



## 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](mailto:support@jstor.org).

poets can say very foolish things. Corroborative testimony, to some extent, is furnished by *In Memoriam*, CXX, where, after expressing the opinion, "I think we are not wholly brain," the poet in the next stanza proceeds:—

"Not only cunning casts in clay:  
Let Science prove we are, and then  
What matters Science unto men,  
At least to me? I would not stay."

The last words evidently express a conditional purpose to commit suicide. And suicide, from one point of view, would be regarded, no doubt, as shaking one's fist in the face of the Eternal.

But, with respect to the genuineness of the closing verses of *Ecclesiastes*, Maurice was undoubtedly right. It has been justly said that, without these verses, the book must be regarded as aimless.

THOMAS TYLER.

### STREANE'S "ECCLESIASTES."

*Ecclesiastes; or the Preacher.* Explained by ANNESLEY W. STREANE,  
D.D. (Methuen & Co.)

THIS commentary forms part of a series entitled "The Churchman's Bible," and designed, it would appear, to include eventually the whole of the Biblical books. The General Preface informs us that, "while taking into account the latest results of critical research," it "is intended to be of service to the general reader in the practical and devotional study of Holy Scripture." The design thus set forth we need not discuss, nor is it necessary to express an opinion as to whether additional commentaries conducted in accordance therewith are really wanted. This is a matter for the authors, the general editor, and the publishers. We are here concerned with Dr. Streane's Commentary on *Ecclesiastes* as giving "results of critical research." In answer to the question which is likely to be first suggested, What opinion does he express with regard to the date of *Ecclesiastes*? the following quotations may be made:—

"The tone of the book and the character of its teaching not only suggest the period when the Persian Empire had been overthrown, and Alexander the Great's successors had established Greek culture throughout the civilized world, but also bear distinct traces of Stoic and Epicurean philosophy, . . . in particular, of Epicurean philosophy,

and thus they tend to determine a date not earlier than the Greek period aforesaid.

“It is difficult to go further than this with any certainty. It would seem probable, however, that the writer of the apocryphal book *Ecclesiasticus*, the composition of which may be placed with confidence *circ.* 180 B. C., was acquainted with the book *Koheleth*. Various parallelisms between the two have been noted, and it appears from internal evidence that the borrowing was on the part of *Ecclesiasticus*, rather than the converse.”

It is not unlikely that the reader is acquainted with the argument employed for the first time by the writer of this notice to determine approximately the date of *Ecclesiastes*, in a pamphlet entitled *Some New Evidence as to the Date of Ecclesiastes* (1872), and subsequently in the Introduction to his Commentary on *Ecclesiastes* (of which a new edition has lately appeared). The argument was derived, on the one hand, from the indications of Stoic and Epicurean philosophy in the book, and, on the other, from the apparent use of *Ecclesiastes* by the author of *Ecclesiasticus*. Dr. Streane, I find, makes no acknowledgment of his indebtedness to what I had written, though there is evidence which could be adduced, if it were worth while, sufficient to show that his knowledge was obtained directly and not at second hand. He makes, indeed, not infrequent reference to other writers, when, in some cases, there would seem to be little, if any, necessity for such reference. The translation of *Ecclesiastes* which is given is that of the Authorized Version, with foot-notes containing “such corrections as are deemed necessary to bring out the sense.” A few verses may be given, incorporating the “corrections” :—

“[There is]<sup>1</sup> no man that hath power over the wind to retain the wind; neither is there a ruler in the day of death: and [there is] no discharge in [that] war; neither shall wickedness deliver its masters” (viii. 8).

“And so I have seen the wicked buried, and they went their way, and men have departed from the holy place, and they were forgotten in the city where they had lived righteously” (viii. 10)<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> To avoid misunderstanding square brackets are used instead of the italics of A. V.

<sup>2</sup> It is, however, fair to Dr. Streane to give an explanation which he adds: “Both honour and oblivion have been misplaced. Evil men have received a stately burial, and been gathered to their fathers with all due observances. On the contrary, men who had lived virtuously have been dishonoured, expelled from the Temple and the Holy City, and dismissed from the minds even of those among whom their good deeds have been

“Death-carrying flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour : heavier than wisdom [and] honour is a little folly” (x. 1).

“Surely the serpent will bite without enchantment; and there is no profit in a master of tongue” (x. 11).

The absurdities in the verses thus translated need not be specially pointed out. No doubt many absurdities have been previously perpetrated in connexion with Ecclesiastes; but it is easy to believe that these “corrections,” as well as some others, are in general really and truly Dr. Streane’s own, *certa domini signata figura*.

THOMAS TYLER.

#### DE PAVLY’S “BABYLONIAN TALMUD.”

*Le Talmud de Babylone, texte complet conforme à la première édition de Daniel Bomberg (Venise 1520) . . . accompagné des principaux commentaires et synthétiquement traduit par JEAN DE PAVLY, Docteur-ès-lettres, Ancien Professeur à l’école du Sacré-Cœur de Lyon.*

THIS is one of the books against which it seems to be one’s duty to protest. On examining it for the Bodleian Library I was struck by the evident disagreement between its contents and the promise apparently held out by the title, if words mean anything. What is meant by “*synthetically* translated?” The editor says in his preface: “Quant à la traduction française dont je fais accompagner la présente édition, sans aspirer au titre de parfaite, elle peut, sans contester, revendiquer celui de première et de complète.” After this one is more than mildly surprised to find what is the actual state of the case. There is, as a matter of fact, no translation, as people ordinarily understand the term, but a more or less thorough *analysis* in French prefixed to *some* of the tractates. This is fairly full for Bérakhoth and Shabbath, less so for Erubhin, Pesahim, and Sheqalim, while the “translations” of Babha Qama and B. Bathra occupy less than two pages each, that of ‘Abhodah Zarah less than a page, and there is none at all for Zebhahim, Menaḥoth, Ḥullin, Bekhoroth, ‘Arakhin, Temurah, Kerithoth, Me’ilah, Tamid, nor for the smaller tractates. Moreover, the text is not “complete,” for the Mishna tractates which have no Gemara are altogether omitted. The

done.” Whether this explanation suffices to remove absurdity from the translation the reader can decide for himself.