

the subjects of the common catechesis. We may notice a few instructive features in this passage, fewer perhaps than usual, owing to the large extent of verbal identity. Even in small details we observe the striving of St. Luke after a more correct and smooth version. In fact there is a curious parallel between the peculiar setting of Lk and the variations of the 'Alexandrian' text of the N.T. For examples of these minor alterations, observe (a) in Lk 12<sup>39</sup> (= Mt 24<sup>48</sup>) the substitution of ὥρα for φυλακῆ and the omission of the repeated ἄν; (b) in Lk 12<sup>42</sup> the more classical θεραπείας replaces the οἰκειείας of Mt 24<sup>45</sup>; (c) for the thoroughly Jewish-Christian μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν of Mt 24<sup>51</sup>, Lk has μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων (12<sup>46</sup>). And, finally, we may notice that whereas the two 'germ parables' follow one another without a break in Mt, St. Luke has supplied, as an introduction to the second, a historical setting in the question of St. Peter, 'Lord, speakest Thou this parable unto us, or even unto all?'

It would be tedious to give even a short summary of the evidence, which is contained in the whole collection of facts which we have examined, for the hypothetical scheme which we are about to put forward. But we claim for our hypothesis that it does enable us to give a rational explanation of the facts which we have reviewed.

(1) First, then, we have the oldest stratum of all, the so-called Triple Tradition, which we strongly suspect to have been, in parts at any rate, not reduced to writing, but committed to memory by catechists and catechumens. Our reason for holding this opinion is the extraordinarily fragmentary way in which pieces of the Triple Tradition are placed amid the peculiar setting of each evangelist. But, whether written or oral, we are inclined to assign a very early date to this stratum of Gospel narrative. At any rate, it assumed its final form some years before 66 A.D.

(2) Next we have an important documentary source lying behind Mt and Mk. The date of this Greek document is about the year 66 A.D. (the year which saw the first investment of Jerusalem).

(3) In the peculiar setting of Mk we have evangelical matter second to none as an authority for Christ's words and acts. If we are not mistaken, we see in this peculiar colouring of Mk the direct influence of St. Peter.

(4) The peculiar colouring of Mt reflects the feelings and judgments of the Jewish-Christian Church. It is to be dated in any case earlier than the fall of Jerusalem, but after 66 A.D.; in other words, it belongs to the period when the crisis which was beginning by the date of 'Mt, Mk' had already so far advanced as to disclose the inevitable end.

(5) Mt and Lk both draw from a Greek document which represents another stratum of the common catechesis to that revealed by the agreement of Mt, Mk, and Lk.

(6) The peculiar colouring of St. Luke is later than the destruction of Jerusalem. We are inclined to refer it to some date between 70 and 80 A.D. It is marked by a striving after the more correct Greek word, and the avoidance of not merely linguistic and grammatical but also of exegetical difficulties.

We do not pretend that a synoptic theory can be considered as proved if it is only based upon the critical study of a single chapter. But we venture to put forward our hypothesis as a tentative explanation of many of the phenomena of the Gospels. And we venture to think that, in the light of some such analysis as this, some of the difficulties which have been felt by ordinary readers in regard to the great Discourse on the Parousia will be found to be capable of a satisfactory explanation.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Holtzmann on the Synoptic Gospels and Acts.<sup>1</sup>

This is the third edition (thoroughly revised) of

<sup>1</sup> *Hand-Commentar zum N.T.* Dritte Auflage. Erste Band. Erste Abtheilung. *Die Synoptiker.* Erste Hälfte.

the first volume of the well-known *Hand-Commentar*. The parts before us include the first half of Holtzmann's commentary on the *Synoptists*

Zweite Abtheilung. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* Bearbeitet von H. J. Holtzmann. Tübingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901. London: Williams & Norgate.

(containing the introduction to the three Gospels and the notes on Mark) and that on *Acts*. It would surely have been advisable to publish the *Synoptic Gospels* together, even although *Acts* should have to be deferred. It is difficult to see what advantage has been gained, as the first half of this first part cannot be obtained without ordering the second. We will deal with the parts separately.

