

THE CHEYNE-BLACK ENCYCLOPÆDIA BIBLICA, VOL. II.¹

Hebrew Lexicography.—The article Hebrew Language is W. R. Smith's article on the same subject in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, revised and abridged by A. A. Bevan. The original article is well known as a concise and careful piece of work presenting the various theories as to the origin of the name Hebrew, the relation of Hebrew to the other Semitic languages, and the history of the development and decay of the language. The additions of the reviser are comparatively unimportant, and increase the value of the article but little. One can but regret that more space was not granted to this important subject, and that an attempt was not made to present a full and fresh treatment of it.

Most of the lexicographical work scattered through this volume is from the pen of Professor Cheyne himself. It furnishes fresh evidence of his great learning, versatility, and originality. The latter appears especially in his treatment of proper names, for many of which he offers new etymologies. Isaac is explained as a corruption of *ahîhalaš*, *i. e.*, "the brother defends;" Jacob is a contraction and distortion of *abîcabod*; Israel was originally *Jizrah-el*, *i. e.*, "God shines forth," which was corrupted into both *יִשְׂרָאֵל* and *יִזְרְעֵאל*, as well as into *יִשְׁשכר*. *יְרֵיכוֹ* is to be taken as a corruption of *בֵּר צִלְחָד* (see article Galeed); the name Jericho was originally *עִיר יִרְחִמְיָאֵל*,² which was also transformed into *עִיר הַחֲמרים*, *i. e.*, "the city of palm trees;" and Judas Iscariot was perhaps originally Judas Ierichotes, *i. e.*, Judas of Jericho. It is safe to say that few of these and other etymologies of similar character will meet with general acceptance, but they are at

¹ *Encyclopædia Biblica*. A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archæology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible. Edited by REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Canon of Rochester; and J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, M.A., LL.D., formerly Assistant Editor of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Vol. II, E to K. New York: The Macmillan Co.; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1901. Cols. 1146–2688. Maps and Illustrations. Cloth, \$5. To be completed in four volumes. A review of Vol. I is found in the *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY*, Vol. IV, pp. 364–85 (April, 1900).

² See also CANON CHEYNE, "From Isaiah to Ezra: A Study of Ethanites and Jerahmeelites," *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY*, Vol. V, pp. 433–44.

least suggestive, and they will serve to lay emphasis upon the possibility that greater corruption has taken place in the forms of proper names than has usually been supposed.³ Professor Cheyne's brief articles on Earth and World, Head, and Heart are especially good, as is also that on Flesh (בָּשָׂר), by W. E. Addis, and that on Idol, by Professor George F. Moore.

The large amount of labor bestowed upon the minutiae of philology and lexicography in this *Encyclopædia* is worthy of all praise, since thorough work of this kind is a prerequisite of good exegesis.

JOHN M. P. SMITH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Assyriology and Egyptology.—The articles on Egyptian topics are by W. Max Müller, whose dissertation (about forty-five columns in length) on Egypt is learned, ample, and well arranged. He also writes on Ethiopia, Etham, Goshen, Hophra, and the route of the Exodus. We are struck by the caution displayed by the writer in his statement of conclusions. It is evident that larger knowledge, while it has served to overthrow earlier hypotheses, has brought us a large margin of uncertainty in which we are at present moving about with considerable uneasiness. The "sure ground" of archæology has not been reached. In Assyrian matters the topics are exceedingly few. Tiele writes on Ellasar, accepting the identification with Larsam, but confessing difficulty. Esarhaddon is treated by C. H. W. Johns, a competent scholar who deals with his theme thoroughly, almost too fully for the needs of the Bible students. Johns also contributes the article on Euphrates. He might have added to his references Peters' *Nippur*, Vol. I, where one of the most recent Euphrates journeys is described in detail.

As a whole, the articles on Assyriology and Egyptology in this volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* are more valuable than the corresponding ones in the *Hastings Dictionary*.

GEORGE S. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Archæology.—About forty articles in this volume come under the head of biblical archæology. All seem to be by competent authorities

³ See G. BUCHANAN GRAY on "The Encyclopædia Biblica (Vols. I and II) and the Textual Tradition of Hebrew Proper Names," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. XIII, pp. 375-91.

and to be well done. Those which have especially taken my attention are the following :

Education, by G. H. Box. The author points out the necessity for oral teaching of children by parents even in the earliest age of Hebrew history. The tradition of religious rites must at least be cared for wherever religion exists at all. In certain classes of the community this oral teaching is considerable in amount, as, for example, among the priests, whose duty it is to decide questions of conscience or of ritual for the people at large. A thorough education of some sort must have been given also to a man like Isaiah. An impulse to popular instruction was undoubtedly given by the publication of Deuteronomy. The ideal of the book is seen in the frequent exhortations to instruct the children in religion, though this ideal was not carried out till after the exile. An epoch was undoubtedly marked by Ezra. Where a ready scribe in the law has such influence, and where the synagogue (primarily a school for the study of the law) is a recognized institution, education has already become a part of the people's life. Even if the work of Ezra is much exaggerated by the chronicler (as the present reviewer thinks to be the case), there can be no doubt of the tendency of his time. With the scribes we find in the post-exilic period a class of sages also coming into view, some of whose works have come down to us. These were really educators. Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus may almost be considered manuals of pedagogy. What relation existed between the guild of the scribes and that of the sages does not appear. The latter are perhaps more distinctly influenced by Greek thought. A new epoch for popular education was opened by Simon ben Shetach. At least he is generally credited with the regulation that children should attend the elementary schools (Schürer's preference of a later date for this regulation is noted). The schools for children were probably attached to the synagogues. The custom of the teachers to earn their living by a handicraft so as not to exact fees for teaching reminds us of the apostle Paul. The training of the memory by constant repetition, of which Jerome speaks, is like the method still in use in the East.

