



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ראשונים, is a very useful book, and may often be applied to the Halachah. It deserves to be widely known, and it is to be hoped that the editing of the second part will be entrusted to abler hands.

JERUSALEM, *December*, 1897.

L. GRÜNHUT.

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.

Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D. (T. & T. Clark.)

It was high time for the production of a new dictionary of the Bible. Smith's Dictionary in the later parts represents the state of biblical science as it was thirty years ago, and those thirty years have seen a greater change in point of view and accumulation of material than the three preceding centuries. Assyriology and Egyptology have become exact sciences in the interim; the whole of biblical geography and archaeology has been placed upon a firm footing by actual survey and excavation; Semitic philology has come to the aid of Hebrew grammar and dictionary, while the new sciences of institutional archaeology and history of religion, though still in the stage of guess-work, have valuable suggestions to make, at least as regards method. Besides all this, English biblical scholarship has assimilated during the past quarter of a century all that is best in German work, and it may be anticipated henceforth that England will before long commence to pay back some of her debts to Germany. Indeed, the works of Cheyne, Driver, and Robertson-Smith have not been without their influence on recent German scholarship.

The new dictionary published by Messrs. Clark shows in many directions the influence of these new aids to biblical research. The physical archaeology and the geographical details show on all sides the vast strides made in these directions during the past quarter of a century, though it is but fair to add that Sir George Grove's contributions to Smith's Dictionary left little to be desired in the latter regard. The illustrations of archaeological objects are scattered rather sparsely, and even when they occur are not so clear as might be desired, and it was somewhat doubtful policy inserting them in such a form. One wonders rather what will be the appearance of the block on page 304 after a few thousand impressions have been taken from it. Indeed, throughout, what are technically known as "half-tone" blocks are very unsatisfactory. The illustrations contrast very

unfavourably with those accompanying the English edition of the Polychrome Bible. If it was not intended to include in the new dictionary a tolerably complete atlas of Bible antiquities, it was scarcely worth while introducing these somewhat inelegant extracts from such an atlas. On the other hand, the three maps included in the present volume are admirably clear, and fully up to date. Thus much advantage would have been gained by a few sketch-maps of important localities, as Damascus, and the like. A notable feature of the new dictionary is the attention paid to the obsolete words of the A. V., which are mostly treated with great care by the editor himself. Here, again, the principle of competing with the ordinary Bible Word-books may be called into question. The subject generally has its interests more from the point of view of philology than from biblical antiquities; excellent word-lists already exist, and there is not much object in multiplying parallel examples from Elizabethan writers. If, however, the task was to have been attempted of including a Bible Word-book in the Bible Dictionary, the list of selected words might have been made tolerably complete. A cursory comparison shows at once an absence of all explanation of the curious form "all to break" (Judges ix. 53); then the word "beaten," as used of oil in Exod. xxvii. 20, also deserves note, if anything like completeness in this connexion is aimed at. But why only English words? There are numerous Hebrew and Greek words on which one would like to have monographs in a Bible Dictionary, if words are to be attended to at all. Words like *αιών* or *הַכְּמָה* are as interesting to the biblical student as any obsolete form of Elizabethan English.

Another reason for objecting to the insertion of this Word-book is the fact that so much of the matter elsewhere in the book is of a highly special character, seemingly intended only for specialist students of the Bible. Much of it might indeed be described not inappropriately as "minced manual." The elaborate division of the sources under the headings of Exodus and Deuteronomy, for example, seem to have wandered away from some technical Introduction to the Old Testament, and can be but disconcerting to a reader who requires to be informed of the exact meaning of "daub." If these sections were intended for the use of biblical students in the special sense of the word, they are too short and general; if for the general reader, they are too long and special. What the editor has probably aimed at has been to cater for both classes, and one cannot help thinking that he is in the proverbial state of unstable equilibrium which a seat upon two stools confers.