Holtzmann's commentary on the *Synoptic Gospels* has long since gained a wide reputation. By careful condensation he was able to pack a large amount of material within the smallest possible space. His notes are clear, acute, always scholarly. No man is entitled to speak with higher authority on the Synoptic Problem. His first work, *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, published as far back as 1863, remains a storehouse from which all investigators must draw. He belongs to the radical school of criticism; so that readers may be prepared for the most uncompromising treatment of the Gospel narratives. 'This attitude of continual protest against tradition is apt, in our view, to exercise as damaging an influence on the scientific judgment as that of the closed mind which prefers dogma to history.'

The new edition of the commentary has been entirely recast. Formerly there was a short, general introduction, dealing with the Synoptic Problem, followed by a commentary on the three Gospels taken together. In order to avoid constant reference from one Gospel to another, and at the same time to treat each on a uniform plan, the editor has now thought it advisable to prefix an elaborate introduction, in which all those sections common to the three Gospels are discussed, 'in so far as they present the same problem to literary or historical criticism.' This scheme also admits of the treatment of many matters belonging to N.T. theology. The introduction leads on to a detailed and separate exegesis of Mark (contained in this part), Matthew, and Luke. The method is admirable, avoiding the wearisome repetitions to be found in editions of such authority as, *e.g.*, that of Meyer-Weiss.

Perhaps we cannot give a better idea of Holtzmann's standpoint than by quoting from the closing paragraph of that section of his introduction which is entitled 'Results' (pp. 35-36). 'The chief value of every exegetical and critical investigation of the Synoptic Gospels consists in

the fact that it forms the indispensable preliminary to our knowledge of the life of Jesus. The theological conflict carried out in this direction may be, perhaps, briefly expressed as follows. On the one side it is presupposed that, in the composition of the Gospels, nothing save the function of the historian, in our modern sense of the term, was the regulating factor. In that case the narratives of the evangelists claim the validity of official records of bare facts. On the other side it is recognized that a second interest (we may call it . . . at one time the practical, at another the religious, at one time the dogmatic, at another even the æsthetic) has prevailed from the very beginning. The representation of our Gospels is subservient not so much to the impulse of historical knowledge as to devout feeling and edification, accompanied, at times, by apologetic and polemic tendencies in view of Jewish assumptions and reproaches (in Matthew), or by the purpose of recommending Christianity to the Roman government (in Luke), or by their interest in referring usages and arrangements of the developing ecclesiastical system back to the sayings and precepts of Jesus (in both evangelists).' At the same time, Holtzmann protests against an exaggeration of this second hypothesis, admitting that 'a kernel of information belonging to eye-witnesses is, in any case, present in the threefold Gospel narrative . . . We can definitely assert regarding the Synoptic Gospels that they even have within their framework the genuine portrait of Jesus of Nazareth, a portrait clearly discernible in its main lineaments' (p. 36). In these days of small mercies at the hands of the advanced school of N.T. criticism we ought probably to be thankful for so candid an admission as this from one of its ablest representatives, although it does far less than justice to the facts.

In comparing the new with the older edition of *Acts*, we find that large amplifications have been made. As one might expect from a scholar of Holtzmann's range and thoroughness, the references to recent literature are very complete. He acknowledges that it was impossible to make anything like a full use of the enormous mass of works relating to the Apostolic Age, and singles out several English books to which he has not referred, including McGiffert's very important contribution to this department. We should have supposed that few of the numerous works which

have appeared within recent years are so fruitful in suggestion as that of McGiffert.

Holtzmann accepts Harnack's characterization of *Acts* as 'a very ancient document of heathen Christianity developing into Catholicism' (p. 3). He decides for a date not earlier than 94 A.D., on the following (to our mind) precarious grounds:— (1) Highly probable acquaintance with Josephus; (2) conscious readjustment of passages in Galatians; (3) kinship of the whole point of view with the Pastoral Epistles; (4) unhistorical conceptions of the speaking with tongues, of the legality of Paul, of the opening of the mission to the heathen by Peter . . . ; (5) proximity in time to the literary products of a Plutarch (parallel Lives), of an Arrian and a Pausanias (works of travel); (6) atmosphere of the Catholic Church, reflecting itself in the parallelism between Peter and Paul . . . ; (7) emphasis on the political side of Christianity and connexion with the apologetic tendencies of Justin.' Some of these reasons may possess a certain weight, but, as a whole, they are good samples of the type of argument used by critics who pride themselves on their scientific method. A hasty glance reveals the lack of historic imagination which most of them involve. If the processes of history could be fitted into certain definite schemes, they might pass muster. But this constant derivation of the separate elements in 'a very ancient document' from this, that, and the other external or (supposed) contemporary influence is arbitrary and mechanical, and therefore untrue to human experience.