Diseases of the Eye, by C. Creighton. These are notoriously prevalent in the East. The case of Tobit is discussed at length, the author maintaining that the cure narrated is intended to be only an example of ancient medical treatment. The white spots produced by ophthalmia are made inconspicuous by pigmentation, for which fish gall might be used, together with charcoal from the burned liver. It is

doubtful, however, if this hypothesis does justice to the original account, in which Tobias rubs the fish gall alone in his father's eyes, "and when he rubbed them the white spots scaled off, and he saw his son and fell on his neck." A radical and miraculous cure seems intended. This same article renews the hypothesis that the apostle Paul's thorn in the flesh was ophthalmia.

Family and Kinship, two related articles by Benzinger. The former emphasizes the fact that community of worship is the bond of the family and of the clan. In this respect the Semites differ nothing from early Indo-Germanic peoples: "The house-father was in primitive times the priest who had charge of the relations between the members of the household and the god. . . . This is clearly shown in the case of the Israelite house-father in the Passover ritual. The transference of the designation 'father' to the priest in this connection is also worth noting." It might have been added that the earliest writers of Genesis assume as a matter of course that the patriarchs are the priests of their families. Anticipating, to a certain extent, what will be said in the next volume on the head of marriage, the article on Family discusses particularly the place of women in the baal-marriage, which the author regards as originally a marriage by capture. But may it not be said that the sale of a daughter as a slave is as old as any title established by capture? To be sure, it is necessary to consider here the facts of matriarchy as brought out more fully in the article on Kinship. The writer might have been more positive in his statement concerning the "uncleanness" of the mother at childbirth. After citing Ploss' theory that this is a primitive quarantine, he says: "More probably the original idea was that the sickness of childbirth, like any other sickness, lay under the influence of certain demons, or that this, like other events in the sexual life, was under the protection of a special spirit." It seems to me quite certain that in the polytheistic stage of Israel's religion the whole sexual life was devoted to a special god (or goddess), and that the *taboo* of childbirth is a survival from this stage. The article on the Family is supplemented by Canon Cheyne in a brief discussion of the term "adoption."

Fasting, also by Benzinger. The author doubts whether the original purpose of the observance was to raise Yahweh's pity, and favors Robertson Smith's explanation that fasting was originally a preparation for the sacrificial meal. While there may be room for both explanations, I confess that the former seems to me more natural. Fasting in order to compel action on the part of an earthly friend

(or of an enemy for that matter) is a very ancient institution. In the naïve apprehension of Yahweh's relation to his worshiper which prevailed in early Israel, it would seem to be the most natural thing in the world to seek to move him in this way.

Food, by Professor Kennedy. The article illuminates the Old Testament material by statements from the Talmud, and by analogies from modern oriental life. Vegetable foods are enumerated, and the limitations in the use of animal food are pointed out. The article here touches upon a subject more fully discussed under the head Clean and Unclean. Instructive, however, is the discussion of the Jewish rules for slaughtering animals intended for food.

High Place, by G. F. Moore. This is a clear presentation of the facts concerning the early sanctuaries, and to this extent an outline history of the cultus in Israel.

Hosanna, by Canon Cheyne. The proposed derivation of the word from the Aramaic *'ushna* ("strength") has much in its favor. Whether it has been proposed earlier I do not know. A number of other articles by the same author show his well-known acuteness, especially in emendation of the biblical text. That many of these emendations are more ingenious than convincing is perhaps what we must expect in dealing with an ancient and faulty text.

The volume maintains the standard set by its predecessor, which is saying a great deal.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

AMHERST COLLEGE,
Amherst, Mass.

Geography.—In this second volume there are more than seventy articles on biblical geography, illustrated with seven full-page maps, of which six are accompanied by lists of names. Some of these maps indicate in colors the elevations and depressions of the country. Besides, there is a map of Egypt covering two pages, with a list of names occupying two more. There is also an excellent article by Francis Brown, which is designed "to investigate the nature of the geographical conceptions of the Hebrews and the extent of their geographical information." He discusses the subject with great thoroughness for nineteen pages, illustrating it with four charts: for the time of the Judges, the tenth, the eighth, and the fifth centuries B. C., respectively.

It is natural to institute a comparison between the geographical articles in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (=DB.) and those in the

Encyclopædia Biblica (= *EB.*). In which of the two will the minister or the specialist find the more valuable information? If a library can afford only one encyclopædia of the two named, which deserves the preference? Does the one work supplement the other?

DB. has only two maps for the articles corresponding to those in Vol. II of *EB.*; it has no general article on geography, but furnishes an admirable presentation of the geology of the country, by Hull, in eleven columns. There is no such article in *EB.* This is a serious omission, as the general contour of the country cannot be understood without reference to the geology.

