

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 (דרייז) into Gobryas (גוריז). 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 Macca-bæan 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-Buḳe'ā. <sup>5</sup>	Undetermined.
Penuel.	Tulûl edh-Dhabab. <sup>2</sup>	Jebel 'Oshâ.	Undetermined.
Succoth.	Deir 'Allâ. <sup>3</sup>	Deir 'Allâ.	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 'Allâ, up the valley.

All these places, except Suleikhat, as well as the routes and fords mentioned in the following remarks, are shown on G. A. Smith's large *Topographical Map of Palestine*. The reader will also be able to follow the argument with the help of the Map of Gilead in the *Enc. Bibl.* ii. s.v., or even with the shilling Map of Palestine in Murray's *Classical Maps* (both of which indicate the elevations by shadings). Suleikhat, according to Merrill's description, is in the higher part of the W. Suleikhat, 3 miles north of the W. 'Ajlun, and a mile east of the road through the Ghôr from Beisan to the south; it would therefore in G. A. Smith's Map be in the second wady north of W. 'Ajlun, a little below the figure '500.' At the spot indicated there are considerable ruins, standing some 300 ft. above the plain, and commanding an extensive view of the Jordan valley; the site therefore, it is argued, if adopted for Maḥanaim, would well suit the conditions of the narrative in 2 S 18 (see Hastings' *D.B.* s.v.).

On the topography of the Jabboḳ valley, the article of Professor J. A. Paine, 'Succoth and Penuel not yet identified,' in the *Bibl. Sacra*, 1878, pp. 481-98, should especially be consulted. This article is mainly a criticism—and, so far as one who has not personally visited the locality can judge, a conclusive criticism—of an article by Merrill in the same periodical, 1877, pp. 742 ff., in which sites are proposed for these two places. Professor Paine describes the region about the Jabboḳ minutely, with a sketch-map (p. 483), examines Merrill's identifications from the point of view of both topography and philology, and (if his descriptions may be assumed to be correct) shows convincingly that they cannot be sustained. As regards the lower course of the Jabboḳ valley, there is a remarkable conflict of testimony: while Merrill (pp. 748-50) speaks of it as the 'main thoroughfare to the east' with 'a good and easy road,' Professor Paine declares emphatically that there is practically no road through it whatever from the ford ez-Zubliyah, a little south of Jerash,

<sup>3</sup> Succoth is said in the Talm. to have been called in later times *Tar alah*, or *Dar'alah*; but it is very doubtful whether, as Merrill thinks, Deir 'Allā has any connexion with this; for *Deir* is a Syriac and Arabic word (common in names of places) meaning 'monastery,' which there is no reason whatever for seeing in the *Tar-* or *Dar-* (without the *yod*) of the Talm. name. Cf. Paine, p. 492 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> *Heth and Moab*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 181-186; Smith, *D.B.*<sup>2</sup> s.v. GILEAD, p. 1192.

<sup>5</sup> A depressed plain (*Buḳei'a* is the dimin. of *ḥayyā*), surrounded by sandstone and limestone ridges (*Heth and Moab*, 186). Corder (Smith, *D.B.*<sup>2</sup> 1192<sup>a</sup>) thinks that the name *Maḥanaim* still survives in *Mukmah* (?) on the W. edge of this.

till it enters the Jordan valley, some 10 miles lower down; the stream rushes along swiftly, at the bottom of a deep chasm like a *cañon*, with very lofty and precipitous banks,<sup>1</sup> fringed by tall canes and rushes, and with no road or passage along either side, except, as it seems, rough paths through the jungle, the best of which is a rocky and perilous bridle-path, on the face of the bluff on the north side, along which Professor Paine found himself frequently obliged to dismount (p. 489 f.). The real ancient thoroughfare in these parts from west to east, says Professor Paine, is a well-marked Roman road (not shown on G. A. Smith's Map), leading up from Deir 'Allā, past Shihan and Mukmah to 'Ammān. Professor Paine's statements certainly produce upon the reader the impression that they are accurate; it is difficult to think that he could have come forward to contradict Merrill as categorically as he does, without the assurance that he was on firm ground in doing so.