There are numerous points of interest both in the notes and introduction. In dealing, *e.g.*, with the conversion of Paul, Holtzmann is very candid. 'It is at all events certain that the apostle himself knows nothing of a gradual process which has drawn him closer to Christianity, but only of a sudden halt which he was compelled to make in the midst of an active career. He knows only of an instantaneous revolution, not a bridge which might have led from one bank to the other (Ph 3<sup>6-9</sup>). He looks on himself as a suddenly subdued rebel (2 Co 2<sup>14</sup>), whom God leads in triumph over the world. . . . These are unassailable personal testimonies, which corroborate the essential content of our narrative [*Acts* 9] with immense demonstrative power.' This is an instance of a refreshing freedom from

prejudice which every now and then distinguishes Holtzmann from other representatives of the same general critical standpoint. There is an admirable section on the text, in which the well-known theory of Blass is severely, and we believe with justice, criticized. On 16<sup>o</sup> we should have expected a definite reference to Professor Ramsay's South Galatian hypothesis. There is no mention of Ramsay, but we are interested to find that Holtzmann both here and on 18<sup>23</sup> rejects the supposition that the author had the Roman province of Galatia before his mind.

H. A. A. KENNEDY.

*Callander.*

### Benzinger's 'Chronicles.'

It is not every one who would care to undertake a commentary on Chronicles. The long lists and numerous genealogies look harsh and repellent. The text abounds in corruptions, some of which are beyond remedy. The labour required seems out of proportion to the result which may be hoped for. The Chronicler's treatment of Hebrew history does not display the freshness and variety of the Book of Kings, and is far more limited in scope and aim. We might therefore be tempted to deem the writer to whom this work is assigned less fortunate than most of his colleagues. Yet there is another side to the picture. Many of the lists and genealogies are parallel to those contained elsewhere in the Old Testament, and it is delightful to a genuine student to account for the discrepancies between two accounts and bring order out of chaos. Benzinger's note on 1 Ch 1<sup>35-42</sup> will serve as a specimen of the thoroughness with which he has thrown himself into the attempt. He begins with the reminder that we have before us an excerpt from Gn 36<sup>1-30</sup>, and then proceeds: 'V. 36. Instead of עֲפַי Gn has עֲפַי, LXX in both passages Σωφap: it cannot be decided which is correct. *Timna* and *Amalek* appear here as brothers, sons of Eliphaz. In Gn (36<sup>12</sup>) *Timna* is the concubine of Eliphaz, and *Amalek* is her son. The alteration is of course not accidental but intentional—an interesting evidence of the tenacity with which such variants in the genealogical

<sup>1</sup> *Die Bücher der Chronik.* Erklärt von Lic. Dr. J. Benzinger. Tübingen u. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901.