There are fewer distinguished contributors to *EB.* than to *DB.* G. A. Smith, who has furnished three independent articles and assisted in the preparation of three others, including a composite article on Jerusalem, in which W. R. Smith and Conder shared; Nöldeke, who has written on Edom; Driver and Budde, who have each prepared a brief article, complete the list of noted names, but in *DB.* there are contributions by eleven distinguished travelers and explorers: Bliss, Conder, Ewing, Hull, Mackie, Merrill, Pinches, Ramsay, Sayce, Warren, Wilson, some of whom have lived years in Syria or Palestine, or have won renown in connection with the Palestine Exploration Fund.

Professor Cheyne is a man of immense learning and of critical erudition, but it is impossible for him to prepare matter of the same interest and value as specialists. He has, indeed, traveled in Palestine, but only as a tourist and for a brief period. His forty-seven, or more, articles give the impression of being more critical than descriptive. There is a great difference between his treatment of Mount Hermon and that by Conder, who has visited it twice; between his discussion of Galilee and that of Merrill, who has gone over it with the utmost care. Descriptions drawn from books, however thorough, can never equal those made by competent students from personal investigations. It seems certain that the geographical articles in *DB.* are better adapted to the needs of ministers than those in *EB.* Libraries that aim at completeness will include *EB.*, but the ordinary student will find far more help and inspiration in *DB.*

The following may be noticed in detail: Edrei, by G. A. Smith, more valuable than in *DB.*, where Sayce makes no mention of the underground city, which is a most important feature; River of Egypt, by S. A. Cook and Canon Cheyne, is much more complete than that by Selbie in *DB.*; Ekron, by G. A. Smith and T. K. C., much superior to that of Beecher in *DB.*; Elath is treated briefly and clearly by

Selbie in *DB.*, but with much more fulness by Cheyne, who traces its history down to the present time; there is no mention of Eleutheropolis in *DB.*, a serious oversight; the information by Cheyne grouped under history and site is well-arranged; Selbie mentions three sites in connection with Elkosh, and favors the one near Eleutheropolis; in *EB.* Budde treats the subject with great learning and discrimination, inclining to the same view, though he pronounces certainty impossible; S. A. Cook in *EB.* is much more thorough than Conder in *DB.* in his discussion of Emmaus; with most moderns he accepts *Kuloniyeh* as the probable site; the argumentation by which Cheyne seeks to prove that we should amend the text of 1 Sam. 28:7 to read En Harod (Judg. 7:1) instead of Endor is characteristic of a weakness that sometimes appears in Cheyne's critical processes; there does not seem to be sufficient reason for rejecting the traditional site; the article, by H. W. Hogg, on Ephraim is incomparably superior to the one in *DB.*; it occupies nearly six pages, besides two pages devoted to a map and list of names; Millar scarcely touches the geography in *DB.*, which will doubtless be treated under another head; there is a great contrast between the anonymous article on Esdraelon in *EB.* and the one in *DB.* by Ewing, long a missionary in Palestine, all of whose articles are of a high degree of excellence, owing to his personal knowledge of the country, his habits of close observation, and his vivid style; on the other hand, C. H. W. Johns has given far more information regarding the Euphrates than Sayce in *DB.*; there is also a separate discussion of the reference in Jer. 13:4-7; the treatment of Galatia in *EB.* has the advantage of an admirable map; it is by Woodhouse and Schmiedel, and is largely at issue with Ramsay, who has furnished the contribution to *DB.*; the articles on Galilee and the Sea of Galilee, by Cheyne, lack the realism of those in *DB.*, by Dr. Merrill, who has made a special study of this part of the country, but the map in *EB.* is illuminating; Gaza in *DB.* is by Hull, who visited it in connection with a scientific journey in 1884; Cheyne in *EB.* makes some good critical suggestions; under Gennesaret, Cheyne claims that 'Ain et-Tin is the most probable site of ancient Capernaum; the article on Jerusalem is by Conder on site and excavations, and by W. R. Smith and G. A. Smith on ancient Jerusalem; G. A. Smith, contrary to Conder in *DB.*, considers it proved that the City of David is to be found on the south end of the eastern hill; the weight of authority, since 1878, seems to be favorable to this view; there is less assurance of the course of the second wall, which would leave the Church of the Holy Sepulcher

outside of it, as G. A. Smith, following Dr. Shick, is inclined to think (*cf.* Golgotha).

This volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* must be considered an important supplement to the *Dictionary of the Bible*, in the subjects discussed, for the scholar who desires every available help for the critical investigation of the geography of the Bible.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Ancient History and Tradition, and Biography.—Under this caption are grouped some forty-eight articles by thirteen different writers. Canon Cheyne's initials stand at the end of thirty or more. In general it may be said that these articles are all well supplied with facts and bring the reader fully abreast with the most recent scholarship. At the same time, the great mass of detail is too often left in such a chaotic condition that the reader is confused, being unable to decide on first reading as to what even the author believes. Jastrow's article on the Hittites is an exception to this rule, and, in the present writer's judgment, is the nearest approach to what the lengthier articles ought to be, viz., fair, scholarly, and summarized.

