct.* 1876 *bis Dec.* 1877 [u. im Jahre 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881]. Leipzig, 1879 *sqq.* (Zeitschr. der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Supplement to vol. xxxiii. [xxxiv. *sqq.*]).

[2] Comp. *Theologischer Jahresbericht. Unter Mitwirkung von . . . herausgeg. von B. Pünjer.* Vol. i. [ii. iii.], containing the literature of the year 1881 [1882, 1883]. Leipzig, 1882 [1883, 1884].

treatment. Simultaneously with the appearing of the second edition (probably as early as 1885), an English translation is to be published. To the smaller works of: (1) Franz Prätorius, *Ueber den Urspr. des Dagesch forte conjunctivum* (Ztschr. für d. alttest. Wissensch., 1883; pp. 17–31). Idem, *Ueber den Einfluss des Accentes auf die Vocalentfaltung nach Gutturalen* (ibid., pp. 211–219); Idem, *Das Imperfectum* יִקְטוֹל (ibid., pp. 52–55). (2) Theodor Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen zur semitischen Grammatik.* I. *Die Verba* ע״ע *im Hebräischen* (Ztschr. der Deutschen Morgenl. Gesellsch. xxxvii. [1883], pp. 525–540). (3) Wilhelm Jenrich, *Der Pluralis fractus im Hebr.*; Halle, 1883; Inaugural Dissertation. (4) Ernst Schwabe פְּ *nach seinem Wesen und Gebrauche im alttest. Kanon gewürdigt;* Halle, 1883; Inaugural Dissertation.

Among the VERSIONS of the Old Testament, that known as the *Septuagint* is confessedly the most important, albeit next to nothing has hitherto been done for the restoration of a pure text. MSS. have indeed been collected and collated, but no one has submitted the material in hand to a searching criticism. The great merit of having pointed out and entered upon the right path belongs to P. de Lagarde (*Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum Pars prior Græce, Pauli de Lagarde studio et sumptibus edita.* Gottingæ: Dieterich, 1883; pp. xvi., 544, 4to [20 Marks]).[1] Before one can attempt to reconstruct the original text of the LXX., one must be acquainted with the later recensions of Lucianus, Hesychius, Origen. De Lagarde has, by dint of acute combination, immense learning, and extraordinary diligence, succeeded in restoring the text of the Syrian presbyter Lucianus (d. 311). In this place, too (comp. also *Theol. Literaturbl.*, 1884, No. 38), I would give expression to the wish that the first volume, which alone has appeared as yet, may find many purchasers; that the author, who is publishing at his own expense, may be in a position to bring out the second half of his important work.—Ad. Merx, Professor at Heidelberg, in his treatise (*Der Werth der Septuaginta für die Textkritik des A.T. am Ezechiel aufgezeigt*) [Jahrbb. für Prot. Theol., 1883; pp. 65–77] has laboured to show that the said Greek version possesses a far higher value for the emendation of the Hebrew text of the original than was thought by Rud. Smend in his commentary on Ezekiel (Leipzig, 1880); but it appears to me that

[1] Comp. Paul de Lagarde, *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griech. Uebersetzung des A. T.* Göttingen, 1882; 4to. pp. 64.

Merx has fallen into the opposite extreme.—K. A. Vollers (*Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner.* Erste Hälfte. Berlin, 1880; pp. iv., 80. — Continuation in *Ztschr. für die A. T. Wissensch.*, 1883; pp. 219–272; End, *ibid.*, 1884; pp. 1–20) has submitted the text of the Twelve Minor Prophets in the version of the LXX. to a close examination.—Leo Ziegler, a man who has already deserved well in connexion with these studies, has published fragments of a Latin translation of the Pentateuch, in many respects interesting, which was made before the time of Jerome (*Bruchstücke einer vorhieronymianischen Uebersetzung des Pent.* München, 1883; pp. vi., xxx., 88; 4to).—It is a very gratifying fact that the edition of the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, brought to a standstill by the death of Heinr. Petermann, is being carried through the press by the well-qualified Samaritan scholar, Dr. Vollers (*Pentateuchus Samaritanus*, III. *Leviticus, quem . . . typis describendum curavit C. Vollers.* Berolini, W. Moeser, 1883; pp. 261–348).—Ceriani's photo-lithographic edition of the Syriac version of the Old Testament, known as the *Peshittha* (*Translatio syra Pescitto V^us T^i ex codice Ambrosiano sec. fere VI. photolithographice edita curante et adnotante A. M. Ceriani.* Mediolani, 1876–1883; 2 vols. fol.) is now, with the exception of the notes, brought to completion. Of the work of the Bible revision in Germany I will give an account in a brief separate article.