tradition have been maintained in spite of the establishment of an "official" genealogy. V. 37. The combination of the list of Horites with the genealogy of Esau is also found at Gn 36<sup>21</sup>. But, whilst v.<sup>8</sup> in that passage explains to some extent how the list comes into that connexion, no such remark is made here. Here again (see above, on v.<sup>8</sup>) we see how the glossator confines himself to the scantiest genealogical outline. V. 39. Against **הַקָּטָן** and in favour of the **הַיָּמִין** of Gn the LXX **Ἰμμαν** (**Ἰμμαν**) is both times decisive. V. 40. **עֵלָּן**, Gn **עֵלָּן**; LXX Vat. **Σωλαμ**; Luc., probably corrected after the Heb., **Ἀλοναμ**,—the latter is in favour of **עֵלָּן**. **שָׁפַי**, Gn **שָׁפַי**, is uncertain; LXX Vat. **Σοβ**, Alex. **Σωφαρ**, Luc. **Σαπφει** = Ch. V. 41. Oholibamah, the daughter of Anah (Gn 36<sup>25</sup>), is omitted; in LXX Luc. the omission is supplied. It remains uncertain whether **חַמְרָן** or **חַמְרָן** (Gn) should be read; LXX Vat. **Ἐμερων** is like the Heb., Luc. **Ἀμαδαμ** like v.<sup>40</sup>, corrected after Gn. V. 42. Not the sons of Dishon, who have already been named in v.<sup>41</sup>, but the sons of Dishan are here in place; alter, therefore, into **דִּישָׁן** as in Gn.' The following remarks on 1 Ch 6<sup>30-66</sup> are an example of comparison worked out on more general lines: 'The section contains (1) a detailed list of the priests' towns, vv.<sup>39-45</sup>; (2) a summary statement as to the number of towns belonging to the several tribes assigned to the three families of Levites, vv.<sup>46-49</sup> (on v.<sup>50</sup> see below); (3) a detailed list of all the towns of the Levites. The section is taken almost verbally from Jos 21<sup>5-40</sup>. But the arrangement there is 2, 1, 3, the only really possible one. That a rational editor should have arranged the verses in the irrational order given above is rendered all the more impossible by the fact that v.<sup>50</sup> forms the introduction to the enumeration of the priests' towns, vv.<sup>39-45</sup>! Two things only are possible: either the Chronicler reproduced the text as it is in Joshua and a later hand prefixed the priests' towns, or the Chronicler gave the list of the priests' towns *in extenso*, after Joshua, whilst a later hand took the opportunity of appending the text of Jos 21 in full. The latter supposition is the more probable, for (1) there is a shorter title for the whole, written by the Chronicler (v.<sup>50</sup>) in place of the fuller vv.<sup>3</sup> and <sup>4</sup> in Jos 21; and (2) the list of the Levites' towns has been specially corrupted in transmission, and the blunders are of a kind to indicate careless copying of the original (Jos, cf.

*e.g.* on v.<sup>56</sup>). The numerous, absolutely meaningless omissions especially point to this.' Here we have sound criticism, worth the trouble of making and worth pondering. Benzinger knows also the art of recovering from his documents fragments of historical and archæological lore. The remarks made on p. 6 concerning the lists of Caleb's descendants are excellent. We are reminded that in earlier documents the distinction between the Calebites and Israel continued to be observed even after they had been incorporated in David's kingdom (1 S 25<sup>3</sup> 27<sup>10</sup> 30<sup>29</sup>, Jos 14<sup>6</sup>, Gn 15<sup>19</sup>); in those times they were never reckoned as Israelites. But our lists show that in post-exilic times they were inscribed on the family-tree of Judah. The note on 1 Ch 2<sup>21-22</sup> is equally helpful: 'This genealogy makes Jair a member of the tribe of Judah. Elsewhere he appears as a Manassite (Nu 32<sup>41</sup>, Dt 3<sup>14</sup>). We cannot explain this as a mere variant of the legend. But there was a time when the designation of the region east of the Jordan as Judahite had a meaning—the time, that is, when Judaic colonies had settled in Gilead. It was to rescue them out of the hands of the heathen that Judas Maccabeus undertook his campaign in those districts. In those times the statement might have an intelligible meaning, whether it were that the Jews endeavoured in that way to vindicate their right to those districts—Hyrcanus I. also justified his proceedings against the Edomites by alleging that their land really belonged to the Jews—or, as is less likely, that the Jews there gave themselves out to be descendants of Jair, and made out their connexion with the Judeans by means of this genealogy.' On 1 Ch 3<sup>8</sup> there is a glimpse into the history of Jewish thought: 'At 14<sup>7</sup> in place of **אֱלִיָּדָע** there still remains the original form **בְּעֵלְיָדָע**: the LXX also witnesses to **בְּעֵל** in our passage. Hence it must have been a later age, not the Chronicler, that got rid of **בְּעֵל** in proper names.' Neither our A.V. nor R.V. would help a mere English reader to understand the note on 1 Ch 9<sup>20</sup>: 'The formula of benediction, *Yah-weh be with him*, at the mention of a holy name, corresponds with an ancient custom which is still kept up, especially amongst the Moslems.' If the text is pure and the division of verses correct, Benzinger's translation will hold good, and the analogous usage amongst the Arabs will illustrate it. But it must be admitted that **יְיָוָה עִמּוֹ** at the