The most important article of this entire group is the one by Guthe on Israel, seventy-two columns in length. It is an excellent piece of work from the point of view of both psychology and philosophy. Indeed, this study is a keen psychological interpretation of Old Testament events according to the modern philosophy of how Semitic religion developed. It is cautious and reverent throughout. Guthe holds, with the editors (and there is a decided editorial stamp to the whole work), that only the tribe of Joseph was in Egypt; that Moses instituted a new religion, monolatry; that the Philistines came into Canaan somewhat later than the Israelites; that Solomon's temple was at first nothing but the court sanctuary; that the schism was not so extraordinary, for there had never been any real blending between Judah and the other tribes; that Manassah's change of heart and policy, as recorded by the chronicler (*cf.* 2 Chron. 33:11-17), is only a legend which grew up under the influence of later theories of divine retribution; that Cyrus probably never gave a general permission for the return of the exiles; and that the second temple was built by the people already in Judah. The weakest point in the article is paragraphs 37 and 38, in which the author attempts to account for the origin of Deuteronomy and the reformation under Josiah. His

main argument is that *it was really necessary* for the prophets to descend from the bold heights of their ideals into the sphere of rude reality; and it was *imperative* that they should secure the introduction of the laws by the king himself. He allows that Hezekiah, through Isaiah's influence, aimed at the purification of the cultus (*cf.* 2 Kings 18:4), but denies that the preference for Jerusalem as the only place of worship, expressed in the same passage, comes from Hezekiah's age. It is more in accord, he thinks, with a later generation and the interests of the royal priesthood. The articles on Gad, Issacher, and Joseph are by H. W. Hogg, to whose direct editorial oversight the *Encyclopædia* owes its exactness and immaculate typographical character. These articles show an immense breadth of critical and historical information. Gad is treated as of Aramæan origin; Issacher is declared to have been more than usually mixed; while Joseph is the old name for all the clans that settled in Ephraim: the name Ephraim being an older geographical, but a younger ethnic, name than Joseph.

Benzinger's article on Government describes in an unusually instructive manner, on the basis of what is known of the pre-islamic Arabs and the modern Bedouins, Israel's evolution from the ancient tribal system while in the desert, through the local communities and territorial unions of Canaan, to hereditary monarchy, and finally the rule of the hierarchy after the exile, when the tendency of the law was to exalt the spiritual over the secular power.

Toy's sketch of Ezekiel is vivid, concise, and masterly. He describes him as a prophet whose life was spent in endeavoring to teach the significance of the captivity. Ezekiel was the last of the prophets, forming the transition from the prophetic to the priestly period. Those who came after him were seers.

Addis' attempt to portray the lives of Elijah and Elisha was a much more difficult task. From the narratives concerning the former in 1 Kings 17:19, which he naturally considers "legendary," he constructs a portrait of Elijah which entitles him still to stand as a great spiritual and ethical power not unworthy of a place by the side of Moses. From the stories about Elisha he finds it much harder to recover the kernel of literal fact. Yet, he claims, these stories are of great value. For the miracles he wrought, so far as they embody the spirit of active love, contribute a Christ-like element to the ideal of prophecy.

S. A. Cook writes on Genealogies, showing that the great majority

of Old Testament genealogies of *individuals* are found in post-exilic writings: genealogical zeal first arose during the exile.

The composite article on Galatia, by Woodhouse and Schmiedel, has one redeeming characteristic: it is accompanied by a good map (this, in general, is a praiseworthy feature of the *Encyclopædia*). Otherwise this article is decidedly unsatisfactory. It is too polemic. Woodhouse takes up the history of Galatia, and introduces the question: Where were the churches to which the epistle to the Galatians was sent? Schmiedel defends in an exhaustive argument the "North-Galatian theory" as against the "South-Galatian theory" of Ramsay. The article is more suitable to a theological quarterly than to an encyclopædia.

Nöldeke writes the articles on Edom, Hagar, and Ishmael. He maintains on the basis of Exod. 15:15 the great antiquity of the title "duke" given to the Edomite princes in Gen., chap. 36, and declares that the territory of Edom was properly Mount Seir, but allows that it may have spread out both east and west and varied at different periods. He correctly identifies Sela' and Petra. Hagar he treats as the personification of a tribe or district (*cf.* the Hagarites of 1 Chron. 5:10), and Ishmael as the personification of a group of tribes regarded as near kinsmen of the Israelites.

The article on Ezra, by the late Professor Kosters, of Leiden, is revised by Canon Cheyne, and brought up to date. That is to say, the article shares the doubts of Torrey concerning the historical character of all the supposed official documents inserted in our book of Ezra. This is the great fault of all Cheyne's articles. He is too careful to incorporate doubtful hypotheses. His own articles on Earthquake, Eber, Eclipse, Goliath, Jacob, Isaac, Joseph, Gideon, Esau, Enoch, Jehu, Jehoiakim, etc., are interesting, but too critical. For example, he doubts the reality of the earthquake in Amos 1:1, and denies the historical character of Matt. 27:51 f. Eber is an ethnological abstraction. The "darkness over the whole earth" (Mark 15:33) is an addition to plain historical facts involuntarily made by men liable to the innocent superstitions of the people. The story of Goliath has poetical and religious truth, but not, except in a very minute kernel, the truth of history. Isaac is a tribal representative. Jacob fled to the Hauran (Bashan), not to Haran. His tribal character, too, is distinctly marked. Joseph is no doubt idealized, but the story is in details an approach to truth. This is one of Cheyne's best and most carefully prepared articles. His extreme views on Isaiah are too well known to be here rehearsed.