Of the domain of the so-called LOWER TEXT-CRITICISM we have here only to mention H. Guthe's writing, concerning the strips of leather, inscribed with excerpts from Deuteronomy, which were brought to Europe by M. W. Shapira in June, 1883 (Herm. Guthe, *Fragmente einer Lederhandschrift, enthaltend Mose's letzte Rede an die Kinder Israel, Mitgetheilt u. geprüft.* Leipzig, 1883; pp. iv., 94 [2 Marks]). We can only regret that so much diligence was wasted upon so unworthy an object. I was the first in Europe who saw these fragments, and at once said to their possessor that they were only a modern forgery, giving him at the same time my reasons for this judgment.[1]

As I shall have occasion in my next review to speak of the *Handwörterbuch des Biblischen Altertums* of Ed. Riehm, now at length completed, I have on this occasion only to mention the *Real-Encyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, in its second,

[1] Comp. my letter in the *Times* of Sept. 4th, 1883 (*Theol. Literaturbl.*, 1883, No. 40).

enlarged edition, amended throughout, begun by the late J. J. Herzog and the late G. L. Plitt; continued by Alb. Hauck. Vol. xi. (Oetinger—Pius I.), pp. 806; vol. xii. (Pius II.—Ring), pp. 804. Leipzig, 1883. [For the future we shall use the abbreviation PRE].—The most important articles, besides those afterwards referred to, are: xi., Opfer, Passah, Philister, Palästina; xii., Polyglottenbibeln, Priestertum, Prophetentum, Reinigungen.

Exegesis and Criticism.—Although the *Collegium Biblicum* of Aug. Friedr. Christian Vilmar (Pract. Exposn. of O. and N.T. Edited by Christian Müller. Gütersloh, 1881–1883) contributes nothing to the advance of science, it is yet worthy of attention on the part of the clergy, on account of numerous remarks of good practical application.—Aug. Dillmann has published anew his recast of Knobel's commentary on Genesis (*Die Genesis erklärt.* 4e Auflage. Leipzig, Hirzel, 1882). As from all other works of Dillmann, so from this also, much is to be learnt (equally great diligence has been applied to the explanation of words and things as to the textual criticism); yet he places too much confidence in the certainty of the critical analysis, and—as it seems to us—concedes too much to Wellhausen on many points. Karl Budde is an adherent of Wellhausen. In his very diffuse book on the Primeval History (*Die Biblische Urgeschichte, Gen.* i.–xii. 5, *untersucht* [in the appendix the attempt is made to restore the earliest form of the history], Giessen, 1883) he claims, so to speak, "to hear the grass grow," and will demonstrate things which are undemonstrable, and with the material we at present possess must remain so. We gladly acknowledge, however, that many a useful observation has been made by the acute young scholar. François Lenormant,[1] too (*La Genèse. Traduction d'après l'hébreu*, etc. Paris, 1883; pp. 364), finally represented the codex of the priests as having a later origin than the writing of the Jahvist and that of the Deuteronomist; with respect to the absolute age of the sources, a judgment cannot yet in his opinion be formed.—H. Strack (Herm. L. Strack, *Pentateuch*; PRE². xi., 437–460) has set forth the present position of the Pentateuch-criticism; and, without seeking to augment the great number of the existing hypotheses by a new one, has shown that weighty arguments plead against the view of Vatke, Graf, Reuss, Wellhausen, and others, now almost exclusively prevailing in Germany.

[1] Died Dec. 9th, 1883.

