

are to be blessed. Thus has it ever been. The greatest and happiest consequences have flowed from single acts of righteousness and faith.—E. W. SHALDERS.

SOME of us are as dead to the perception of God's gracious call, just because it has been sounding on uninterruptedly, as are the dwellers by a waterfall to its unremitting voice.—A. MACLAREN.

How the revelation of God came to Abraham we do not know, but there is a charming legend known to most of us. The scene, according to Dean Stanley, is laid, sometimes in Ur, sometimes in the celebrated hill above Damascus. He gives the story in the form in which it is preserved in the Koran. "When night overshadowed him, Abraham saw a star, and said, "This is my Lord." But when the star set, he said, "I like not those who set." And when he saw the moon rising, he said, "This is my Lord." But when the moon set, he answered, "Verily, if my Lord direct me not in the right way, I shall be as one of those who err." And when he saw the sun rising, he said, "This is my Lord. This is greater than the star or moon." But when the sun went down, he said, "O my people, I am clear of these things. I turn my face to Him who hath made the heaven and the earth."

The legend becomes more impressive when we remember that on the great plains of Central Asia, from the earliest times, the heavenly hosts received worship. But however the knowledge of the one true living God came

to him, it was not a doubtful inference of his own from what he saw in the natural order of the world, or from the sovereignty of conscience. It was a revelation—not a hypothesis constructed by his own logical skill.—R. W. DALE.

#### Sermons for Reference.

- Abrahams and Montefiore, Aspects of Judaism, 241.  
 Brown (J. B.), The Home and its Relation to Man and to Society, 22.  
 Bickersteth (E.), Condensed Notes on Scripture, 1.  
 Church (R. W.), Pascal, and other Sermons, 144.  
 Driver (S.), Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament, 50.  
 Farrar (F. W.), Eternal Hope, 220.  
 Godet (F.), Biblical Studies in the Old Testament, 10.  
 Joseph (M.), The Ideal in Judaism, 152.  
 M'Cheyne (R. M.), Basket of Fragments, 163.  
 Maurice (F. D.), Patriarchs and Lawgivers, 68.  
 Mozley (J.), Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, 1.  
 Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, ii. 337.  
 Parker (J.), People's Bible, i. 192.  
 Pressensé (E. L.), The Redeemer, 24.  
 Price (A. C.), Fifty Sermons, vi. 273.  
 Roberts (W. P.), Liberalism in Religion, 178.  
 Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xliii. 301.  
 Thorne (H.), Foreshadowings of the Gospel, 22.  
 Vaughan (J.), Fifty Sermons (1874), 293.  
 Wilberforce (S.), Sermons, 165.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Dalman's 'Die Worte Jesu.'

DR. FAIRBAIRN has pointed out that the great difference between the library of a present-day theologian, as compared with one of the past generation, consists in the number of Lives of Christ, by men of all schools, tendencies, and Churches, which now abound. Younger men, who are so indebted to Farrar, Geikie, Edersheim, etc., can scarcely realize that such works are an entirely new feature in theological literature. This desire for the recovery of the historical Christ has given birth to valuable histories of New Testament

<sup>1</sup> *Die Worte Jesu.* Mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen Jüdischen Schrifttums und der Aramäischen Sprache. Erörtert von Gustaf Dalman. Band i. Einleitung und wichtige Begriffe. Nebst anhang: Messianische texte. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. Price M. 8.50. Messianische texte allein. M. .50.

times, and also, during the present decade more particularly, to a desire to know something of the actual language which Jesus spoke, and to apply modern methods to the study of contemporary Jewish literature. Several young men, ten or fifteen years ago, quite unknown to one another, seem to have been seized with a strong desire to ascertain what was the state of Jewish theology in the first century. We would like to know what of Christianity was the creation of our Lord and His apostles, and what was *appropriated* from current theological and eschatological beliefs, thus receiving the imprimatur and sanction of the founders of Christian theology. And in cases when our Lord and the Apostle Paul were in antagonism to Jewish creeds, many of us have felt that we should understand our New Testament better, if we knew what were the precise beliefs which are there opposed. To all who realize the value of these lines of investigation the appearance of Dalman's

work on *The Words of Jesus*, 'studied with regard to extra-canonical Jewish writings and the Aramaic language,' is an event of great importance. Professor Dalman favours us with a bit of autobiography, and, with a pathos which struck a deeply responsive chord in one of his readers, he describes the immense obstacles which lay in the way of anyone who, ten years ago, might be smitten with a desire to study Aramaic literature, with the wish of elucidating thereby the words of our Redeemer. No one has done so much to remove these obstacles as Professor Dalman. His *Aramaic Grammar*, published in 1894, his *Specimens of Aramaic Dialects* (1896), and his *Lexicon*, now in process of publication, will render all future students of Aramaic his debtors to an extent they can but faintly realize; and the work before us is the matured product for which this long, dreary, patient investigation of Jewish dialects and literature was deliberately undertaken.

