

its later sense of "freeholder," with a melioration of meaning which is probably due to the changed social organization of the Hebrews.

To recapitulate, the reviewer accepts Alt's theory that the casuistic corpus was adopted by the Israelites from the Canaanites in the period between the Conquest and the time of Saul (p. 30). The form which the laws found in the Book of the Covenant take, however, can hardly antedate the ninth century B.C., as perhaps indicated by the use of 'Ivri in the sense proposed above. Morgenstern's discussion of the status of the *mišpāṭim* in the legal system of the Divided Kingdoms (*The Book of the Covenant, Part II, pp. 231-241*) is particularly good, and should be read as a supplement to pp. 29-33 of Alt. The reviewer, who shares with the Alt school a higher opinion of the historicity of the unique data preserved by the Chronicler than is generally held, would suggest that the corpus from which the *mišpāṭim* now preserved in the Book of the Covenant were excerpted, was drawn up in the reign of Jehoshaphat, who is said to have introduced the institution of royally appointed judiciary (II Chron. 19 5-7). The evidence adduced by Alt and the reviewer (above) seems, however, to show that there was little change either in the form or in the content of the *mišpāṭim* in the four centuries preceding the reign of Jehoshaphat (cir. 872-851).

In pp. 33-71 Alt gives a brilliant treatment of the apodictically formulated laws of the Pentateuch, which he considers as specifically Israelite. Here lies his major contribution. Alt does not attempt, of course, to exhaust the material, but simply offers a preliminary analysis of certain types of formulation, especially the participially introduced commands (Morgenstern's *hugqōth*), the curses (Deut. 27 15-26), and the "thou shalt not" commands (Morgenstern's *mišwōth*). To these he adds an important discussion of the Decalogue (Morgenstern's *devarim*). On p. 59 ff. he considers the problem of the origin of these groups of legislation, calls attention to the fact that most of them refer to religious and ethical matters with which the casuistic corpus of civil law was not concerned, and shows that this law was administered by the Levitic priests, not by elders or judges. He shows in detail how intimately the apodictic law was bound up with Israelite religious conceptions and even with religious festivals, such as the Feast of Tabernacles. In its origin the apodictic type goes back, Alt maintains, to the period of Israel's formation, before the collision between Hebrew and Canaanite culture after the Conquest. He also points out some interesting traces of the modifications which arose as a consequence of this collision of legal systems.