So much by way of general comment on the method which has been adopted in this new attempt to summarize modern knowledge

about the Bible. One would be indeed ungrateful if one did not recognize what a large amount of new and accurate information has been placed at our disposal in these pages. The mere list of contributors is enough to indicate the high quality of the work. When we have Prof. Hommel writing upon Assyria and Babylonia, Prof. Flinders Petrie on the material remains of Semitic antiquity, Dr. Isaac Taylor upon the alphabet, Mr. Buchanan Gray on many of the proper names, Mr. Charles on Enoch, Prof. Jevons on divination, Prof. Davidson on special theological terms of the Old Testament, Colonel Conder on Palestinian Geography, and Prof. Ramsay on the Geography of Asia Minor, one must own that every attempt has been made to apply to the highest sources on most of the special topics. But one must in these pages enter a protest against the entire absence of Jewish names among the contributors to the dictionary. There are so many sides to biblical science nowadays which are strictly scientific, and therefore quite apart from any theological preconceptions, that there would be no impropriety, and indeed one would have thought special suitability, in allotting some subjects to Jewish writers. They would, at any rate, be able to contribute special information on the later development of biblical practice, which to them is still in large measure a living thing. One might mention the names of several in this country and in America, whose co-operation would have been specially valuable. Merely as a sign of the times, it would have been desirable to display in practice the common desire of Jew and Christian to reach the truth about biblical things.

After these preliminary remarks, I may perhaps indicate under a few headings a number of additions or corrections, mainly as regards the bibliographies attached to the more important articles.

Abraham.—Beer's book should have been referred to in connexion with the rabbinic traditions about Abraham, instead of the much over-rated Weber. Uncritical as Hamburger is, he also gives the facts of rabbinic tradition in tolerable fullness.

Agriculture.—Vogelstein's treatise upon the agriculture of the Mishna would have given some useful parallels closer than those from Egypt and modern Syria.

Algum Trees.—As the name of the peacocks which accompanied these from Ophir has been definitely traced to the Tamil, it seems unnecessary scepticism to doubt the identity of these trees with the Indian red sandalwood.

Alphabet.—Some notice might have been taken here of the ingenious suggestion of the Rev. C. J. Ball that the true origin of the

alphabet is not from Egypt, as De Rouge suggested, but from the Assyrian, the Archaic forms of which are at least as near the palacography of the Moabite stone as the Hieratic forms.

Altar.—The writer here is somewhat too ready to accept without criticism Robertson-Smith's views, which, it must be confessed, were very "viewy." The connexion of the altar with the blood of sacrifice is not so universally made out as Smith's hypothesis would require.

Amulets.—A reference might here be made to Brecher's treatise *Das Transcendentale im Talmud*.

Anah.—I have pointed out in my *Studies in Biblical Archaeology* that the evidence for the matriarchate among the Horites is very slight.

Angel.—Reference might have been made here to M. Schwab's elaborate list of names of angels and demons in later Jewish mysticism. More attention might also have been given to the elaborate lists in Enoch.

Anointing.—The relation between this and baptism might have been adverted to. No savage ever washes without anointing, there may therefore be some relation between the purification produced by contact with water according to all folklore, and the subsequent operation of anointing. It would have been interesting also to have discussed why extreme unction resolves itself into unction of the extremities: tips of fingers, toes, &c.

Apes.—It should have been mentioned here that the Hebrew word is identical with, and probably therefore derived from, the Sanskrit.

Apocrypha.—Reference should surely have been made here to the important fact that Sirach has now been recovered in Hebrew, and in any case Prof. Schechter's citation of the rabbinical extracts from it should have been referred to rather than Zunz's.

Art.—The interesting fact noted by Prof. Flinders Petrie that the bell and pomegranate design on the dress of the high priest was really the Egyptian pattern of a lady's dress, should have been further referred to under the former heading. At the same time Prof. Petrie does not make it clear that his suggestion is at present only a suggestion.