end of a verse looks strange: LXX Vat. has καὶ οὗτοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, Alex. connects the יהוה with the preceding word, ἔμπροσθεν Κυρίου. One is inclined to think that the correct reading may have been יהוה לפני, though it is difficult to account for or dispose of the עמו. Whatever may be said of this passage, the reference to another Mohammedan practice on 1 Ch 2<sup>50, 51</sup> is justified: 'This reminds us strongly of the *Kunya* of the Arabs, the designation of a man as father of his first-born son.'

A commentary on Chronicles embraces some points of more general interest than those hitherto touched by us. What has it to say, e.g., about the differences between the two narratives of David's numbering the people? 'The Chronicler cannot omit this narrative which is not favourable to David, for it is the apparition of the angel on Ornan's threshing-floor and the command of Yahweh that David shall build an altar there which occasion the choice of this spot for the temple, 22<sup>1</sup>. 2 S 24 is the parallel section. But the text of that passage has not served as the Chronicler's model. The divergences are far too significant and, above all, they cannot be explained by a reference to any principle, either to the Chronicler's theology (leaving aside some exceptions) or to the desire to abbreviate. But the Chronicler does not narrate independently, from memory for instance, as though that would explain the differences. On the contrary, it is easy to see that he is here making use of a source, which he probably reproduces pretty literally, seeing that its view of the matter corresponds with his. . . . In Samuel it is God Himself who stirs up the king to sin. That is the old idea; cf. on 1 K 22<sup>19ff.</sup>; but meanwhile theology has advanced, and the figure of Satan has been laden with the burden of the origination of evil. In Zechariah (3<sup>1ff.</sup>) he is still nothing more than the accuser of man to God, similarly also in the prologue to Job, except that in the latter he takes pleasure in evil. The use of the name without the article, i.e. as a proper name, shows how well known and familiar his figure is.' Another debated question is that of Manasseh's captivity in Babylon. Benzinger writes: 'Some have wished to treat the Chronicler's narrative, which is not found in Kings, as a mere Midrash. According to his theory of retribution the long reign of the ungodly king needs to be explained by his con-

version, and his wickedness demands a corresponding punishment. But Winckler (*Alltest. Unters.* 122 f.) rightly remarks that the self-contradictory statement about the *Assyrians* carrying the king to *Babylon* cannot possibly have been invented by a later writer. But it is explained as a *fact* by the circumstance that after the fall of his brother in 647 Assurbanipal assumed the status of king of Babylon, and this compelled him to reside during some portion of every year in that city. This was connected with the insurrection of Assurbanipal's brother, Shamash-shum-ukin, who wished to make himself independent in Babylon. The Palestinian princes, probably including Manasseh, were naturally ready to support the insurrection; at all events, Manasseh refused to pay his tribute. After the fall of Shamash-shum-ukin he was called to account, and had to appear in person at Babylon to do homage. The extant Assyrian documents do not entitle us to decide positively whether this is the historical kernel of the narrative, or whether Manasseh overtly supported the insurrection so that his subsequent journey to Babylon was not a voluntary one.' This is surely a more satisfactory way of handling the subject than Kittel's (*History of the Hebrews*, ii. 378): 'Even if it were not altogether probable that the narrative originated in the necessity felt of bringing Manasseh's long and peaceful reign into harmony with the theocratic standpoint of the book, still, taking into account the well-known character of Chronicles, very few serious reasons can be advanced in favour of its historicity. Besides, it cannot be denied that the narrative possesses a striking analogy in the history of Pharaoh Necho I., who was carried away in chains to Nineveh, and was afterwards set at liberty.' No one would dispute Kittel's facts and views as here set forth; but the additional fact of which Benzinger reminds us must also be taken into account. A careful reader will not need to be told that *Jerobeam*, p. 105, is a misprint for *Josaphat*.