H. Vuilleumier, Prof. at Lausanne, in his articles, which have appeared up to March, 1884 (*La critique du Pentateuque dans sa phase actuelle* [Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie, Janvier, 1882, Mars, 1884; pp. 204]), pursues in the main the object of proving to his readers, of the French tongue, the untenableness of the traditional view that Moses was the author of the whole Pentateuch. On the other hand, its Mosaic authorship is contended for more or less by E. Böhl, Prof. at Vienna *Zum Gesetz und zum Zeugniss*, Vienna, 1883; pp. 231), Fr. Roos (*Die Geschichtlichkeit des Pentateuchs, insbesondere seiner Gesetzgebung. Eine Prüfung der Wellhausen'schen Hypothese.* Stuttg., 1883; pp. 168), who combat that theory as to the origin of the Pentateuch which is ordinarily named after Graf and Wellhausen. The work of Böhl possesses hardly any value for science, because the author, while contending with dogmatic arguments, has no eye at all for that which is advanced by the opposite party. Simultaneously in the main with these controverting writings, at any rate without allusion to them, appeared the second edition of Wellhausen's first volume of the History of Israel (J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels. Zweite Ausgabe der Gesch. Isr.*, Band I. Berlin, G. Reimer, 1883; pp. x., 455), provided with a title better descriptive of the contents. Chapter viii. (Die Erzählung des Hexateuchs) has been remoulded, and thereby rendered considerably clearer; in other respects not much has been altered.

Of the commentary of Ernst Bertheau (Prof. at Göttingen) on Judges and Ruth, published in 1845, we have to speak of a second, and essentially improved edition, brought out by the author himself (*Das Buch der Richter und Ruth erklärt.* 2 Aufl. Leipzig, Hirzel, 1883; pp. 316 [vol. vi. of the Kurzgefasstes exegetisch. Handbuch zum A.T.]).—As of the prophetic historic books, so also of the prophetic admonitory writings, there is but little to report in this place. Himpel, Catholic Prof. at Tübingen, elucidated the historic section of Isaiah, chap. xxxvi.–xxxix., by means of the Assyrian Cuneiform Inscriptions (*Der geschichtliche Abschnitt Jesaja, Kap.* 36–39. *Erläuterungen desselben durch assyrische Keil-Inschriften* [Tüb. Theolog. Quartalschr., 1883; pp. 582–653]). C. H. Cornill, Private Teacher at Marburg, published a warmly, almost enthusiastically, written lecture on the work and book of the prophet Ezekiel (*Der Prophet Ezechiel.* Heidelberg, 1882; pp. 53). Kühn's explanation of some difficult sections of the same prophet, called forth by his co-operation in the

work of revising Luther's translation of the Bible, is to be received with gratitude (Ernst Kühn, *Ezechiel's Gesicht vom Tempel der Vollendungszeit.* Gotha, 1882; pp. 92). The arguments of G. Hoffmann, Prof. at Kiel, on some passages of Amos (*Versuche zu Amos* [Ztschr. für die alttestam. Wissensch., 1883; pp. 87–126]), likewise merit attention.

There lies before us the fourth edition of Franz Delitzsch's Commentary on the Psalms (*Biblischer Commentar über die Psalmen.* Leipzig, 1883. [A volume of the well known Old Testament Commentary of Keil and Delitzsch]), for which, in addition to the other products of science, notably the results of Assyriology have been turned to account. A supplement to this Commentary is formed by the article *Psalmen* in the Prot. Real-encyklopädie (Franz Delitzsch, *Psalmen;* PRE², xii., 308–335). The work of H. Grätz (*Kritischer Kommentar zu den Psalmen, nebst Text und Uebersetzg.* Breslau, 1882–3; pp. 701), abounding as it does in conjectures, is rather suggestive than convincing. Grill's interpretation of the difficult Psalm lxviii. (Julius Grill, *Der achtundsechzigste Psalm, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf seine alten Uebersetzer u. neuere Ausleger.* Tübingen, 1883), will prove a mine of information to every expositor of the Psalms, even to those who do not accept the conclusions of the author.

Those who are occupied with the Book of Proverbs would do well to consult the little volume of Dyserinck (Johannes Dyserinck, *Het Boek der Spreuken, uit het Hebreeuwsch opnieuw vertaald,* etc. Haarlem, 1883). The second edition of Bertheau on Proverbs, and Hitzig on Ecclesiastes, has been brought out by W. Nowack, Prof. at Strasburg, who makes a judicious use of that which has been furnished by others (Ernst Bertheau, *Die Sprüche Salomo's. In zweiter Aufl. herausgeg. von W. Nowack.*—F. Hitzig, *Der Prediger Salomo's.* 2e Aufl. Leipzig, Hirzel, 1883). The first of the two ingenious dissertations of P. Kleinert, Prof. at Berlin, mentioned in the subjoined note,[1] was called forth more particularly by the English writings of Thomas Tyler and Dean Plumptre on the book of Koheleth. Fraidl's work[2] is an interesting contribution to the history of the exegesis of the Old Testament.