It is probable that the 'Mizpah' of Gn 31<sup>49</sup> was further to the north or north-east than either Kal'at er-Rabaḳ or Sûf (for it seems to mark the border in these parts between Israelitish and Aramæan territory): but that hardly affects the main question; Jacob will in any case have approached the region of the Jabboḳ from the north or north-east. To consider, then, Merrill's route first. If Jacob passed by (or near) Suleikhat, he will naturally have come down to it by the route passing north and south along the Ghôr<sup>2</sup>; but a glance at the map will show how improbable it is that, having reached the neighbourhood of Deir 'Allā, he should then, if his goal were the ford ed-Dâmiyah, have made a *détour* of 6 miles to the east, up the valley of the Jabboḳ, to Tulûl edh-Dhabab (= Penuel), and then back again,—crossing the stream (Gn 32<sup>22</sup>) as he returned, and afterwards, of course, recrossing it, to Deir 'Allā (= Succoth), in order then to resume his journey to ed-Dâmiyah. Moreover, if Tulûl edh-Dhabab is Penuel, it must have been useless either for the Midianites to take flight up to it, or for Gideon to pursue them; for, as has been shown, according to Professor Paine, the banks of the stream for some 10 miles above Tulûl

<sup>1</sup> Similarly Thomson, *Land and Book*, iii. 584: 'The gorge of the Zerka is exceedingly wild and picturesque; and the cliffs rise almost perpendicularly to a great height on either side.'

<sup>2</sup> The route straight down from Ra'at er-Rabaḳ would have led him to the head of the W. 'Ajlun, not into the W. Suleikhat.

edh-Dhahab, as far as the ford *ez-Zubliyah*, are so lofty and precipitous as to be virtually impassable on either side. It thus seems impossible that Tulûl edh-Dhahab can really be the ancient Penuel.

Conder's localization of Maḥanaim and Penuel brings Jacob by an entirely different route. Passing through Gerasa, he will have crossed the Jabbok by the ford *ez-Zubliyah* (on G. A. Smith's Map, just north of el-Mastabeh); pursuing the route southwards he will have climbed from the level of the Jabbok (between 500 and 1000 ft.), 1000 ft. or more, up to el-Buḳei'a<sup>1</sup> (2000 ft.); then turning off to the west, at a point not clearly indicated, but perhaps at Jogbehah, he will have climbed 1200-1500 ft. more, past es-Salṭ, till he reached Jebel 'Oshā (3597 ft.), then—though, if his goal was ed-Dāmiyeh, the shorter and more obvious route would have been for him to go straight down to it from es-Salṭ (see the route in G. A. Smith's Map)—going on in a north-westerly direction he will have come down to the Jabbok, have crossed it at about one mile south-east of Deir 'Allā, afterwards, turning southwards along the Ghôr route, he will have crossed it again in order to reach the ford ed-Dāmiyeh. Can this extremely circuitous route of journeying from any part of the Jebel 'Ajlun to ed-Dāmiyeh be deemed probable? Is it likely that Jacob would have gone, with his numerous flocks and herds, up and down these lofty mountains? Let it also be remembered that el-Buḳei'a (= Maḥanaim, upon this hypothesis), so far from being 'near' either the Jordan or the Jabbok, is 20 miles from the former river and 8 from the latter, while even Jebel 'Oshā (= Penuel) is 10 miles from the Jordan and 8 from the Jabbok. Conder's localizations obviously do not satisfy the conditions of the biblical narrative.