J. TAYLOR.

*Winchcombe.*

### Babylon and the Bible.

A VERY lively controversy seems likely to be called forth by the recently published work of Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel*. Amongst

others who have felt compelled to protest against a number of the positions there contended for, is Professor Ed. König, who has promptly come forward with a tractate entitled *Bibel und Babel* (Berlin: M. Warneck, price 80 pfennigs). Dr. König feels that the relation between the Babylonian literature and the Bible is presented by Delitzsch too much from one side, and that light and shade are unequally distributed by him.

The little work before us opens with a succinct but most interesting history of the progress of cuneiform discoveries during the past century. The author then passes to the important question of the value which the monuments possess as sources for ancient history, and of the relative weight to be assigned to them and to the O.T. records in certain instances. We need not remind our readers that Professor König is no traditionalist or 'apologist,' yet he finds it necessary to utter some cautions against treating everything that is cuneiform as therefore bearing the stamp of absolute truth. For instance, these records are, at least in a great many cases, not the originals but copies—often long removed from the archetypes. Nor can we be always certain that the narrative is unwarped by prejudices and partialities, leading now to invention, and at other times to suppression of the truth (e.g. Sennacherib's silence about the disaster that compelled him to retreat from Judah in 701 B.C.). From this point of view it is shown that the advantage lies on the side of the Hebrew records, although in such a minor point as chronological exactitude the superiority belongs to Babylon.

Perhaps the two points that will interest readers most are Dr. König's very careful examination of the ethnological relations between Babylonia and Palestine (including the cognate question whether the twelve tribes of Israel sprang from Canaanite tribes), and his comparison of the religious and ethical ideas of the respective records. Here we must refer our readers to the tractate itself, where abundant reasons are adduced for the conclusion, that 'if Babylon was the fountal source of many elements of culture found in regions nearer or more remote, religion, the final factor in all civilization, has its classical literature in the Bible.' We have very great pleasure in recommending this work of Dr. König's as at once most interesting and informing.

## The Abiding Value of the Old Testament.

It will be felt by many to be especially appropriate that at the present juncture we should have a pronouncement upon this subject by so well-known and competent an O.T. scholar as Professor Kautzsch of Halle. The work in question (*Die bleibende Bedeutung des Alten Testaments*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, price 65 pfennigs) has for its basis a lecture delivered by Dr. Kautzsch last year at the *Sächsische kirchliche Konferenz* at Chemnitz.

Passing over what our author says so well regarding the futility and misunderstanding of Social Democrat attacks upon the O.T., we come to the kernel of the discussion. We are called upon to abandon unreservedly positions that are no longer tenable (e.g. the mechanical view of inspiration which attributed inerrancy and equal value to every letter of Scripture). We have also to be careful not to press unduly arguments in favour of the O.T. based upon its value from the point of view of mere history and æsthetics. Its real abiding value must be discovered from the religious and ethical side. We feel certain that it will rejoice and reassure many of our readers to have such testimonies as the following from Professor Kautzsch:—'The abiding value of the O.T. lies above all in this, that it guarantees to us with absolute certainty the fact and the process of a divine plan and way of salvation, which found its conclusion and fulfilment in the New Covenant, in the Person and the work of Jesus Christ.'—'There is one thing which utterly refutes every attempt to trace the matter to human reflexion, every appeal to natural development, in short, every form of the evolutionist theories at present so much in vogue,—and that is Prophecy.'—'Having been for more than forty-five years occupied with the O.T. in its original text, I can testify with the utmost sincerity that anything imperfect or even repugnant attaching to the O.T. . . . has year by year shrunk to nothing in face of a deepening penetration into the overpowering phenomenon of Prophecy.' Although meant especially to be a plea for the continued use of the O.T. in schools, this brochure of Professor Kautzsch has a much wider scope, and deserves careful study by all lovers of Scripture.

### Miscellaneous.

A WELCOME is due to Professor O. Holtzmann's *Religionsgeschichtliche Vorträge* (Giessen: J. Rickers, price M.3). The volume is made up of lectures delivered by the author at Davos to a popular audience, and will be found interesting by all, and not without value even to experts. The lectures include the following range of subjects: Israel and the Prophets; The Jewish Law; The Century of Jesus Christ; The Conquest of the World by the Church; The Gospel and the Confessions.