*Die Worte Jesu* is the first of several volumes projected by our author, in which he intends to compare the teachings of Jesus with the religious beliefs which were current among His contemporaries. He confines himself in the present volume to the more 'important conceptions' and phrases which occur in the Gospels, showing in what sense they were used by Jewish writers, and comparing this with the meaning which they have in the Gospels.

Inevitably, the work has a long Introduction. The one before us is intensely interesting to the Aramaic student: less so, perhaps, to the theologian. (1) The first section restates the evidence adducible to prove that Aramaic was the vernacular of Palestine in the time of our Lord. Here he has little to add to the evidence compiled by A. Meyer in *Jesu Muttersprache*, and Th. Zahn in his *Einleitung in das N.T.*, in which last-named work the first chapter is devoted to 'the original language of the Gospel.' (2) The second section discusses the literary use of Hebrew; and claims a Hebrew original for all the pseudopigrapha, *i.e.* works written under the name of O.T. worthies; and with reference to the Book of Daniel, he advocates the remarkable view that all the first six chapters were first written in Aramaic and the last six in Hebrew. The redactor, we are told, translated 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>4</sup> into Hebrew, and chap. 7 into Aramaic. (3) He then treats of *Semitisms* in the Synoptic Gospels. He uses

this term intentionally, because he recognizes that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels were under two Semitic influences: (a) the Hebrew, underlying the Septuagint, which was the model of Jewish Greek; and (b) the Aramaic, which was the vernacular of the evangelists, and also probably the language in which the Logia were first penned. Dalman regrets that this twofold influence has not been sufficiently regarded. Schmiedel, in his new edition of *Winer's Grammar*, complains that the Aramaic ingredients of N.T. diction have not received due attention, but his distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms is untenable; and Blass, in his *Grammar*, speaks of Hebræo-Aramaic influence on the N.T. idiom, but makes no attempt to separate between the two at all; and in his *Evangelium sec. Lucam*, the so-called Aramaisms are partly just as good Hebraisms, and partly not Aramaisms at all. He complains also of lack of attention to the *Graecisms* of the Gospels; *i.e.* phrases which have no immediate Semitic equivalent, and for which the Hellenistic author is responsible. Dr. Dalman maintains that, in endeavouring to arrive at the original Aramaic form of a *logion*, one must carefully eliminate the Graecisms. This, however, would require great caution; as a free Greek translation or even paraphrase may sometimes cover a real Aramaic expression. (4) Our author then examines a few commonplace words which are due to Semitic influence, such as (a) the superfluous use of ἀφείς = 'he left,' ἤρξατο = 'he began,' and εὐθύς = 'immediately,' 'straightway,' which are pure Aramaisms; (b) the use of εἶναι with the participle for a historic tense, and the redundant use of 'he came,' 'he stood,' 'he sat down,' 'he rose,' which are found in both Aramaic and Hebrew; while (c) the use of 'and it came to pass,' 'and he spake saying,' 'he answered and said,' are pure Hebrew, and are due to the influence of the LXX, which was 'the classic' for Hellenistic Jews. Certainly they are not due to a Hebrew primitive Gospel. The distribution of these phrases among the evangelists is somewhat remarkable and unexpected. (5) Dalman next traverses the proofs assigned by Resch for a Hebrew primitive Gospel, and arrives at the conclusion repeatedly expressed by myself in the *Critical Review*, that Resch's reliance, all but exclusively, on synonyms would equally well prove an Aramaic or an Arabic urevangelium (p. 35). (6) As to an original

Aramaic Gospel, Dalman believes that the words of Jesus were first circulated in Aramaic, orally, or in written form; but seems strongly of opinion that on one but himself possesses the needful linguistic equipment for retranslating the Greek into Aramaic. He admits that the present writer was the first to open up the subject in modern times, but passes his investigations by with a curt notice, and only alludes to Wellhausen's and Nestle's retranslations from Greek into Aramaic to show that 'it is possible for scholars to be familiar with Edessene Syriac and even the Christian-Palestinian dialect' and yet be hopelessly incompetent for the task of reproducing the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord. (7) Dalman then defines the nature of the task he has undertaken in the present volume. He does not attempt to give us an Aramaic Gospel by retranslating Christ's discourses, but deems it enough that it is absolutely certain that Jesus spoke Aramaic, and that His apostles propagated His teachings in that language; and he seeks to inquire, so far as the more important conceptions and phrases of the Gospels are concerned, what words Jesus would actually employ, and what sense these words would have for Jewish hearers. He does not consider that sufficient evidence has yet been adduced for an Aramaic account of the *deeds* of Christ, as distinct from His sayings. On this point I must still venture to dissent. I am strongly of opinion that an Aramaic original lies behind the incidents of the Galilean ministry, which Mark records in common with Matthew and Luke. Dalman now presents to us a list of works on Jewish theology, but finds that almost all are sadly lacking in an independent knowledge of later Jewish literature. Charles, Ryle, and James have still a great deal to learn. Even Weber's new edition is not satisfactory. All, save only Bacher, leave us often in the lurch. In fact, one conspicuous feature of the work before us is that (with one or two exceptions) the author never alludes to the work of *any* of his predecessors with commendation. We cannot help being impressed by his erudition, but his superiority would have been more cheerfully conceded, if it had been less superciliously claimed. (8) The last chapter of the Introduction is devoted to 'the choice of dialect,' and in opposition to Nöldeke, Buhl, Cornill, and myself, he finally decides that the Palestinian Targums are not to be relied on, but that, lexically, we must rely on the vocabulary of the