In general, one learns much from such a collection of critical material, and the world is indebted to the editors for giving the English people so many continental views; still, it must be said that the editors' ears have been too often open to modern vagaries and passing *individual* opinions, and too frequently closed to the *consensus* of modern critical research and common-sense exegesis. Instead, therefore, of giving us an encyclopædia of biblical facts, they have put into our hands a collection of the extremest critical hypotheses existing at the end of the nineteenth century. Listen to Schmidt, who writes on Jeremiah: "However favorably Jeremiah may have been impressed at the outset by the moral tone of the deuteronomic law . . . when he observed the 'carnal' confidence in the possession of this law, he had no hesitation in openly denouncing it as a fraud and a forgery (*cf.* Jer. 8:8)." What is this for exegesis? But he echoes Wellhausen.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

THE MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.

Old Testament Introduction.—The articles of this volume assigned to the present writer for examination are upon the following books: Ecclesiastes, by A. B. Davidson; Esther, by Th. Nöldeke; Ezekiel, by C. H. Toy; Ezra–Nehemiah, by W. H. Kusters and T. K. Cheyne; Habakkuk, by K. Budde; Haggai, Hosea, Joel, and Kings, by the late W. R. Smith, supplemented by Canon Cheyne, K. Marti, S. R. Driver, and E. Kautzsch, respectively; Isaiah, Job, and Jonah, by Cheyne; Jeremiah, by N. Schmidt; Judges, by G. F. Moore.

From the point of view of introduction to the Old Testament, this is the most important volume of the four, though the distinguishing characteristics of the *Encyclopædia*, appearing prominently in these articles, have been noticed by reviewers of the first volume. For special students of critical questions, the articles set forth, in admirable form, the history of research in this field and many of the problems now occupying the minds of scholars. The diligence and learning exhibited by Canon Cheyne, his breadth and candor, are worthy of all praise, and this volume will bring additional laurels to biblical scholarship and fame to the distinguished editor. One hesitates to offer any adverse criticism, in view of this marvelous exhibition of erudition. At the same time it would seem that, for general use as a dictionary of the Bible by "all serious students, both professional and

lay," the critical side has received undue emphasis, both in the matter and in the manner of its presentation, while the contents and teaching of the Bible have been somewhat overlooked. This impression is not derived wholly from the use of such terms as "fabrication," "invention," and similar undesirable words, as applied to the stories of the Bible. It is good, indeed, that we should realize that the leading men of old time spoke especially to the men of their own generation, did not all commit their oracles to writing any more than our Lord did, and were dependent, as he was, upon the accuracy of their followers rightly to reproduce their sayings; but the "serious student" who is untrained in critical processes and dependent on his Bible dictionary for information about the Scriptures will find too little that is positive in the articles of Cheyne and the writers who appear most in sympathy with his conclusions, and the comfort of supposing that these volumes mark the extreme limit to which he will ultimately be expected to go will be denied him. In the article on Isaiah, *e. g.*, may be found such expressions as these: "We can hardly expect to find that Isaiah left much in writing;" "It will be well for the student to be continually revising his earlier results in the assignment of dates in the light of his later critical acquisitions;" "It is too bold to maintain that we still have any collection of Isaianic prophecies which in its present form goes back to the period of that prophet." In the discussion of Isa., chaps. 40-66, six columns are given to criticism, even to the reproduction of superseded theories apparently not steps in the growth of the theory advocated, but the article has been searched in vain for a plain statement of the contents of these chapters. Now, the question of authors in the several parts of Isaiah has become so complex in recent years that refined criticism should be accompanied by the most careful analysis and statement of the teaching. The pen of Cheyne, always learned, sometimes runs away with him, as seems to have been true when he wrote the two hundred words of well-restrained praise of G. A. Smith's admirable studies of Isaiah.

The characteristics of the article on Jeremiah are, *mutatis mutandis*, similar to those just mentioned: "Even through the mists of tradition the fact can be discerned that there never were any Jeremianic autographs;" "there is not the slightest evidence that any part of the volume was ever written by him" (Jeremiah); ". . . 51:59-64 is a piece of haggadic fiction;" "[chap.] 38 is manifestly a late legend." In spite of such statements as these, this article has much that is thoroughly good and informing respecting the origin of the book.

Special notice of these two articles has been made because of the great importance of the books treated in them, but other positions, leading the reader to indefinite or sharply challenged conclusions, are made prominent in this volume; as, for example, in *Ezra-Nehemiah*, wherein is maintained the unhistorical character of the story of a return in the time of Cyrus, and Ezra is given a place in the history subsequent to Nehemiah, though the latter position is disputed in at least two passages of the article itself.

Some of the articles do more justice to the actual contents of the books. This is true of that on Judges, which gives a brief statement of contents, and especially is it true of those on Ecclesiastes and Ezekiel. The former is to be commended for its clear perception of the philosophy lying at the basis of the author's words. Professor Davidson is at his best in analysis of this sort. He inclines to a date in the latter part of the third century B. C., two hundred years too early, according to Cheyne. The article on Ezekiel is a model in the way of positive presentation of our knowledge of the book in readable form. The last two articles are worthy of a place beside the best in the *Hastings Dictionary*.

