



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.

connexion it makes between the various principles, while in certain directions it adds certain bonds of union which other systems either repudiate or do not recognize at all. Thus, to take one example, the conception of Morality as Law, as I call it, or Ethicality as Legality, in Professor Lazarus's phrase, is a conception repudiated by Pauline Christianity, and yet interpenetrates the whole of Jewish life and morality. It is because Professor Lazarus's treatise brings out into due prominence these combining principles which weld together the elements of morality into a definitely Jewish system, that I regard it as of such importance in the history of Jewish speculation.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.

Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS. Vol. II. Feign—Kinsman. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899.

THE second volume of the Edinburgh *Dictionary of the Bible* carries on to the beginning of the letter K the same principles displayed in the first volume, and already commented upon in these pages. As before, special, and it would seem unnecessary, attention is paid to the English terminology of the Authorized Version. No Jewish names appear in the very extensive list of contributors, and Jewish scholarship is but slightly represented in the Bibliography in the treatment of the *Realien*, where it might be thought no sectarian influences need be feared. On the other hand, there seems to be less tendency to present what I called "minced manual" to the student; and the articles on the Hexateuch, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, are by no means so statistical as that on Exodus, though Genesis and Kings are filled with lists, the exact object and value of which it is somewhat difficult to see. The volume is distinguished, owing to the eccentricities of alphabetical arrangement, by an exceptional number of articles on the archaeology of the Old Testament: Food, Garden, Gate, Glass, Hair, Headband, Hunting, Hospitality, Jewel, and King, fall within the limits of the volume, and go over a large section of Old Testament life. It would be impertinence for any one person to profess to criticize contributions to the whole field of theology by some of the most distinguished theologians of the day. I will content myself, as on a previous occasion, with pointing to a few cases where Jewish research and Jewish conceptions are not

adequately represented in the new Bible Dictionary. A few notes, following the alphabetical order of the articles, may possibly be of use in a future revision of the Dictionary.

I must, however, make an exception in my comments on the longest, and in many ways the most important article in the volume, that devoted to "Jesus Christ," which is contributed by the Rev. Prof. Sanday, of Oxford, and runs to no less than one hundred columns. It is needless to say that Jews are interested in watching the development of Christian opinion about Jesus, both from the historical and the theological standpoint, from both of which the contrasting position held by Jews of the past and of the present forms a portion of the treatment. In particular, the alleged superiority of the Christian position, as against the so-called narrowness of the Pharisees, has been contested time after time by Jewish writers, and it is of interest to watch how far their protests have affected Christian opinion. It is pleasant to report a distinct improvement in tone in Prof. Sanday's article. In his treatment of the state of religious thought and life in Palestine at the beginning of the first century, Prof. Sanday recognizes the difficulty and delicacy of his task, and adds:—

"It is too apt to seem like an indictment of the Judaism of nineteen centuries, which not only on general grounds, but specially in view of the attitude of some Jewish apologists of the present day, a Christian theologian will be loth to bring."

And he does more than recognize the difficulty; he attempts to overcome it. While he adds a section on the darker side of contemporary Judaism—an almost necessary section, if the claims of Christianity are to be adhered to—he has by a pleasing novelty devoted a section to the brighter side of contemporary Judaism, which, according to him, consists in the fact that, after all, Judaism is a continuation of the religion of the Old Testament, that certain portions of the New Testament and of the Apocryphal literature are based on Jewish documents, and that the Talmud contains many grains of fine wheat among its chaff. We should have more confidence in Prof. Sanday's right of judgment on this latter point, if he had not allowed it to be seen that he considers Akiba's date a hundred years before the true one. Still, it is a new phenomenon for even this much to be allowed, and it is clear that the work of Mr. Montefiore in particular has exercised a beneficial influence upon current theological speculation on this point, so important to Jews. Here, as elsewhere, *la vérité est en marche*. Prof. Sanday draws attention to what he calls the "special seed-plot" of Christianity in the importance attributed to the poor in the Psalms. It is to be regretted he was not acquainted with the

work of the late M. Isidore Loeb on this subject, which would have convinced him that this was a special seed-plot for even Pharisaic Judaism. And when we come to details it is found that many conceptions hitherto claimed exclusively for Christianity are, in like measure, common to Judaism, and therefore derivative from the former religion. Even at the outset, the kingdom of God preached by John and Jesus is recognized to have been distinctively Jewish. It might have been also recognized in this section that even the supernatural surroundings of the baptism are Jewish in form: the voice from heaven corresponded to the "Daughter of the Voice," familiar in Rabbinic writings. On the other hand, in speaking of the method of Jesus, Prof. Sanday grants that the parable was derived from the Rabbis, though he naturally claims a higher value for those of Jesus. When one comes to the contents of Jesus' teaching, Prof. Sanday allows that the God-Father and the Kingdom of God are substantially Jewish conceptions, and while he denies that the latter is identical with the theocracy of the Old Testament, he is equally frank in denying that it is identical with the Christian Church of any age. According to him, its peculiar note is that of victory through suffering; but if so, the founder of Christianity is rather "Isaiah" than Jesus. Prof. Sanday owns, with considerable frankness, that there is little evidence of the doctrine of the Trinity in any utterance of Jesus, but on the other hand, he contends that it is indirectly involved in the references to God as "my Father." He takes up a similar cautious position with regard to the miracles. In his remarks upon the events of the last week of Jesus' life, Prof. Sanday is equally judicial. He does not decide either for or against the ingenious suggestion that the Last Supper was the *Seder* service, even though the first day of Passover was on the succeeding Sabbath (see *J. Q. R.*, V, 680 seq.). He states against any evidence that in the last hours the Pharisees as a party were identified with the accusation of Jesus before the Roman procurator.

