



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.

contributions of scholarship at different points have made necessary a new writing of the religious history of this period. Mr. Browne has done a good piece of critically constructive work. The identity of the authorship of the Servant Songs and the rest of Isaiah, chapters 40-55, is made clear by a convincing citation of parallel passages showing unity of thought and identical phraseology. This is important for the history of religion since it puts the missionary conception of Israel's task as early at least as the latter part of the sixth century B.C. In this connection a suggestion more ingenious than convincing is made, that the difficulty of the servant Israel saving the nation Israel is solved by making the two represent the Israel of pure stock as saving the half-blooded Israel that had mingled itself with non-Hebrew peoples. It is better, however, to remove the problem entirely by a different translation of 49:6. Haggai's parable of the clean and unclean is made to refer to the participation of the Samaritans in the building of the temple which rendered the whole enterprise unclean. Isaiah, chapter 64, is interpreted as a sermon by a Samaritan prophet. In this connection, Mr. Browne's question as to the improbability of a Hebrew prophet laying the blame upon Yahweh for leading Israel astray, as is done in Isa. 63:17, is easily countered by a reference to Ezekiel where precisely that charge is made. The building of the Samaritan temple and the final schism between Jerusalem and Samaria are rightly brought down to Alexander's time. The claim that Ezra's law was Deuteronomy only does not quite fit the facts. It has long seemed to me that Ezra's reform was based upon some earlier form of the Priestly Code than that which we now have.

The proofreading is good, but a few errors have crept in. It is not quite accurate to cite Driver as dating Daniel in 300 B.C. (p. 37); see Driver's *Introduction* (1914), page 509. On page 37, "try and find" should yield place to "try to find." On pages xiii and 43, *Bibliothek* is misspelled, and on page 55, *ceiled*.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

POPULAR INTERPRETATIONS OF OLD TESTAMENT THOUGHT

Mr. Cohu has written with the distinct aim of reaching the general public. The title of his book¹ is a bit misleading, since it confines itself to the Old Testament. But the point of view is genuinely historical and the method of treatment is such as to hold the interest

¹ *The Bible and Modern Thought*. By J. R. Cohu. New York: Dutton, 1920. xii+341 pages. \$6.00.

of the educated layman. The history of Israel is briefly outlined and each Old Testament writing is considered in the light of its historical background. The author stresses not literary and formal matters, but the religious and theological ideas and practices that the literature discloses. A high degree of accuracy of statement is assured by the fact that the author's manuscript was read by Professor C. F. Burney and by Mr. C. G. Montefiore.

Of course, no man may expect to meet with approval of all his opinions, and in such a broad survey of Hebrew literature and life as this there is naturally room for much difference of opinion. For example, with a more thoroughgoing criticism of the Book of Isaiah, it is doubtful whether we could rightly call Isaiah "the most optimistic of the prophets." The treatment of Ezra and Nehemiah is not quite in line with the latest findings in that period, which has been greatly illuminated by the discovery of the Assuan papyri, some mention of which should have been made in this work. But the book as a whole is worthy of high praise. It is far ahead of most popular books in its scholarship and it may be heartily commended to the public for which it was written.

Dr. Jastrow's commentary upon one of the world's masterpieces¹ is provided with an extensive introduction and a translation which is accompanied by explanatory footnotes. The whole is addressed primarily to the non-specialist, but it presents the results of long study and is therefore of interest likewise to the specialist. The process of literary analysis is carried farther here than in any preceding study of the text of Job not even excluding that of Siegfried in the Polychrome Bible. The drama of Job is dissolved into a symposium which in its original form included only chapters 1-27 and 42:7-9, i.e., the prose prologue and epilogue and the first two cycles of the debate. Indeed, it is with reluctance that the second cycle is allowed to stand to the credit of the original book. The third cycle, chapter 28, the speeches of Elihu and the Yahweh speeches, were all added later by writers who sought to supplement the thought of the original writer in various ways. Not only so but the Elihu speeches are themselves composite and the text of the original book has been doctored by orthodox editors who sought to furnish an antidote to the skeptical tone of the original Job.

The introduction is long, but well calculated to impress upon the reader the fact of the composite character of the book as the work of many hands. The original book was an out-and-out denial of the moral order of the universe. Such a message, however, challenged the

¹ *The Book of Job*. Its origin, growth, and interpretation, together with a new translation based on a revised text. By Morris Jastrow. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1920. 369 pages. \$4.00.

minds of many Jews, and as one after another sought to enrich the discussions by his own contribution the book grew to its present dimensions and character. Finally, it was completely transformed, or at least sufficiently so that its original skepticism escaped the eye of the common reader and awaited the discovery of the modern scholar.

The translation is very free. Emendation of the text is generously indulged in, most of the corrections being taken from Ehrlich's *Randglossen*; when the text is not changed paraphrase frequently replaces translation. The objection to this is that it substitutes the author's own private interpretation for the original text. We really have before us still another addition to, or revision of, the Book of Job. This may be seen from the treatment of the famous passage 19:25 f. which is rendered thus:

Then I would know that my defender will arise,
Even though he arise in the distant future.
Only under *my* skin is this indited,
And within *my* flesh do I see these [words].

The "would know" calls for an imperfect instead of the perfect of the text. "Defender" is rather weak for the text's "avenger" or "redeemer." "Will arise" is a very free rendering of "is alive" or "lives." "Even though he arise in the distant future" is very far removed indeed from the text's "and a later one will rise upon dust." The "only under" of the next line is clearly an emendation of "and after" (or perhaps, "and behind"). The "my" in both instances is in the text and need not be italicized. "Indited" is free conjecture for the present text which is untranslatable. "Within" is a very free rendering of "from"; and "God" has been ruthlessly eliminated to make way for "these [words]." Dr. Jastrow is probably right in refusing to credit the original Job with any hope of a future life, but his conclusion is not strengthened by such methods as these.

There are many useful and illuminating suggestions in this commentary which will make it of value to scholars, but it is too subjective and speculative to be a safe guide for the unwary layman.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

IMPORTANT STUDIES IN ANCIENT PALESTINIAN RELIGION¹

This is the first of a series which ought to continue and grow more and more valuable with succeeding years. This volume contains four

¹ *The Annual of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem*. Vol. I (for 1919-20). By C. C. Torrey. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920. xiii+92 pages.