Nöldeke believes that there is no historical kernel in Esther, but that the whole narrative is fictitious. In the article on Habakkuk Budde reproduces (see *Studien und Kritiken*, 1893) his interesting and strongly defended view that in Hab. 1:5-11 we have a threatening addressed to Assyria, and that the Chaldæan power of 1:6 is mentioned as the conqueror of this oppressor, the date being about 615 B. C. A skilful critic might have detected authorship from two different points of view in the brief article on Haggai, even without the initials of the two distinguished men who wrote it. The article on Hosea is thorough and satisfactory. The late date of Joel is defended with force. The most of Jonah is said to belong to the early post-exilic period, as literature it is to be classed with Tobit and Susanna, and the peculiar form of the story of the great fish is derived from the nature-myth of the dragon, the dragon here symbolizing the Babylonian power.

In the illuminating article on Job the complex nature of the problems of criticism is expounded, and the solution is found in the different purposes cherished by the writers at the several stages in the growth of the book. The book was not completed before the latter part of the Persian period.

No writer upon these topics can afford to ignore the positions maintained in this volume.

CHARLES RUFUS BROWN.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION,
Newton Centre, Mass.

The article Hexateuch is Wellhausen's article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* on Pentateuch and Joshua, revised by himself, to which is added a brief closing statement by Cheyne. The revision includes (1) modification of certain technical terms, *e. g.*, "fragment—hyp." for "fragmentary;" "supplement—hyp." for "supplementary;" "Yahwé" for "Jehovah;" (2) the substitution of the German titles of books cited for the English; (3) the use of smaller type for many sections; (4) the improvement of the phraseology in certain minor points; and (5) the omission of (*a*) the very interesting illustration of the critical methods as applied to Gen., chaps. 1-9 (pp. 517, 518); (*b*) the larger part of the discussion of feasts, including the Passover (pp. 521, 522); (*c*) the application to narratives of the conquest of Canaan (p. 523); and (*d*) the concluding paragraph in which the time and character of Ezra's work are described. The addition by Cheyne emphasizes the view that purely literary criticism is a thing of the past, since the future criticism will look to archæology and the comparative study of social customs for the material on which to base further progress. The work of Budde, Stade, and Baentsch is cited as furnishing examples of the kind of work called for. Much, it is said, is to be expected from Steuernagel and Gunkel. Attention is also called to the need of further development of Hebrew philology and textual criticism. The article, therefore, as printed in *Encyclopædia Biblica* (*a*) omits much that was illustrative in the old article; (*b*) contains nothing that is new upon the subject; but (*c*) is in better typographical form; and (*d*) exhibits the influence (*e. g.*, in the omission of the paragraph on Ezra's work) of the new views concerning the history of the restoration.

The article on Historical Literature, by Professor George F. Moore, appears to be one of the freshest and most instructive in the entire volume. Its aim is "to sketch the development of Israelitish and Jewish historiography from its beginnings down to the second century of our era." History-writing began under the stimulus of the organization of the kingdom after the overthrow of Philistine supremacy in the middle of the tenth century in Solomon's reign. The *first* form is narrative, dealing (*a*) with the great events of the preceding half-century

(*cf.* material in 2 Sam., chaps. 9–20; 1 Kings, chaps. 1, 2); (*b*) after that, with history going back to the patriarchs (*cf.* J and E in the Hexateuch), and the sources, down to Solomon, were largely oral tradition, including poems, laws, legends, myths, folklore, fable, etc., but after Solomon, probably royal and priestly documents preserved in the palace and the temple. Under the strong influence of the prophets, who interpreted all calamity as a punishment for sin, catalogued the various acts and attitudes that constituted sin, and taught that sin had existed in every generation back to the beginning, a *second* form of history-writing grows up which may be called *pragmatic*, since it introduces an interpretation of the events, showing their interdependence and causation. It also includes a rhetorical element, seen in the enlargement and embellishment of older histories and the introduction of prophetic speeches which express the thought of the author. Here belong (*a*) the deuteronomistic history of the kingdom of Judah and Israel from Solomon on, found in the books of Kings; after which (*b*) the earlier history is taken up on the same principles, as in the book of Judges, and to some extent in portions of Samuel; and (*c*) the wanderings from Horeb on, and the conquest of Canaan, are treated, as in Deut., chaps. 1–11, and the book of Joshua; but naturally the patriarchal and primæval history did not lend itself to this treatment. As a specimen of a *third* form of history-writing, we find the biography of Jeremiah (combined with his prophecies), the first and almost the only example in the extant literature. A *fourth* form, although related to the second, is that which appears in the fifth century. We may call this legalistic, priestly, or religious history, although Professor Moore does not employ these terms, and includes (*a*) that history which begins with creation and closes with a technical description of the Israelitish tribes in Canaan, called P (with P², P³, etc.), together with (*b*) the laws, which are to be regarded as an “ideal of the religious community and its worship projected into the golden age of the past, as Ezekiel’s is projected into the golden age of the future.”