Targum of Onkelos, together with the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash, as that which will yield us the precise words used by our Lord.

Having now spent more time than I intended on the Introduction, I pass on to the main body of the work, which is entitled 'Important Conceptions.' And very properly the first to be considered is 'The Kingdom of Heaven,' ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, for which the Jewish equivalent is, in Aram., מַלְכוּת דְּמַרְקָא; in Heb., מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם. In this connexion, שָׁמַיִם is always anarthrous, and therefore is merely a substitute for God, due to Jewish reverence in avoiding the Divine name; and the phrase 'the kingdom of heaven' would, on this account, be used by our Lord; and of this, 'the kingdom of God,' in Mark and Luke, would be an alteration to suit Greek readers. Dalman insists that our rendering 'kingdom of God' is misleading. An Oriental kingdom, now as in antiquity, is not a State in our sense of the word, nor a people or country viewed collectively, but a government which embraces a definite territory; and in reply to Stanton, Candlish, and Wittichen, who take the word to include the ideas both of 'reign' and 'kingdom,' he urges that the former must be tenaciously adhered to (p. 78). Ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is the *Gottesherrschaft*, 'the Divine rule,' 'the theocracy.' According to Jewish conception, this 'kingly rule' on earth began when Abraham made God known. Under Sinai, Israel submitted to the 'kingly rule,' and from that day forward its earthly presence has been in Israel. The proselyte who accepts the law takes upon himself the 'Divine rule' (מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם עָלָיו), and 'puts on the yoke of heaven.' The Jews anticipated, however, a fuller unfolding of the 'Divine rule,' in the deliverance of Israel from foreign oppression, and in the bringing of the nations to submit to the 'Divine rule.' There can be no doubt that to conceive of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ as 'the kingly rule of God,' or 'the Divine rule,' helps us to understand many passages in the Gospels more lucidly. The 'kingly rule of God' can, better than *the kingdom*, be the subject of 'joyous proclamation' (Lk 4<sup>23</sup>), of 'discourse' (Lk 9<sup>11</sup>), and of 'promise' (Ja 2<sup>6</sup>). It can 'be at hand' (Mat 4<sup>17</sup>), and 'appear' (Lk 19<sup>11</sup>). The Divine rule can be 'received as a little child' (Mk 10<sup>15</sup>), it may even be 'sought for' (Lk 12<sup>31</sup>)

and 'found' (Mat 7<sup>7</sup>), and it can certainly be 'within' us (Lk 17<sup>21</sup>). But there are other cases in which the *local* conception of a kingdom comes out more prominently, and which seem to justify the statement of Stanton (*Jewish and Christian Messiah*, pp. 217 f.): 'Kingdom includes both ideas, that of royal authority and the realm over which the king rules.' 'Reclining at meat' (*ἀνακλίνεσθαι*) (Mat 8<sup>11</sup>), 'eating bread' (Lk 14<sup>15</sup>), more naturally suggest 'in the kingdom' as a place, than 'in the kingly rule.' So also does the phrase 'the keys of the kingdom' (Mat 16<sup>19</sup>). And locality is certainly prominent, when we read of 'shutting up' (Mat 23<sup>13</sup>) and 'shutting out' (Mat 22<sup>13</sup>; Lk 13<sup>28</sup>); and of its being 'prepared' (Mat 25<sup>34</sup>). In fact, after having throughout kept uniformly to the rendering *Gottesherrschaft* = 'Divine rule' as the rendering of *βασιλεία* in all its usages, Dalman admits at the close that in the mouth of Jesus the *βασιλεία* signified 'the Divine might which ever in constant progress effects the renewal of the world, and also the renewed world, into the realm of which men can one day enter, which even now can be offered, and therefore as a good thing can be grasped and received' (p. 112). Dalman is very severe on Schnedermann for stating that Jesus did no more than adopt the popular conception of the kingship of God. The submission to the 'kingly rule' was something totally different from the daily recitation of the 'Shema' (Dt 6<sup>4</sup>). It was something essentially inner and ethical—the reign of God in the heart; and the submission of every faculty and propensity to the obedience of Christ.