Astronomy and Assyriology.—Mr. Pinches' article on this subject is practically devoted to the influence of Chaldea upon Jewish astronomy, as is on the whole justified, but with regard to the Zodiac, reference should have been made to the Egyptian views which are fuller and present somewhat closer analogies.

- Atonement, Day of.*—Though a few additional items are given from the Mishna, the Talmudic references are by no means adequately taken into account in this article.
- Azazel.*—Many instructive parallels for the scape-goat are given in Andree's *Ethnographische Parallelen*.
- Baptism.*—Here again is a case where Jewish sources are very inadequately dealt with. The altogether obsolete treatment of Schneckenberger, 1829, is referred to as the leading authority on Jewish baptism.
- Benjamin.*—It is possible that the late formation of this tribe may be connected with the rise of the house of Saul, rather than that the movement for a king should have arisen in the tribe.
- Blood.*—The work of Trumbull which should have been referred to is *The Blood Covenant*, rather than his later work.
- Bridegroom's friend.*—Reference might here have been made to the widespread custom of the "best man" as being a survival of marriage by capture. Maclennan's classic treatise on marriage affords numerous examples.
- Chronicles.*—Zunz's discussion of the sources in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* should have been referred to as almost the earliest critical treatment of the subject.
- Chronology of the New Testament.*—Reference should here have been made to Mr. Torr's recent suggestion, confirmed by early Christian iconographic art, that the earlier dates refer rather to John the Baptist than to Jesus. This solves many difficulties.
- Colours.*—Delitzsch's treatment of this subject, in his work entitled *Iris*, should have been referred to and used, while with regard to the question raised by Mr. Gladstone as to the early colour sense of the Hebrews, Mr. Grant Allen's discussion on this subject in his work on *The Colour Sense* is of some importance.
- Confession.*—Here again reference to later Jewish practice might have been included with advantage.
- Day.*—Some consideration should here have been given to the Hebraic (? Semitic) conception of the beginning of the day at sunset.
- Debt.*—This was a case in which the very elaborate Talmudic legislation on the subject might have been compared with advantage. It certainly would have been desirable to mention the curious principle of the *Prosbul*, by which the debt enactments of the Jubilee were evaded. The elaborate information given by the Egibi tablets might also have been compared.

Decalogue.—In connexion with the so-called Jahwistic Decalogue, the importance attributed by Jewish custom to the tenth commandment—"Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk"—might have been referred to, as well as the possibility that the second commandment in the ordinary version was probably directed against totemism.

Demon.—Here a section is devoted to the demonology of later Judaism, but the only authority used is that of Weber, instead of Brecher and Kohut.

Dragon.—This article is almost entirely philological. Some reference should have been made to the Dragon Myths of Syria, and the interesting discussion on them prefixed by Mr. Keane to the translation of Bousset's *Antichrist Legend*.

Education.—This article deserves attention as being one of the few in which Jewish research has been adequately utilized.

These somewhat miscellaneous jottings may perhaps indicate the two chief directions in which the new Dictionary of the Bible is, in the opinion of the present writer, most deficient. The light thrown by later Jewish practice and research on biblical topics has not been adequately consulted, and, notwithstanding the influence of Robertson-Smith, the researches of comparative folklore have not been utilized as much as they might have been. On the other hand, it must be recognized that some of the contributors have used Jewish research, to some extent, while others are aware of the large volume of illustrative literature afforded by a study of savage practice and belief. It would, however, have been desirable to have made use of these two lines of research more consistently.

It is natural that in reviewing a book of this kind, attention is concentrated upon those sides in which the reviewer can see faults. The better polished facets offer no opportunity for comment, but it would be unjust to part from the book without recognizing the very high average merit of the articles, and the scrupulous fairness with which all the writers have approached a subject crammed full of difficulties, both subjective and objective; the completeness of the plan, which is at times almost excessively minute, and the general success with which the plan has so far been carried out.

JOSEPH JACOBS.