We cannot, for lack of space, follow, even in this brief fashion, the treatment from this point forward, except to name in the order given the more important subjects of sections: histories combined, *i. e.*, the joining together of J and E, of J E with D and P; personal memoirs of Nehemiah and Ezra, a new type of Jewish historical literature; Aramaic chronicle, parts of which are seen in Ezra, chaps. 4–6; the Midrash of Kings, cited by the chronicler (2 Chron. 24:27; 13:22);

the books of Chronicles, an ecclesiastical history, based upon a new type of pragmatism, the religious conception being clerical rather than prophetic; popular religious stories, *e. g.*, Judith, Esther, Jonah, Ruth, Daniel; history of Asmonæans, as seen from the Palestinian point of view in 1 Maccabees, and from the Greek-speaking Jewish point of view in 2 Maccabees; Hellenistic histories of the Jewish people in the third and second centuries B. C., *e. g.*, Demetrius, Eupolemos, Artapanos, Philo, in his life of Moses and his account of the persecutions of the Jews in his own time; Justus of Tiberias, whose work is lost; Flavius Josephus; *Seder 'Olām*, a chronological outline.

In the classification of Hebrew historiography there is contained an epitome of the literature of twelve centuries; for the relation of the historical to the prophetic and legal literatures is exceedingly close. Perhaps this relationship is not as distinctly formulated as it might have been. No mention is made of the lack of influence exerted by Wisdom writers upon historiography; but the fact that the sages had no interest in the nation as such is sufficient explanation. While prophetic influence is supreme down to the destruction of Jerusalem 587 B. C., and after that the priestly or ecclesiastical, the first dominates the period of existence as a nation, the second the period of existence as a religious community or church. The sages stand out separate from and above the merely local situation, and consequently do not share in history-making. It is difficult to see how this presentation could be improved, unless it were (*a*) by some comparison, from period to period, of the contemporaneous historical literature among other nations, with a view to finding traces of the influence of such literatures (slight reference to this is given in the case of the Babylonian); and (*b*) a clearer presentation or classification of the different elements confounded as history, *e. g.*, myth, legend, folklore, story, fable, etc.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

New Testament Articles.—The articles on the New Testament in the present volume treat matters of the greatest importance, especially in the field of introduction. The work of Professor Schmiedel is naturally the center of interest, including as it does voluminous studies of the Gospels (in connection with E. A. Abbott), Galatia (in connection with W. J. Woodhouse), Galatians, and John the Son of Zebedee. Of these three papers that upon Galatians is largely a criticism of the South-Galatia theory of Professor Ramsay. Professor Schmiedel states

the two opposing views admirably, but, as one might have expected from his paper upon Acts, decides against Professor Ramsay and Luke. The Galatian churches were in North Galatia. It is not likely, however, that his arguments will convert the champions of the other view. On the contrary, his own statement of the case and his frank recognition of its merits, as well as his recognition of the difficulties inherent in his own position, will probably confirm them in their opinions. Much more important are Professor Schmiedel's two papers dealing with the four gospels. The first of these papers, *Gospels*, is prefaced by an exhaustive discussion by E. A. Abbott, in which the external evidence of the gospels is treated, with conclusions that leave the gospels little historical worth. Professor Schmiedel's treatment is independent of Professor Abbott's and really falls into two parts. The first deals with the question of the sources of the synoptists, and the second deals with their historical value. It is greatly to be regretted that the article is so written as to make it almost impossible for one to get the full position of Professor Schmiedel without laborious reading of it in its entirety, for this has already led to a misapprehension of its purpose. Any person, however, who is familiar with the critical treatment of the gospels will readily discover its excellencies as well as its defects. In the first part of the paper he has given an exhaustive and brilliant presentation of the various synoptic hypotheses, and has carried the search for sources a step farther than most current theories, deciding that it is possible to discover a stratum of sources, which lies under the sources used by the writers of our present gospels. He does not attempt any detailed presentation of what these sources are, but suggests a few which seem to him to be indubitably genuine. He mentions nine passages which he would consider as indubitably genuine, and therefore to be used in testing the other material of the synoptists, viz., Mark 3:21; 10:17; 13:32; 15:34; Matt. 12:31; and Mark 6:5; 8:12; 8:8-21; Matt. 11:5. Evidently the ground for Professor Schmiedel's certainty is the probability that no one would ever have invented them as sayings of Christ.

In his use of these too few critical certainties, however, Professor Schmiedel seems to have abandoned his method. When discussing the credibility of the gospels as they stand, instead of discussing their relation to original material, he is led off into an almost interminable discussion of the various discrepancies, some of them very minute, which appear upon comparison of the three gospels. Such a method seems most unfortunate in the light of his previous critical process.

Professor Schmiedel does not intend to leave such an impression, and in his treatment of the Johannine gospels he freely uses the synoptists as the standard of judgment. Yet, despite the fact that he does not disbelieve in the historical Jesus, he has so minimized his appreciation, and has so presented the negative side of his work, as to leave the impression that the gospels are of almost no historical worth. This we are inclined to believe to be a fault of an editorial supervision, which, though everywhere present, constantly magnifies difficulties and, at least in the New Testament field, seldom emphasizes constructive results.