II. Dalman next discusses the phrase, *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, 'the coming age' (Mk 10<sup>30</sup>). There is no certain trace of this conception in Jewish literature before the Christian era. It occurs once in Enoch (71<sup>13</sup>), but this passage is of late authorship, and the same is true of the Apoc. of Baruch. The later additions, written after the destruction of Jerusalem, contain it, but not the earlier. The oldest testimony for the use of the phrase is in Pirke Aboth, ii. 8, where Hillel says: 'He who acquires the words of the law, acquires for himself the life of the age which is to come.' The origin of the phrase is to be sought in the prophetic expression 'the day of Jehovah,' which is rendered in the Targum, 'the day which is about to come from before Jehovah.' Dalman considers also that the use of *ἡβ* in the sense of

'life-time,' 'a cycle,' 'era,' or 'age,' is due to contact with the Greek *αἰών*, either directly or through the medium of the Syriac.

III. Next, the phrase 'eternal life,' *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, receives attention. There are two equivalents for this in Jewish theology: 'the life of the age' (*ἡβ*) which is to come,' and 'the life of eternity,' *i.e.* endless life and life in the coming *æon*, are both implied. Professor Dalman maintains that the difference between Christ's conception of *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, and that of the Jews around him, was not in the conception of the life itself, but in that of the Divine rule to which the Christian must submit himself, and the 'righteousness' he must possess before he can gain the life.

IV. *The World*.—Old Testament Hebrew has no expression quite equivalent to the Greek *ὁ κόσμος*, and the use of *ἡβ* with this meaning in pre-Christian times must be gravely doubted. In the Synoptics there is only one instance in which the word *κόσμος* occurs in all the parallel passages, and that is in the phrase, 'to gain the whole world' (Mat 16<sup>26</sup>, || Mk 8<sup>36</sup>, || Lk 9<sup>25</sup>). If *κόσμος* occurs in one Gospel we usually find *κτίσις* or *ἡ οἰκουμένη* in the other. The Gospel of John uses the word frequently, and it is very common in Palestinian literature towards the close of the first century. How the word *ἡβ* took upon itself a *local* significance is difficult to know. Dalman rejects the authenticity of the saying in Pirke Aboth, assigned to Simeon the Just (fl. 280 B.C.), that '*the world* (*ἡβ*) rests on three things: the law, the ritual-service, and the bestowal of kindnesses'; but he is less decided whether Shammai may not have been the author of the statement ascribed to him in Eduyoth, i. 13: 'The *world* was created only for being fruitful and multiplying.' In Mat 19<sup>28</sup> we have the phrase *ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ* = 'in the regeneration'; for which the parallel passage (Lk 22<sup>30</sup>) gives 'in my kingdom.' The Syriac versions render this, 'in the *new world*,' or '*æon*': and this, most probably, was the original Aramaic. Eleazar of Modiim (100 A.D.) speaks of 'the new world,' and the Targum of Onkelos on Dt 32<sup>12</sup> speaks of 'the world which He is about to renew.' Jewish literature also knows of the conception of 'a new creation' in Enoch 72<sup>1</sup>, Jubilees 1<sup>29</sup>, and 4 Ezr 7<sup>75</sup>. The Midrash uses the phrase 'a new creature' of the one who repents of his sin on the day of atonement: but, in my judgment, this is a

phrase borrowed from Christianity. We have no early evidence of its use.

VI. *The Father in Heaven*.—Professor Dalman holds that Jesus derived this designation of God from common usage; the evidence adduced being as follows:—In Eccles 23<sup>4</sup> we have the phrase, ‘O Lord, Father, and God of my life.’ Jubilees 1<sup>24</sup> emphasizes the fatherly relation of God towards Israel. In Tob 13<sup>4</sup> we read, ‘He is our God and our Father,’ and in Enoch 62<sup>11</sup> pious Israelites are called ‘His sons.’ The earliest clear evidences for the phrase are a saying of Simeon Ben Jochai (130 A.D.): ‘Over a wise son not only does his father who is on earth rejoice, but also his Father who is in heaven’; and a saying of Gamaliel 11. (100 A.D.): ‘Since the beloved children provoked their Father who is in heaven, he put over them a king.’ In the fifth and sixth prayers of the Eighteen Prayers formulated about 110 A.D., Israel, in seeking for pardon, addresses God as ‘Our Father,’ and Akiba (120 A.D.) once prayed for rain with a short prayer beginning ‘Our Father and our King.’ The word אבא in the N.T. is the determinative form, and yet may be used for ‘my Father’ and ‘our Father.’