With the latter part of Prof. Sanday's article, dealing with Christology rather than with Jesus, Jewish critics have less to do. To use his words:—

"They begin with the assumption that Christ was only man, and will treat all the subsequent development as reflecting the growth of the delusion by which he came to be regarded as God."

This statement by itself is sufficient to indicate the general fairness of Prof. Sanday's treatment, and how he recognizes the existence of different standpoints. His whole article is encouraging for the Jewish position towards Jesus; in many points he approaches nearer than

any previous official writer on the subject, and on the many points where Jews and Christians must necessarily disagree, he is fair enough to allow for the possibility—and one might even say, the justifiability—of such disagreement.

Reverting to the less important articles, I continue my miscellaneous annotations on the same principle as the previous instalment.

Fire.—Reference might perhaps here be made to the folk-lore uses of fire, which are not without their light on the doctrines of sacrifice and taboo generally.

Flood.—I mention this article, merely to notice with somewhat pleased surprise that the folk-lore on this subject has been adequately dealt with, thanks to Andree's work. Mr. Lang has some remarks worth calling attention to in his *Mythologie*.

Food.—This very thorough article by Prof. Macalister only uses the Talmudic information as given in Surenhusius, which is quoted in the "Amsterdam Edition"—there is no other, so far as I am aware. Reference might have been made to the rather unsatisfactory monograph of Spitzer, *Das Mahl bei den alten Hebräern*, still more to the recent work of Krengel, *Das Hausgerät der Mishnah*.

Fringes.—Reference might be here made to the fact that the knots on the fringes are made so as to represent the tetragrammaton of a *gematria*, and a comparison might perhaps have been instituted with the *quipu* of the Peruvians. The writer of the article does not seem to be aware that *talith* is a very late word, the etymology of which is still doubtful.

Galilee.—Some reference might have been made in this article to the Talmudic passages relating to the contemptuous Jewish opinion about Galileans. These are given in a convenient form in Dr. Neubauer's *Géographie du Talmud*.

Gehenna.—A curt reference to the later Jewish views on this subject might at least have been supplemented by a reference to Hamburger's article, while it is curious to find no use made of Schwally's book.

Genealogy.—This is a most valuable article, bringing together all the genealogies of the Old Testament, with a valuable Index. No discussion, however, is given on the object of the more detailed genealogies in tribal communities, as, for example, in early Wales a man's genealogy represented his title-deeds. The writer does not discuss Robertson Smith's ingenious views as to the possible early existence of exogamy, nor, under "Caleb," the

suggestion that Calebites were the totem Dog tribe. My suggestion that the additional names in 1 Esdras of the Nethinim and sons of Solomon's servants were derived from the second batch of Nethinim, has escaped the writer's notice.

Gestures.—The fact of the existence of a gesture language, common to the Orientals, might have been mentioned (see Tylor, *Early History of Mankind*).

Glass.—Dr. Loewy's paper on this subject in the *T.S.B.A.* might have been referred to.

Good, chief.—If this subject was to be at all dealt with, reference might at least have been made to Mr. Tyler's edition of Ecclesiastes, that the Greek conception of a *summum bonum* is to be found in that work.

Hair.—An opportunity has here been lost to refer to the very interesting folk-lore customs about hair, which throw light upon the Biblical passages. Wilken's tract on Hair Customs in South-east Asia was especially noteworthy.

Isaac.—Beer's *Leben Abrahams* contains many of the Rabbinic traditions about Isaac, and should have been referred to. The same remark applies to the article *Ishmael*.

From these somewhat scanty annotations it will be seen that it is not part of the plan of the new Dictionary to make any thorough use of any light which either Jewish tradition or modern folk-lore would throw upon Biblical matters. Both omissions are to be regretted. It must be allowed that neither source of information is easily accessible to the modern theologian, and perhaps, after all, neither source is indispensable for such purposes of instruction as the new Dictionary attempts to carry out. The new volume, which includes the important letter J, is fuller than the first of longer articles, and of those devoted to New Testament subjects, so that in any case the sources to which I have referred were less necessary.

Meanwhile, I should not like to leave these scattered notes without again expressing my appreciation of the thoroughness and widely-instructed scholarship with which the contributors to the Dictionary have carried out its plan, even though that plan is, in some respects, open to criticism.

JOSEPH JACOBS.