Gn 32<sup>22</sup> says that Jacob passed over the 'ford' of Jabbok. According to both Paine's sketch and G. A. Smith's Map, there are four fords in the lower Jabbok: (1) The ford crossed by the Ghôr route (acc. to Paine, p. 497 f., the *Mesra Kēnan*, or 'Canaan-ford'<sup>2</sup>); (2) the ford on the road from es-Salṭ to Deir 'Allā and Beisan; (3) the ford on the road from es-Salṭ to Burmah and Gerasa (the *Mesra en-Nāṣariyeh*, Paine); (4) the ford on the

road from 'Ammân to Gerasa (the *Mesra ez-Zubliyah*, Paine). According to Paine, (3) is dangerous, and quite impassable for large droves of cattle, the descent being very steep and the current swift (p. 484);<sup>3</sup> hence natives always send loaded animals round by (4). But even supposing Jacob, coming from the north, had crossed the Jabbok by (4), this, as the Map shows, would not have taken him in the direction of ed-Dāmiyeh: there is, as we have seen, no passage down the Jabbok, at any rate for flocks and herds; and the road over the ford leads naturally up to Jogbehah and 'Ammân. If he crossed by (2), he could no doubt have 'picked his way' (Paine, p. 489) down past Tulûl edh-Dhahab (= Penuel) to Deir 'Allā (= Succoth): but this implies that Maḥanaim was not at Merrill's site, but somewhere (say) near Burmah; and there remains the further difficulty mentioned above, that there would be no route for Gideon and the Midianites above Tulûl edh-Dhahab. The most natural ford for Jacob to cross would be (1): then Maḥanaim might be (say) at Deir 'Allā, 4 miles north of the ford;<sup>4</sup> Penuel might be (say) near where the Ghôr route crosses the route from es-Salṭ to ed-Dāmiyeh; and Succoth on one of the lower terraces of the Jordan valley (which here sinks from -500 ft. to -1000 ft.) west of the point just suggested for Penuel, in the position, south of the Jabbok, and consequently in the territory of Gad, postulated by Dillmann.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps, at some future time, excavation will show whether towns stood anciently upon the sites thus indicated.

It is to be regretted that in recent maps of

<sup>3</sup> Professor Paine's own horse was, in July, swept off its legs. When Tristram crossed by this ford (*Land of Israel*, 549), 'the strong current reached the horse's girths'; it is, however, 'not very formidable' in September (Thomson, *Land and Book*, iii. 584; see for the date p. 578).

<sup>4</sup> Suleikhat, Merrill's site (see above), 13 miles north of the Jabbok ford, would not perhaps be too distant from it for the narrative of Gn 32 (it is not certain that 'there' in 32<sup>13</sup> is Maḥanaim: vv. 3-6 imply that Jacob had stayed at Maḥanaim for some time, so 'and he lodged there that night' reads like a *new* statement relating to a place to which he had now advanced, and which seems to be the one named afterwards (v. 30) Peniel). However, a site nearer the Jabbok would seem to be more suitable for a place on the border between Gad and Manasseh (Jos 13<sup>26, 30</sup>), and belonging properly to Gad (21<sup>28</sup>).

<sup>5</sup> The route from the south up the Ghôr, through Moab, and past Heshbon and Beth-Nimrah (see G. A. Smith's Map), would also be a natural one for Esau to take in coming from Edom to meet Jacob (Gn 33).

<sup>1</sup> Conder himself (p. 185) takes him much further round by the east to reach el-Buḳei'a, viz. by the present Ḥaj route.

<sup>2</sup> Whence, also, on Paine's sketch, a route is marked, and spoken of (p. 498), as leading up to 'Ajlun and other towns of the Jebel 'Ajlun.