VII. *Other designations for God*.—The Mishna scrupulously avoids the use of the word ‘God,’ except in citations from the O.T., and Dalman thinks it ‘remarkable that ὁ Θεός in all the Gospels is found on the lips of Jesus.’ But is it so? Did not Jesus come to give us a new revelation of God as entering into loving fellowship with men, and would He not wish to rebuke the superstition which shrunk from using the name of God? Pious substitutes for the name of God among the Jews were: (1) the Most High (Lk 6<sup>35</sup>), (2) the Blessed (Mk 14<sup>61</sup>), (3) the Power (Mat 26<sup>64</sup>), (4) the Holy One (1 P 1<sup>15</sup>), (5) the Merciful (Eccles 50<sup>19</sup>), (6) Heaven (Lu 15<sup>18</sup>).

IX. *The Son of Man*.—This was not a popular Jewish name for the Messiah, as is evident from the question asked by the Jews in Jn 12<sup>34</sup>, ‘Who is this Son of Man?’ This was the reason why Christ adopted the name, because He wished to conceal His Messiahship at the outset, and yet to appropriate a name which in a few passages in previous literature signified, as He was conscious, none but Himself. The chief passage is Da 7<sup>13</sup>: ‘There came with the clouds of heaven (one) like a Son of Man’ (בֶּן אָדָם). It would, I venture to think, simplify this passage very much if we might

deem this ‘the *Kaph veritatis*’: ‘a veritable, real Son of Man’ (cf. Is 13<sup>6</sup> 29<sup>2</sup>, Ezk 26<sup>10</sup>). I do not remember to have met with the usage of בן in Aramaic, but if Dalman could adduce more *proof* that Da 7 has been translated into Aramaic out of Hebrew, then we might with confidence assign to בן its Hebrew significance. In the Book of Enoch, with which our Lord was probably familiar, the title ‘Son of Man’ is used to indicate the mysterious greatness of the supernatural being who never was upon earth and yet is not God. Jesus used the name to assert His claim to be the One whom Daniel spoke of, and *also*, in probable antithesis to the phrase Son of God, to indicate that He was ‘the frail child of men whom God will make Lord of the world’ in allusion to Ps 8<sup>5</sup>.

We must not now trespass further by giving the results of Dalman’s exposition of the phrases ‘Son of God,’ ‘Christ,’ and ‘Son of David.’ They are discussed with the same thoroughness as the rest. In each case our author examines the use of the phrase in Jewish writings, and compares it with the use of the same in the Gospels, giving clear expositions of the Semitic words which lie behind both. The charm of the book is not so much in the *new* citations which the author exhumes from Jewish literature. The student of Gfrörer, Weber, Stapfer, Wünsche, and Edersheim has met with most of them before. The value of the book is that—(1) with an unprecedented knowledge of Aramaic, Professor Dalman has gone direct to original sources, and one can rely absolutely on the accuracy of the translations; (2) he pays great attention to remedy what one has so often deplored in Weber, *i.e.* indifference to chronology in citing Jewish Rabbis. We wish to know the state of Jewish theology in the first Christian century, and Dalman never names a Rabbi without affixing the time at which he lived; (3) there is a masterly freshness in the way in which Jewish and Christian conceptions are compared. When the work is complete (this is marked as vol. i.), it seems likely to supersede all previous works as a reliable store-house of Jewish theology.

We must not omit to state that Professor Dalman appends to his work a list of Messianic passages in the original, culled from Jewish literature. This may be had separately.

J. T. MARSHALL.

Manchester.

## Among the Periodicals.

### The Parable of the Vineyard in Isa. v. 1-7.

IN the *Revue Biblique* of January last, PROFESSOR CERSOY of Lyons has an interesting study of Is 5<sup>1-7</sup>. He deals with (1) the prelude, (2) the literary structure of the passage, (3) the LXX version of it. We shall speak only of the first two of these points.

(1) The opening verse is usually rendered (as in A.V.) 'I will sing to (or, as in R.V.m. 'of') my beloved (*lîdîdî*) a song of my beloved (*shîrath dîdî*) touching his vineyard.' But, as Cersoy points out, there are serious objections to this rendering, although it is faithful to the Massoretic text. There is something unnatural and awkward in the notion of singing a song of the kind in question to its author. On the other hand, this objection is only partially evaded by rendering 'of or concerning my beloved,' while, further, what follows is *not* 'a song of my beloved.' On the contrary, it commences '*My beloved had a vine,*' etc. The author of a song could not have spoken of himself in this form. In other words, *dîd* and *yâdîd* do not designate one and the same person. *Dîd* in the Old Testament, besides meaning 'beloved' (as in Canticles *passim*), has the sense of 'uncle' (paternal), e.g. Lv 10<sup>4</sup> 20<sup>20</sup>, 1 S 10<sup>14</sup>. 15. 16, etc. Suppose we try this rendering here: 'I am to sing to (or touching) my beloved the song of my uncle about his vineyard.' This would certainly avoid the difficulties encountered when *dîd* and *yâdîd* are identified. But it is opposed by the circumstance that the opening words of the parable '*My beloved (yâdîd) had,*' etc., cannot be uttered except by the speaker to whom we owe the preceding 'I am to sing to (or touching) my beloved (*yâdîd*),' etc.