A WORK on Confession as an ecclesiastical practice cannot fail at present to find readers. And, like many other subjects, this cannot be satisfactorily treated except from the historical standpoint. Pastor E. Fischer has accordingly commenced a work on the History of Evangelical Confession, of which the First Part has appeared, dealing with the Roman Catholic practice of Confession at the beginning of the Reformation, and describing Luther's attitude to it at the initial stage of his activity. The whole subject is treated with scholarly detail and exactness, and Pastor Fischer's work will supply a felt want, besides maintaining the reputation of Bonwetsch and Seeberg's 'Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche,' to which it belongs (*Zur Geschichte der evangelischen Beichte*, von Pastor E. Fischer, Seminaroberlehrer in Sagan; I. Die katholische Beichtpraxis bei Beginn der Reformation, und Luther's Stellung dazu in den Anfängen seiner Wirksamkeit, Leipzig: Dieterich, price M.4.50).

THE same series (Bonwetsch and Seeberg) contains a work by H. Boehmer with the startling title, 'The Forgeries of Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury' (*Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks von Canterbury*, Leipzig: Dieterich, price M.4). Before now, doubts have been expressed as to the genuineness of some of the documents involved in the inquiry before us, but Boehmer goes the length of maintaining that the whole ten Papal Privileges were either forged or falsified by Lanfranc, whose misapplied skill is supposed to have found vent also in the Canon Law and elsewhere. The argument of the book is supported by the style as well as the character of the archbishop, whose motives are examined, and on

whose behalf Boehmer declines to hear of any extenuating circumstances. It may be taken for granted that the last word has not been spoken in this controversy, but any champion of Lanfranc will have to encounter a powerful adversary.

ONE of the most interesting works we have met with on Primitive Christianity is E. von Dobschütz' *Die Urchristlichen Gemeinden* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, price M.6, bound M.7). The name of the author will be a sufficient guarantee of the thorough scholarship and accuracy of his account of the social and moral conditions of the early Christian communities. From many points of view the questions he handles have a special interest at the present time, whether one looks upon the primitive Church as our ideal or not.

After an introductory chapter on the Problem and the Sources, Professor von Dobschütz goes on to examine the state of things in the various Pauline Churches (Corinth, Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Rome). In each case the burning questions in these Churches are clearly exhibited, and a great deal of side-light is thrown upon them. Then comes a chapter on Judaistic Christianity, which is followed by one on the later Gentile Christianity (including the Churches under Pauline influence; the Johannine circle; the beginnings of Gnosis; the Churches of the period that witnessed the transition to Catholicism). Then comes a useful summary (pp. 252-263), followed by a Bibliography, and Additional Notes on various subjects, 'James the Lord's brother,' 'Slavery in Antiquity,' etc. We have said enough to show that the student of Church History will find a valuable addition to his authorities in the treatise of Professor von Dobschütz.

IT will be welcome news to many of our readers that Mr. J. Ricker of Giessen is about to publish a German edition of the work of Morris Jastrow, jun., on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. This will be practically a new work, the English edition having been thoroughly revised by the author himself, who takes full account of all more recent investigations and all texts that have been published since the English edition appeared. The Bibliography has undergone corresponding expansion. The book is to be published in some ten parts, to be completed within the present year,

and the price for the whole work will be about 15 shillings. Even those who already possess the English edition will find the new work indispensable, if they wish to be up to date; while students who have not yet made acquaintance with Jastrow may be confidently recommended to procure the forthcoming volume as *the* authority on its subject.

