

present form is probably not more than a hundred years older than the time of the Maccabees (see Moore and Budde *in loc.*).¹ But how was it that the translator stumbled over so simple an expression? My conjecture is either that the final ת of עִירָה had been dropped in his copy of the original, or *was indicated by a contraction which he overlooked.*² The remaining letters making no sense, the whole expression was understood as the name of a locality, and rendered 'עִיר

¹ The N.T. use of the phrase, 'people of God,' will occur to everyone (He 11²⁵, of Israel; 4⁹, 2 P 2¹⁰, of the Christian Church).

² For the neglect of a contraction as a *vera causa* of textual corruption, see Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zu d. griech. Uebersetzg. d. Proverbien*, p. 4; Merx, *Hist.*, p. lxi.

'*Ἀσαραμὲλ.*' The main objection to the reading now proposed lies in the mention of λαοῦ, the people, in the very next clause, where, however, it may denote, as Grimm suggests, the laity as opposed to the priests. In this case 'the people of God' would be an appropriate general term for the whole community of Israel. It is difficult to decide between the two restorations of the Hebrew original now submitted. On the whole, I am inclined to prefer the first 'in the court of Israel,' as supplying the desiderated indication of locality, and as being less evident than the other, for simplicity is not always a recommendation of a restored reading of a Hebrew text.

A. R. S. KENNEDY.

Edinburgh University.

The Oxford Hexateuch.¹

BY REV. J. A. SELBIE, M.A., MARYCULTER.

ONE of the surest indications that many of the results of the so-called 'higher' criticism are now widely recognized as relatively final is to be found in the increasing number of publications intended to place these results not only before scholars but also before non-professional students of the Old Testament. Above all, does this remark apply to the results that have been reached by the literary criticism of the Hexateuch. Much has been done both for German and for English readers since the publication of Kautzsch and Socin's well-known *Genesis*. We need recall only the works of Fripp (*Genesis*), Addis (*The Documents of the Hexateuch*), Kautzsch (*A.T.*), not to speak of the *Polychrome Bible* now in course of publication. So far as we are aware, no Hebrew scholar, now that Professor Green of Princeton has passed away, disputes the presence of different documents in the Hexateuch or the possibility of distinguishing, at least in their broad outlines, between these. The only differ-

ence of opinion relates to the details of the analysis.

The work before us is the most important of its kind that has as yet appeared in English. It consists of two volumes. The first contains an Introduction to the Hexateuch, and Tabular Appendices, of which A gives a very complete and useful list of words and phrases characteristic of (1) the Prophetic narrators, JE, (2) the Deuteronomistic school, D, (3) the Priestly Law and History Book, P; B gives a tabulated comparison of the three sources as regards Laws and Institutions; while C contains an Analysis and Conspectus of the Hexateuch. The second volume contains the Text and Notes, the latter being of course mainly engaged with points of literary criticism.

The work, we are told, was first executed by a small Committee appointed by the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford, in 1891. The original members were G. Harford-Battersby (to whom we owe the very careful and elaborate articles 'Exodus,' 'Leviticus,' and 'Numbers' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*), J. E. Carpenter (best known perhaps by his work *The First Three Gospels*), E. I. Fripp (author of *The Composition of the Book of Genesis*), C. G. Montefiore (of the

¹ *The Hexateuch, according to the Revised Version, arranged in its constituent documents, by Members of the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Marginal References, and Synoptical Tables, by J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A. (Lond.), and G. Harford-Battersby, M.A. (Oxon.). London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1900. Two vols., price 36s. net.

Jewish Quarterly Review), and W. B. Selbie (then Tutor in Mansfield College, Oxford), with Professor Cheyne for consultative reference in special matters. The place of Mr. Selbie, when he left Oxford, was taken by G. Buchanan Gray (author of the well-known and extremely valuable *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*), and the Committee obtained also the co-operation of Professor W. H. Bennett. The work of analysis, we are not surprised to hear, occupied about three years, another year was devoted to revising the results, and then the preparing of the work for the press, in which an earnest endeavour was made to keep pace up to the very last with the advance of critical literature, was entrusted to Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Harford-Battersby. The two editors accept a joint responsibility for the arrangement of the text and the substance of the notes. The Introduction in vol. i. (with the exception of chap. xv. contributed by Professor Cheyne) is the work of Mr. Carpenter, who also prepared the notes, word-lists, and marginal references, having the aid of draft lists for J and E and of notes on Leviticus and the early chapters of Numbers placed at his disposal by Mr. Harford-Battersby. The latter compiled the Tables of Laws and Institutions, and the Synopsis of Narratives. The whole work has been read either in MS. or in proof by Mr. G. Buchanan Gray, to whom the Editors own their indebtedness for many useful suggestions. The text employed is that of the Revised Version, except that, with the sanction of the Delegates of the University Press, a few changes have been introduced, such as the substitution of 'Yahweh' for 'the LORD,' and the occasional transposition of phrases which there was reason to think had become detached from their true context in the processes of editorial compilation.