The same general criticism may be passed upon Professor Schmiedel's treatment of the article upon John the Son of Zebedee, in which he discusses the Johannine literature. It is impossible in a brief review to follow him through his exhaustive discussion. He does not believe that the gospel was written either by John the son of Zebedee, or by the mysterious John the Elder of Ephesus, but rather by some unknown man of Asia Minor just before 140 A. D. As independent history it is valueless on the whole, though it contains many accurate statements of geography and chronology. It depends upon the synoptists, but as history has been rewritten to suit its own interpretation of Jesus as the Philonian Logos. The Apocalypse was certainly not written by the man who wrote the other Johannine literature, but Professor Schmiedel does not seem to be very clear as to who might have been its author. The treatment of Papias he so interprets as to make four generations of Christians, the apostles, the elders, the companions of the elders, and Papias himself. This makes some difficulty with John the Elder, who on such an interpretation of Papias would naturally be put in the same generation as the apostles; but Professor Schmiedel at this point changes his interpretation because of the impossibility of such a supposition. Partition theories also are not at all to his liking, and he criticises Wendt's position thoroughly. Altogether, his treatment of the fourth gospel is probably the strongest negative treatment which has appeared. For those who had thought that the Johannine question had been solved on the basis of external evidence the article will be most unwelcome.

The other articles, like that of Professor Cone upon James and Jude, and von Soden's rewriting of Robertson Smith's upon Hebrews, are of less importance. Naturally neither James nor Jude is regarded as of apostolic origin, and although Apollos is offered as a possible writer of Hebrews, that letter is held to have been written to some small Christian community at Rome in the time of Trajan, or possibly even Hadrian.

Other articles dealing with New Testament matters are of unequal interest. Very valuable is that by Deissmann upon Epistolary Literature, in which, after having made a distinction between the letter and the epistle, he decides that nearly all the genuine Pauline writings are distinctly of the letter rather than of the epistolary sort.

Professor Jülicher in treating Hellenism admirably combats a general tendency of today to magnify the influence of Hellenism in the New Testament, declaring that no single idea derived from a Greek source can be attributed to Jesus. Of the concessions to biblical theology, the papers upon Faith, by Professor Cheyne, and Gnosis, by Jülicher, are, like most constructive articles of the volume, of comparatively small importance, but that of Charles upon Eschatology, like all his work, is admirable. It would be difficult to find an equally succinct and serviceable compendium of the entire eschatological development of the Hebrew and Jewish people.

Two other articles may be barely mentioned. That of Professor Cheyne upon John the Baptist—whom, by the way, he persists in calling Johanan—as an article upon its subject is of comparatively little value, but characteristically Professor Cheyne finds an opportunity to amend various texts of the New Testament. Thus Luke 11:30 is so amended as to make Johanan the sign which is refused to Christ's generation. The other paper is by Professor Bruce upon Jesus, and is perhaps the greatest disappointment of the volume—all the more so because of the admirable treatment by Professor Sanday in the *Hastings Dictionary*. The article is written so vaguely as to make it almost impossible to determine what Professor Bruce's conclusions may be, and the entire treatment is so superficial and partial as to awaken a suspicion of incompleteness or severe redaction, and to arouse regret that it should have been permitted posthumously to detract from the reputation of Professor Bruce.

Thus, altogether the volume is, so far as the New Testament articles go, a companion of its predecessor. With positive constructive results its editors and writers have little interest. In the encyclopædic presentation of critical theories it is without rival; and as such will be of value to those already well versed in current discussions.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Biblical Theology.—The plan of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, as far as revealed in the first volume published, was criticised for making so little of biblical theology. While the criticism is a fair one, and the

plan is not essentially modified in the second volume, an exception is to be noted in favor of the subject of Eschatology. This subject is given fifty-five of the 1,543 columns of the volume. Other biblico-theological topics (some of which, however, can only be brought into the category by an extreme stretch of the term) occupy thirty-three more columns; so that the total space given to this important branch of biblical study is eighty-eight columns. The special topics treated of are the Eucharist, Faith, Heresy, Idolatry and Primitive Religion, Excommunication, and Gnosis. To these may be added a brief section on the subject of faith as viewed in the epistle of James. In almost every case, however, the method of treatment reminds one of archæological articles, and raises the query whether these topics were not regarded as of interest from the archæological point of view only. But if the encyclopædia is meager on the general subject of biblical theology, no one will feel inclined to complain of the method and scope of the treatment of Eschatology. Whether introduced into the volume for its mere archæological interest or made an exception to the general law followed by the editors not to include biblico-theological subjects in the *Encyclopædia*, this special topic has certainly received ample and satisfactory treatment. The scholar charged with writing on it is R. H. Charles, whose specialistic zeal in the sphere of the apocalyptic literature of the inter-testamental period is fast pushing him to the very foremost place as an authority on this subject. Professor Charles' article, as already intimated, is a satisfactory one; and yet we must take exception to his position on the origin of the religion of Israel. It appears to us that he accepts too easily the theory of Stade and Schwally to the effect that the antecedents of Yahwism in Israel are to be traced to ancestor-worship. All the reasons which he gives in support of this view have, in our judgment, been proved irrelevant to the conclusion based on them by the investigations of Frey and Grüneisen (whose work Charles does not seem to have read). Of the other articles little needs to be said. That on the subject of Faith, by Cheyne, is tantalizing, not only on account of its brevity, but also because it shows how much more could have been put into the *Encyclopædia* of fresh and suggestive discussion on this and kindred topics. The article on the Eucharist, by J. Armitage Robinson, is certainly not open to the criticism passed on the same scholar's article on Baptism in the first volume.

A. C. ZENOS.

THE MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.