Palestine no attempt is made to distinguish sites which are certain from sites which are merely hypothetical. The student who uses Murray's Map would suppose, for instance, that the sites there given for Betonim, Ramath-Mizpeh, Ramoth-Gilead, Penuel, Ed, Zoar, Zophim, Beth-Peor, were as certain as those of Jerusalem or Hebron, whereas, in fact, they are one and all purely conjectural, and at least in some cases anything but probable. Even in G. A. Smith's extremely valuable Map it is difficult not to think that the note of interrogation might have been suitably used more freely than it has been. The maps in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, however, show in this respect a commendable judgment and reserve. That a place should, in two different maps, be shown with equal certainty in two different positions, is surely

the *reductio ad absurdum* of map-making; and yet this is by no means unexampled in maps of Palestine.<sup>1</sup> Thus in maps of this country the sites shown for many places must often be accepted with caution and distrust. A critical map of Palestine, on a convenient scale, in which the certain sites were distinguished consistently—whether typographically or otherwise—from those which are (a) only more or less probable, and (b) purely conjectural, is a desideratum of biblical students at the present day.

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Luḥith (Luith) in G. A. Smith's Map and Murray's Map. The grounds upon which this is placed in the former on the south of Ras Şi'aghah are not apparent; those assigned in *P.E.F.M. West Pal.*, pp. 228, 253, are surely questionable and inconclusive in the extreme. Contrast Buhl, p. 272.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

#### ACTS III. 19-21.

'Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that He may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of His holy prophets which have been since the world began' (R.V.).

#### EXPOSITION.

**Repent ye therefore.**—The apostles began (Ac 2<sup>38</sup>), as the Baptist began (Mt 3<sup>2</sup>), as the Christ Himself began (Mt 4<sup>17</sup>, Mk 1<sup>15</sup>), with the exhortation to repentance, to a change of heart and life, not to mere regret for the past.—KNOWLING.

**And turn again.**—As in Mt 13<sup>15</sup>, Mk 4<sup>12</sup>, Ac 28<sup>27</sup>, so also here, the verb is active, 'turn,' though it is rendered 'be converted' in the Authorized Version.—KNOWLING.

**Repent**—indicates a change of aim and purpose, while 'turn again' expresses a consequent change in direction and course in life. Both changes are wrought *by*, not *on*, the individual.—ABBOTT.

**That your sins may be blotted out.**—Particularly their being so terribly at cross purposes with God as to have rejected His Chosen One as a sinner.—BARTLET.

THE ancient mode of obliteration was by applying the blunt end of the stylus to the wax on which letters had been traced with the sharp end.—JACOBSON.

**Seasons of refreshing.**—The word 'refreshing' was used by the Greek translators in Ps 66<sup>12</sup> for the *wealthy place* into which Israel was brought after passing through fire and water, and so it takes us back in thought to the Exodus. As Israel then groaned under the tyranny of Pharaoh, so were the Jews now groaning under the yoke of Rome. It was the 'seasons of the Gentiles' (Lk 21<sup>24</sup>), and the Jews longed for a second Exodus. They wanted seasons of refreshing or of *recreation*, for that is the better meaning, as in Ps 39<sup>13</sup> where the word again occurs. In fact, Israel wanted 'the regeneration' (Mt 19<sup>28</sup>), to be made once more a people.—RACKHAM.

**That He may send the Christ.**—This sending is, by the construction of the Greek, dependent on their repentance, as are the seasons of refreshing.—ABBOTT.

**Who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus.**—The expression here not only refers to the fact that Jesus was the appointed Christ, inasmuch as the covenant with Abraham was fulfilled in Him, but also to the return of Jesus as the Christ, the Messianic King, at His Parousia, in accordance with the voices of the prophets.—KNOWLING.

**Restoration of all things.**—The same word is used by Josephus for the return from the Captivity, and by Philo for the restoration of inheritances at the Jubilee. The times which had to run their course before the restitution of all things were already in progress. St. Peter embraced the whole period between the Ascension and the Second Advent, when the regeneration (Mt 19<sup>28</sup>) will take full effect, when the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God (Ro 8<sup>19-21</sup>) by the bringing back, in the new heavens and new earth (2 P 3<sup>13</sup>, Rev 21<sup>1-3</sup>), of all things out of the con-