

By mere chance I approached the subject. But now that I do so, I believe to have found the way by which a more correct understanding of the gospel history can be obtained than has hitherto been done." Pp. 45-54 contain miscellaneous remarks, mostly of textual character, on passages from the gospels and Acts, followed by "Nachträgliches statt eines Vorwortes," pp. 55-9. The "two-document" hypothesis does not bother Nestle, who shows also in this pamphlet his immense linguistic attainments and acumen. He applies his theory of a Hebrew original of the New Testament history — maintained for the gospel of Matthew throughout the entire ancient church — also to Mark, and to parts of Luke and the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles. In general, he maintains that we must separate from the original Semitic nucleus the original Greek additions of the recensions. Of special interest are the author's observations on τέλειος (Matt. 5 : 48) = οἰκτίρων (Luke 6 : 36), both going back to the שְׁלֵמִים (also see Nestle in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1896, 737-9); on Bethphage and Dalmanūtha; on ἔθνος = עַמִּי, and ἐθνικός = עַמִּי (pp. 28, 36, 57); and on the influence exercised by popular etymology on proper names (p. 20). The whole book is a new proof of the author's learning, and betrays from cover to cover the all-pervading spirit of de Lagarde. Additions to the *Philologica Sacra* have been published by the author in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 40, 148-9.²—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

Die Entstehung des Neuen Testamentes. Von Gustav Krüger, Professor of Theology at Giessen. Zweiter, unveränderter Abdruck. (Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896, pp. 27, M. 0.60.) This essay deals with the origin, not of the New Testament books, but of the New Testament, that is, with the rise of the New Testament canon. It is a most admirably clear and informing piece of work, maintaining the view that down to 150 A. D., while the Christian church revered the Lord Jesus and his apostles as the highest authority for its faith, and in consequence also the writings which either told their history or came

²On Semitic originals of some New Testament passages see, *e. g.*, the series of short articles in the London *Academy*, 1896, June 27, p. 530; July 4, p. 11; September 5 (Badham), p. 160; 12 (Herz and Cheyne), p. 184; 26 (Nestle), p. 224; October 3, p. 245; 10, p. 265. Also Nestle's articles in *Expos. Times*, October 1896, pp. 42-3 (Matt. 5 : 42 = Luke 6 : 30; Matt. 5 : 47 = Luke 6 : 34); December, pp. 138-9 (Semitic Assonances); January 1897, pp. 190-1; February, p. 237; pp. 239-40 (Luke 16 : 25); August, p. 521 (Matt. 2 : 9), etc.; *Mittheil. u. Nachr. d. deutsch. Paläst.-Vereins.*, 1896, pp. 54-5 (Matt. 3 : 12; Luke 3 : 17); also Marshall, *Expos. Times*, November 1896, pp. 90-1; Selbie, *ibid.*, November, p. 75.

from them, yet it had not found occasion to make a definite collection of their writings or been led to recognize them individually as Scripture. This latter process, according to this view, was the work of the "Catholic church," both this and the New Testament canon being in fact the product of the same cause. Of course, in the brief space of twenty-six pages no details can be given and no proof of these positions, but as a clear and broad statement of the matter from this point of view the essay can hardly be excelled.—ERNEST DEWITT BURTON.

Ueber die Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelien. Von D. Paul Ewald, ord. Professor der Theologie in Erlangen. [Sonderabdruck aus der *Neuen kirchlichen Zeitschrift*.] (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf., Geo. Böhme, 1897, pp. iii+25, M. 0.75.) This address treats, not of the inspiration of the Scriptures, but of the trustworthiness of the gospels. The doctrine of inspiration would be of value only in case the origination, preservation, and interpretation of the Scriptures were all inspired. But this hypothesis is rendered impossible by errors due to imperfect preservation and by manifold contradiction of interpretation—if so be that God is errorless and self-consistent. This aside then, the purpose of the author is to indicate in broad outlines the way to take in order to certify to ourselves ever anew the trustworthiness of the evangelists and of their narratives, against ever-recurring objections. It is a plain, common-sense argument based on internal evidence.—GEORGE B. FOSTER.

The Origin and Peculiar Characteristics of the Gospel of St. Mark, and its Relations to the other Synoptists; being the Ellerton Essay for 1896. By J. C. Du Buisson, B.A., Late Demy of Magdalen College. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Pamphlet. Pp. 72, 1s. 6d.) This is a brief but valuable introduction to the second gospel, dealing mainly with the question of its sources and its relation to the other gospels. The argument is confessedly based in considerable part on the essay of F. H. Woods published in the first volume of the *Studia Biblica*. The writer advocates the theory of an original Mark, differing, however, only on minor points from our present gospel. These differences consist almost entirely in additions and slight modifications by a later editor, not at all in the omission of matter now found in Matthew and Luke, but absent from the present Mark. The last twelve pages contain a brief but discriminating discussion of the purpose and characteristics of the gospel.—ERNEST DEWITT BURTON.