[1] P. Kleinert, *Sind im Buche Koheleth ausserhebräische Einflusse anzuerkennen?* (Theol. Studien u. Kritiken, 1883; pp. 761–782). Idem, *Prediger Salomo* (PRE², xii., 169–175).

[2] Franz Fraidl, *Die Exegese der siebzig Wochen Daniels in der alten und mittleren Zeit.* Graz, 1883.

In the provinces of Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic literature we have the researches of Cæsar Seligmann (*Das Buch der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* [*Joshua ben Sira*] *in seinem Verhältniss*, etc. Breslau, 1883), Berhard Pick, Alleghany, Pa. (*The Psalter of Solomon.* Presbyter. Rev., 1883; pp. 775–812), and Aug. Dillmann (*Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments.* PRE², xii., 341–367).

ARCHÆOLOGY, HISTORY, and GEOGRAPHY. The work of Eberhard Schrader, indispensable for the study of the Old Testament (*Die Keilinschriften u. das A. T. Mit einem Beitrage von Paul Haupt.* 2nd edition, remodelled and greatly enlarged. Giessen, 1883), will be already known to most of the readers of the EXPOSITOR from its English translation. It thus suffices here to call attention to the issue of this edition. The time for an encyclopædia of Semitic science is in our opinion not yet come; yet it must be conceded to the book of Fritz Hommel, Private Teacher at Munich (*Die semitischen Völker und Sprachen*, etc. Leipzig, 1883), that everything is done in it which, in the present condition of the science—particularly of Assyriology—could be done by a single person. As regards the Biblical chronology, all experts are agreed that there are errors in the numerals which have come down to us in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. As to the number of errors however, and still more as to the mode of correcting them, they are at variance. This uncertainty will remain until the material necessary for correcting the Biblical numbers shall have been furnished to us by the Assyrian or Egyptian monuments. On this account the attempts made by Adolf Kamphausen, Prof. at Bonn (*Die Chronologie der hebräischen Könige*, Bonn, 1883), and F. E. König (*Beiträge zur biblischen Chronologie. Ztschr. für kirchl. Wissensch. und kirchl. Leben*, 1883), although distinguished above many others by sobriety, can hardly lead to the fixing of even an approximately certain chronology. Of the abundant geographical literature we mention here only two works. The *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, edited by Hermann Guthe, has appeared from the year 1882 (vol. vi., Leipzig, 1883), and presents, in addition to valuable original papers, an annual "report of new publications in the domain of Palestine literature," by Prof. A. Socin of Tübingen. The work edited by Ebers and Guthe (*Palästina in Wort und Bild. Nebst der Sinaihalbinsel und dem Lande Gosen*), although strictly a recast of an English book, deserves mention in this place, because

the above-named scholars have done much in the way of amendment and addition.

That BIBLICAL THEOLOGY may not come off quite empty-handed in this review, we mention—last, but not least—the work of Ed. König, published as early as 1882, in which particularly the personal testimonies of the prophets, with regard to the revelations vouchsafed to them, are very carefully examined (Friedrich Eduard König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments.* Leipzig, 1882. 2 vols. pp. 212, 410).

HERMANN L. STRACK.

University of Berlin.

BREVIA.

Bishop Temple on the Relations between Religion and Science.—The most admirable point of these lectures is their very thorough and lucid statement of the *status questionis.* The whole ground is traversed with complete appreciation of the main difficulties, and with wide knowledge of the modern answers to them. *The Bampton Lecture for* 1884, indeed, may be said to embody the results of all recent speculation upon the problem—is in fact a tide-mark indicating the levels reached by the maturest speculation up to this time. On one point, that of the probable naturalness of the miraculous, there is a distinct advance at least in firmness and boldness of statement; and certainly the distinctively moral aspects of religion have never been brought out with more clearness or enforced with greater purity and dignity of expression.

Whether this is the whole truth, however, regarding the relations of Science and Religion is a question. We are inclined to think it is not. Valid as are the distinctions drawn by Bishop Temple, the mere difficulty of grasping them, and the innumerable philosophical questions that arise all along the line, suggest the doubt as to whether the standpoint from which the subject is viewed can be the final one. Philosophical examinations of the relations of Science and Religion proceed upon the supposition that the field of knowledge is a plane divided into different departments, one for Theology, one for Philosophy, one for Science, and so on. The effort is then made to trace and fix the boundaries of the several domains—a process apparently satisfactory enough,