The names cited above are an amply sufficient guarantee for the quality of the work contained in the two volumes, which will be everywhere recognized as highly creditable to English scholarship. The general standpoint of the authors is that of Dr. Driver's *Introduction*, although the analysis is deliberately carried out much more minutely than is done in that standard work. We may be permitted to doubt the wisdom of this last action. It is quite possible to agree with the authors in their admiration for B. W. Bacon's *The Genesis of Genesis* and *The Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, and yet to question whether for English

readers, to some of whom at least this will be practically a pioneer work, a less elaborate analysis would not have been more opportune at present. No doubt the value of the work is increased for scholars, but may it not be lowered for non-experts? When we take into account, further, the unavoidably complicated notation whereby the sources are indicated, and the sloth that so frequently characterizes human nature, we confess to a fear that only earnest and patient students (and these are all too few) will face the task of mastering the system. No doubt all these considerations have been present, however, to the minds of the authors, and our misgivings may be unfounded. While we are in this carping mood, it may be as well to notice another point. Was there any good reason for omitting marks of abbreviation where these are usually inserted? After considerable experience ourselves, we hold pretty strongly that, except in the names of books of Scripture (e.g. Gn, Ex, etc.) or in symbols (such as *LOT* for Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*) which cannot be mistaken, it is a mistake to abbreviate without indicating that it is done. We object even to 'cp' for 'cp.', and there is a decidedly unsatisfactory appearance about 'Clem Strom', 'De Cult Fem', 'Clem Hom', etc. It is even worse when the words abbreviated are Greek or German. Especially inexcusable does this practice appear to us when there is no need to save space, and when, as a matter of fact, space is often not saved. We trust also that, when a second edition of the work is called for, a very full Index will conclude the second volume, as an excellent Table of Contents opens the first.

The opening chapter of vol. i. dealing with 'Criticism and the Old Testament' is calculated to be of extreme value to those who with their modern notions have no conception of how documents were treated in ancient times, and who accordingly are staggered by what critics tell them about the various strata found in the Hexateuch, and the processes of revision and interpolation that can be detected. The critical position is supported in the Introduction by analogies drawn from (α) Asser's *Life of Alfred: the Saxon Chronicle*; (β) Early English Laws; (γ) Buddhist and Brahmanical sacred literatures; (δ) the *Diatessaron* of Tatian; (ε) the *Books of Chronicles*. By the way, in this valuable discussion either we misunderstand one remark or the author has

been guilty of an oversight. Under (β) he cites from 'Alfred's Dooms' a passage containing the apostolic letter of Ac 15²³⁻²⁹, which, he says, has 'an interesting addition of his (Alfred's) own'—

It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us that we should set no burthen upon you above that which it was needful for you to bear; now that is that ye forbear from worshipping idols, and from tasting blood or things strangled, and from fornications; and that which ye will that other men do not unto you, do ye not that to other men. From this one doom a man may remember that he judge every one righteously; he need heed no other doom-book. Let him remember that he adjudge to no man that which he would not that he should adjudge to him, if he sought judgment against him.

Something here calls for explanation. The italics above are Mr. Carpenter's own, implying apparently that the whole passage italicized is the king's own addition to the apostolic letter. But while the original decree in the Acts did not contain the negative form of the Golden Rule given above, and while the hortatory expansion beginning 'From this one doom' is doubtless an addition of Alfred's, the practice of adding the Golden Rule to the Apostolic Decree or substituting it for some of the enactments of the latter, is very much earlier, actually appearing in the Western Text of Ac 15²⁰ (see Harnack in *Sitzungsberichte d. königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin* [Philos.-histor. Classe], 2nd March 1899, and cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June 1899, p. 395 f.). It is inconceivable that Mr. Carpenter is unaware of this, but his language tends to convey a wrong impression.

We turn from these minor points to the many admirable features of this great work. We have nothing but unstinted praise for the account given of the Rise of Historical Criticism and the gradual evolution of opinion regarding the documents until the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis came to hold the field. It is hardly necessary to say that Mr. Carpenter ascribes to D the priority over P, and there are not wanting indications that this will come to be the universal opinion of scholars. Even so high an authority as Baudissin holds the opposite view with such restrictions and explanations that the difference between him and the great majority of critics is reduced to infinitesimal dimensions.—The history of the discovery of the Law-book by Hilkiiah is discussed in a way that leaves nothing to be desired. We confess to

sharing Mr. Carpenter's difficulties about ascribing the book to the reign of Manasseh rather than Josiah, and we think he hits the situation exactly in what he says about Hilkiiah.—The question of the priority of J to E or of E to J is discussed in full detail, as well as the supposed connexion of these sources with the Judæan or the Ephraimite kingdom respectively.—We are thoroughly at one also with the author in his remark that as to Gn 14 'nothing has yet refuted the suggestion of Meyer (*Gesch. d. Alterthums*, i. 166) and Tiele (*Bab.-Assyr. Gesch.* 1886, p. 123) that a Hebrew author may have utilized a tradition first learned in Babylon to glorify the great ancestor of Israel.'

The special chapter (xv.) on 'Criticism and Archæology,' by Professor Cheyne, cannot be too highly commended. Of Professor Cheyne's scholarship and thorough acquaintance with any subject upon which he might choose to write, no one would be likely to entertain a doubt. But not a few are known to us to cherish the suspicion that 'extreme' views have too great an attraction for him, and that he is only too ready to set aside ancient tradition. Certainly in the chapter before us Professor Cheyne says nothing to justify any such suspicion. It is all the other way. Nowhere, in fact, have we met with a more successful effort to do justice alike to criticism and archæology, and to avoid the error at once of those extreme critics who ignore or disparage archæological discoveries, and of those unscholarly archæologists (we name no names) who look upon criticism as worse than folly. We feel that either praise or blame from us to Professor Cheyne savours of presumption, but perhaps he will allow us to say that we have read nothing from his pen with more satisfaction than this chapter.

We trust, then, that this great work, prepared with so much labour and at so great expense, will have the success it merits. It can scarcely fail to be for long to come the standard English authority on the important subject with which it deals.