The conclusion from all this is clear to Cersoy, that in *dîd* we have no third person at all, the speaker and his friend the owner of the vineyard being the only two persons in view. What then? We must have to do with the word *dîdîm* 'love,' which is found only in the plural. Lowth adopted this reading and rendered 'a lovely song,' remarking that 'thus we avoid the great impropriety of making the author of the song and the person to whom it is addressed to be the same.' Lowth is followed in this by Cheyne (*The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 1884), and *Isaiah*, in the 'Polychrome Bible' ['a love song']. All that is necessary to justify it is

to suppose that a final *m* has dropped out of the Massor. text, so that we have now *dîdî* instead of an original *dîdîm*. Cersoy suggests a still simpler emendation, the substitution of the Heb. vowel *pathah* for *hireq*, thus giving rise to *dîdai* instead of *dîdî*. He thus obtains the rendering 'I am to sing to my beloved my love song' ('Je vais chanter à mon ami mon chant amical').

(2) The parable falls into four divisions. In the first of these (vv. 1<sup>b</sup>-2), which is in verse, the trouble taken by the owner of the vineyard and the ill recompense of his pains form the subject, which is unfolded in a way calculated, like many of our Lord's parables, to enlist the attention of the auditory, without at once awakening their suspicions regarding its application. Secondly, the owner of the vineyard, without any introduction, speaks directly (vv. 3-4), appealing to Jerusalem and the inhabitants of Judah to say what more he could have done for his vineyard. Thirdly, the owner announces the vengeance he is to take (vv. 5-6). It has been growing always more clear that no ordinary vineyard and no ordinary owner are in view, so that the way is now completely paved for the fourth stage (v. 7), where the prophet takes up the word and roundly declares, 'The vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel,' etc. He might have gone on to speak of the coming chastisements, but he leaves his hearers to draw the conclusion for themselves.

### Müller's 'Prophets in their Original Form.'

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1897 (pp. 413 ff.) an account was given of Professor D. H. Müller's work, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*. The views contended for by this author are examined by PROFESSOR KAUTZSCH in *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1899, Heft ii. pp. 307 ff.

The aim of Professor Müller was nothing less than to trace a fundamental inner connexion between the poetical structure exhibited in Biblical writings (not only in the Old Testament, but e.g. in Mat 6 and 7), in the cuneiform texts, in the Koran, and in the choruses of the Greek tragedians. In particular, to use the language of Mr. G. G. Bagster, 'he endeavours to prove that the Hebrew prophets used strophes like those employed in the choruses of the Greek drama, with strophe and antistrophe answering one another, yet displaying conceptive unity, perfect consonance, or else similarity of sound, while a certain rhythm supplies the

place of the strict Greek metre. It was this law of antiphony in the Hebrew text, the answering of strophe and antistrophe, which, the author says, led him to the discovery of the original, prophetic, and poetic form.'

The theory of Professor Müller has had a mixed reception. The proposition to establish a connexion between elements so disparate as those above enumerated appears to many so monstrous that they deem themselves absolved from the task of examining the arguments offered in support of it. Others have examined these, and pronounced an emphatic condemnation on the theory. Some again have been not only convinced by Professor Müller, but have been so carried away by enthusiasm for his alleged discovery that they speak of his book as 'epoch making,' and cannot estimate too highly its significance for the history of literature and even of ethnology. In view of such a conflict of opinion, our readers will be glad to hear what is the judgment pronounced by so competent an authority as Professor Kautzsch.

The starting-point of Müller's alleged discovery was Ezk 14<sup>12-23</sup> 16 f., and especially chs. 19 and 21. The phenomena observed there were then traced throughout Ezk, discovered also in Am 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, Jer 11<sup>ff.</sup>, Is 1, etc., and not only there, but in Zimmern's translation of the Babylonian Creation epos, and very markedly in different passages of the Koran. The essential mark in all these instances is the strophe structure and the antiphony ('Responion'), i.e. the correspondence also of ideas between different strophes, which is often marked by the use of the same or similarly sounding words. To quote Müller's own words, 'What the *parallelismus membrorum* is in verse, such is the "Responion" in the strophe and in the language.' Besides this, the æsthetic effect is heightened by the 'Concatenatio' and the 'Inclusio.' By the first of these terms is meant 'the connecting of the two strophic organisms by a bond in the ideas or in the form,' while the 'Inclusio' is the separating barrier from the neighbouring organism, that which gives its individual character to a strophe.