J. A. SELBIE.

*Maryculter, Aberdeen.*

## Among the Periodicals.

### The Book of Daniel.

PROFESSOR HOMMEL contributes to the *Theol. Literaturblatt* (28th March last) a paper on 'The Date of the Book of Daniel, and the Lunacy of Nabonidos.' The Annals of the latter monarch contain repeated notices (extending over five years) of the absence of Nabonidos from Babylon and his sojourn in Te-ma-a (Tēmâ), while his son Bel-šar-ušur (Belshazzar) with the nobles and the troops was in the land of Akkad. Hommel argues that this exile of the Babylonian king can have been due to nothing but some malady which it

was sought to conceal from the knowledge of his subjects, and which in all probability was of a mental character. The special interest of Hommel's article lies in his attempt to bring this into connexion with what the Book of Daniel relates of the lycanthropy of *Nebuchadnezzar*. It is well known that a serious difficulty is occasioned by the circumstance that in that book Belshazzar is called the son of Nebuchadnezzar, whereas there was no blood relationship whatever between them. Nabonidos, on the other hand, was the father of Belshazzar, and Hommel seeks to show reason why in Dn 2-5 we should read נבנר (Nabonidos) for נבוכדנצר (Nebuchadnezzar) everywhere except in 5<sup>2</sup>. He finds a similar error of transcription in chap. 6, where he would change Darius (ררויט) into Gobryas (גורויט). The bearing of all this upon the date of the Book of Daniel, especially if, with Hommel, one could be brought to accept of the Aramaic portions (chaps. 2-7) as part of an original work, and to look upon chaps. 8-12 as of Maccaean date, is of no little importance. But the present is not the place in which to examine the validity of his arguments.

J. A. SELBIE.

*Maryculter, Aberdeen.*

## Jacob's Route from Haran to Shechem.

BY PROFESSOR S. R. DRIVER, D.D., LITT. D., OXFORD.

OF none of the four places, Mizpah, Maḥanaim, Penuel, and Succoth, which Jacob is stated to have passed on this journey, has the name been preserved locally; and the identifications which have been proposed are in consequence entirely conjectural. From such indications as are afforded by the way in which the places are mentioned either in this narrative or elsewhere, it may be inferred that *Mizpah* was some elevated spot on the north-east of Gilead; that *Maḥanaim* was within sight of the Jordan (Gn 32<sup>10</sup>; cf. 2 S 2<sup>29</sup> 18<sup>23ff.</sup> [see 17<sup>24</sup>]), near some ford of the Jabbok (32<sup>22</sup>), and also a city of Gad, bordering closely on Manasseh (Jos 13<sup>26, 30</sup> 21<sup>38</sup>); that *Penuel* was close to the Jabbok (Gn 32<sup>22, 30f.</sup>), on higher ground than Succoth, and to the east or south-east (Jg 8<sup>5, 8</sup>, cf. v. 11); and that *Succoth* was on the route between Penuel and Shechem, which would pass most naturally over the ford ed-Dâmiyeh (a little south of the point at which the Jabbok enters the Jordan), in the

territory of Gad, and in a 'vale' (Jos 13<sup>27</sup>, Ps 60<sup>6</sup>),—presumably, therefore, in the part of the Jordan valley through which the Jabbok flows into the Jordan, and which is very fertile. The following synopsis will perhaps assist the reader to estimate the relative probability of the principal identifications that have been hypothetically proposed:—

	MERRILL.	CONDER. <sup>4</sup>	DILLMANN.
Mizpah.	Ka'at er-Rabad. <sup>1</sup>	Sûf.	An indeterminate spot on Jebel 'Ajlun.
Maḥanaim.	Suleikhat.	el-Buķe'ā. <sup>5</sup>	Undetermined.
Penuel.	Tulûl edh-Dhabab. <sup>2</sup>	Jebel 'Oshā.	Undetermined.
Succoth.	Deir 'Allā. <sup>3</sup>	Deir 'Allā.	South of the Jabbok, in the Jordan valley, on the road from es-Saḡ to the ford ed-Dâmiyeh.

<sup>1</sup> A Saracenic castle: see photographs in *Mitth. u. Nachr. des Z. D. P. V.*, 1893, p. 55f. It stands on the top of a hill, and commands a particularly fine view of the entire Jordan valley, from the lake of Gennesareth to the Dead Sea (Le Strange, in Schumacher's *Across the Jordan*, p. 286f.).

<sup>2</sup> 'The bills of gold,' so called from the yellowish metalliferous sandstone of which they are composed,—two conical hills, round which the Jabbok winds, about 6 miles east of Deir 'Allā, up the valley.