Professor Kautzsch confesses that hitherto he has always been very sceptical of all strophe theories and of most theories of rhythm in Hebrew poetry. Nor has his scepticism yielded to the arguments of Professor Müller. At the same time he readily admits that the latter has brought many valuable

facts to light. Apart from such clear cases as Am 1 f., 7 f., Is 9<sup>ff.</sup>, Ps 39, 42 f., 46, etc., with their regularly recurring refrain, Müller appears to him to have established, or at least made very probable, the presence of a similar structure in a number of other passages (for the Koran passages see Kautzsch's article). It is also worth considering whether Müller's alterations on the Massoretic text, although made in the interest of his theory, are not in some instances worthy of being accepted.

Müller has recently published a set of *Neue Beiträge* in support of his theory. These are drawn from the Song of Deborah, eight passages from the prophetic books, a number of Psalms, some chapters of Proverbs, Job, Lamentations, Sirach (chs. 39-42, the recently recovered Hebrew text, in which a considerable number of ten-lined strophes are discovered by Müller). Professor Kautzsch examines at length Müller's analysis of Ps 119, for the details of which it is only fair to refer Old Testament students to the article in *Studien u. Kritiken*.

It may be noted here, that the same number of the last-named periodical contains, amongst other items of importance, an elaborate article by Ley on the 'Ebed-Jahweh' of Deutero-Isaiah (which will be found carefully criticised in Professor König's forthcoming English work), and one by Resch on the Hebrew 'Testament of Naphtali.'

### Demonology, Magic, etc.

In the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* (Nos. 4 and 5 of the present year) PROFESSOR SCHÜRER notices a number of recent works on the above subjects. As the bearing of the ancient beliefs in these is of the utmost importance for the understanding of a good deal both of the Old Testament and the New, it may be of service to some readers to have the benefit of Schürer's guidance in regard to the literature. In the recently published third edition of that author's *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, the section dealing with magical formulæ and books (vol. iii. pp. 294-304) has been materially enlarged, and he has evidently made a special study of all recent publications in the same department.

1. Last year appeared a German translation of Lehmann's originally (1893) Danish work entitled *Aberglaube und Zauberei von den ältesten Zeiten an bis in die Gegenwart*. The primary aim of the writer is to explain the phenomena of modern

spiritualism and kindred superstitions, but he judges rightly that a psychological explanation will have far more force if preceded by a historical. Hence he gives the results of a very full examination of the beliefs in question, from the earliest times down to the present day. He distinguishes three leading forms of superstition and magic, which he traces to three main sources: (1) the popular form of belief in spirits and in magic, originating especially among the Chaldeans, proceeding from them to the Greeks and Romans, establishing itself in the Christian Church, and finally giving rise to the belief in witchcraft and to the persecution of witches; (2) the scientific Cabalistic form is of mixed Jewish-Egyptian-Arabic origin, and reached Europe through the Moors; (3) the third form is modern spiritualism, with its tinge of natural science, a belief introduced from America into Europe about the middle of the present century. Only a small quantum of the superstitious notions which have prevailed in our quarter of the world have had their original home among the European nations.

The above scheme, Schürer thinks, can be adopted only with very considerable modifications. Lehmann himself supplies a fundamental correction to it in what he says on 'Superstition and Magic among the savage nations,' and on 'the Northmen and Finns.' The influence of the Chaldees on Græco-Roman antiquity, great as it undoubtedly was, appears to Schürer to be exaggerated by Lehmann. A more comprehensive examination of the data would show, he thinks, that the belief in spirits and the magic connected therewith is to be found amongst all nations at the primitive stage of their religious beliefs and practices, and tends to survive even after a higher form of religion has gained a footing. Both amongst the Jews and the Greeks these superstitions are believed by Schürer to be considerably older than Lehmann supposes. But in general the work under review is warmly commended to all students of this obscure subject.

2. J. Weiss's articles 'Dämonen' and 'Dämonische' in the new edition of Herzog, are commended as supplying rich materials, and presenting these in the proper light for the study of the history of religion.

3. A special welcome is accorded by Schürer to Blau's *Das altjüdische Zauberveresen*, because it takes careful account of the little accessible Rabbinical

material. By '*altjüdisch*' the author understands the Talmudic period, say roughly, about the first 500 years of our era. In addition, however, to Rabbinical sources, he uses also the Greek magical papyri, which have for the most part become accessible in quite recent times. These are not, of course, Jewish, but they witness more or less to strong Jewish influences. After an introduction dealing with the belief in demons, and with magic in general, Blau treats of the prevalence of magic among the Jews. This he takes to have been extensive, and women are shown to have played an important rôle in connexion with it. He believes that it was introduced mainly from Egypt, which he holds to have been the special home of magic, as Babylonia was of astrology and soothsaying. On this last point Schürer joins issue with him, holding that all the evidence goes to show that in magical arts Babylonia could at least hold its own with Egypt. Blau goes on to speak of the 'aims and efficacy of magic' and its 'methods.' A preliminary question appears to Schürer to be this, On whom or what (God, the demons, the souls of the dead, animals, natural objects viewed as animated) is the magical influence meant to be exerted? The want of any special treatment of this question appears to him to leave a *lacuna* in Blau's treatise. Of methods, the most efficacious was the employment of the unutterable Divine name. Other formulæ and practices are described in a way that leaves little to be desired.

4. Wunsch in his *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom* has deciphered—a very difficult task—a number of lead tablets, or fragments of such, discovered at Rome in the year 1850. Some of the texts are in Latin, some in Greek, and along with them there are frequently figures scratched on the lead,—notably there occurs a figure with a human body and an ass's head. The texts are composed of imprecations intended to prevent the victory of a rival in the chariot race in the circus, for which noble end, as Schürer remarks, the demons are invoked to check and to damage the opponent and his horses. The date of the tablets is probably 390–420 A.D. The deities invoked are principally Egyptian, especially Osiris and Seth-Typhon. Wunsch here introduces what Schürer considers to be a very precarious notion about the connexion of these tablets with the Gnostic sect of the Sethians.

5. In his *Das Reich Gottes und die Dämonen*



in *der alten Kirche*, K. Müller shows admirably what immense influence the belief in demons exercised over the notions that prevailed in the early Church. So much so, that in many circles the redemption wrought by Christ was viewed as pre-eminently a deliverance from the power of the demons, a notion which, with certain modifications, still lingers on in many quarters.

6. Mr. Conybeare contributed to the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (vol. xi. 1898-99) a translation into English of the 'Testament of Solomon.' In this we are told how Solomon, at the building of the temple, summoned one after another of the most diverse demons, and gave them their work to do in the building. Schürer sees no ground for Conybeare's opinion that the present text is the Christian revision of a Jewish original, which was used by the Ophites. He commends warmly Conybeare's

former articles on 'Christian demonology' in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, viii. (1896), pp. 576 ff.; ix. (1897), pp. 59 ff., 444 ff., 581 ff.

7. Finally comes Professor T. Witton Davies's *Magic: Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and their neighbours*. On this Schürer pronounces a rather qualified judgment, finding that both the arrangement and the treatment of the subject leave a good deal to be desired. His unfavourable judgment does not, however, affect the part of the book devoted to the Old Testament, where he finds all the essential data gathered and handled scientifically, while the author's thorough acquaintance with the literature (including the German authorities) on the subject is conspicuous.

J. A. SELBIE.

*Maryculter, Aberdeen.*

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Wells of Beersheba.

THREE years ago I published in the *Revue Chrétienne* of Paris (April 1896, p. 295) an account of the visit I had made in February 1894 to the old wells of Beersheba. Your contributor, Mr. Selbie, noticed that article, and mentioned it in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of July 1896 (p. 472). Professor Driver and Dr. Trumbull wrote on the same subject in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of September 1896 (pp. 567, 568) and of November 1896 (p. 89). I may also refer to my book, *Souvenirs de Terre-Sainte* (2nd ed. 1898, p. 148).

Canon Driver's conclusion was: 'Perhaps future visitors to Beersheba will direct their attention to this point, and endeavour to number the wells and measure the distances between them more accurately.' In a letter to myself, the learned professor wrote: 'There is room for a more accurate description of the wells and determination of their number; and it is to be hoped that some traveller may before long give it to us.'

I enjoy now the privilege of being the traveller hoped for by Dr. Driver. Sojourning for the second time in the Holy Land, I of course arranged to visit Beersheba again, and went there

last Tuesday, 28th February, with my friend, Dr. Paterson of Hebron. We stayed there from 11.15 a.m. till the following morning (in 1894 I had arrived at sunset, and left shortly after sunrise). We measured accurately the wells, and inquired carefully about their number.

These are the results—

	WIDTH (DIAMETER).			DEPTH.		
	Metres.	Cm.	Ft. In.	Metres.	Cm.	Ft. In.
Western well . . .	1	65	= 5 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	13	60	= 44 7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Middle „ . . .	3	80	= 12 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	12	66	= 41 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Eastern „ . . .	2	72	= 8 11	14	72	= 48 3 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>

The distance from the western well to the middle well is 254 metres 45 cm. = 834 ft. 6 in., and from the middle well to the eastern well, 214 metres 20 cm. = 702 ft. 9 in.

The eastern well and the middle well are exactly east-west from each other. The western well is a little more south than the middle well, by 10 degrees.

Beersheba is no more the solitary and poetical place it was five years ago, as I have described it in my above-mentioned book. An enterprising sheikh of the Bedouins, Suweilim-Ibn-Arfân es-Sâkhini, belonging to the mighty tribe of the 'Azâzimeh, has started business in Beersheba, and built two *sâqiye*'s above the eastern and the middle wells (the eastern one in July 1897, and the middle one