

'Galatic Territory' meant to Luke something quite different from Galatia. If in a modern travel narrative one read that the traveller now entered and traversed 'British Territory,' one would forthwith understand that he crossed territory possessed by Britain, territory of the British Empire, but not that he landed in Great Britain. It is the same with 'Galatic Territory.' Ancient usage is clear. The only passage ever quoted to prove that 'Galatic Territory' means 'Galatia' is Arrian, *Anab.* ii. 4, ἐπ' Ἀγκύρας τῆς Γαλατικῆς, falsely translated 'towards Ancyra of the Galatic (Territory).' It really means 'towards Ancyra the Galatic city,' distinguished from Ancyra

the Phrygiac city (cf. Strabo, p. 567, Ἀγκυρα ὁμώνυμος τῇ πρὸς Ἀνδία περὶ Βλαῦδον πολίχνη Φρυγιακῆ).

There will be more to say about the meaning of Γαλατικῆ. Meantime I will only add that accurate interpretation of geographical terms is far from universal among the best and in other respects most accurate scholars. It sometimes amazes me to read geographical remarks, made in admirable and justly admired commentaries: see, for example, Blass's note on Ac 16⁸⁻⁹, p. 176, where he quotes Pliny, *N.H.* 5, 28, as a proof that the term Asia, as sometimes used, included Mysia, Lydia, etc., excluding Phrygia: the words of Pliny have no bearing on this subject.

The Latest Issues of the 'International Critical Commentary.'¹

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., ABERDEEN.

THE Commentary on Isaiah in this great series was originally entrusted to Professor A. B. Davidson of Edinburgh. His lamented death, before he had reduced to anything like final shape the material he had collected, necessitated other arrangements, and the work was divided between Professor G. Buchanan Gray and Professor A. S. Peake. It was universally felt that the death of Professor Davidson had robbed the world of a unique commentary; for, in addition to the most accurate scholarship, he had a rare insight into the meaning of the O.T. prophets and a sympathy with their spirit which have never been surpassed. We are fortunate, however, in having amongst us two such competent O.T. scholars as Professor G. Buchanan Gray and Professor Peake—names that are both familiar to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES and the *Dictionary of the Bible*. It is with Professor Gray's work alone that we are concerned in the present volume. That scholar as long ago as 1896 established his

claim to front rank by his *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, and he has already enriched the 'International Critical Commentary' by his volume on *Numbers* (1903). The Commentary on Isaiah is to be in two volumes, the first of which contains Professor Gray's introduction to the whole book, and the exegesis of chapters i.—xxvii. The second volume will deal with chapters xxviii.—xxxix., also by him; while chapters xl.—lxvi. will be treated by Professor Peake.

In his preface our author takes full cognizance of the work of other scholars. He acknowledges obligations to Dillmann and Duhm, although he thinks that the latter sometimes leads his followers astray, 'particularly by his line and strophe divisions.' Justice is done also to the works of such men as Marti, Cheyne, Driver (who has also offered valuable suggestions in the present work), and G. A. Smith. The Introduction deals with the following subjects: Title and Place of Isaiah in the Canon; Text and Versions; the Book of Isaiah a post-exilic compilation; Origin and History of the Book; Criteria for distinguishing the words of Isaiah from the additions of later writers; the poetic forms of the Prophetic literature, and of the Book of Isaiah in particular; Isaiah in relation to the political and social con-

¹ *The Book of Isaiah*, i.—xxxix., by Professor G. Buchanan Gray, Mansfield College, Oxford. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912. Price 12s. *Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Joel*, by John Merlin Powis Smith, Ph.D.; William Hayes Ward, D.D., LL.D.; Julius A. Bewer, Ph.D. Price 12s. 6d.

ditions of his age; Isaiah as Prophet and Teacher. This is followed by a valuable chronological table. The Commentary itself runs to 472 pages, and is marked, it is needless to say, by all the care we expect from Professor Gray.

On the thorny question of Hebrew metre our author appears to us to tread with safety and caution. He says: 'I came to the study of Isaiah still sceptical on the subject of Hebrew metre; I remain sceptical of the finality of any existing theory of it; but the approximation to regularity in the parallel periods is too striking to be neglected; and I have systematically drawn attention to it in the small print notes prefixed to the translations; at the same time I have endeavoured to make the irregularities, which in the present text at all events are frequent, as obvious as the approximations to regularity. At the present stage metrical arguments alone appear to me a precarious textual criterion, but as confirmatory of other considerations they often have value' (Preface, p. viii f.; cf. more fully, §§ 44-57). He is equally cautious in regard to the brilliant and sometimes startling theories of Winckler and Cheyne.

Special care has been bestowed on the work of translation, the ruling motive being to make this as expressive as possible of the meaning of the Hebrew text, form and style being deliberately sacrificed when necessary.

In common with nearly all modern scholars, Professor Gray feels himself constrained to recognize in the present Book of Isaiah the work of a number of authors, and he shows that it is necessary 'to do justice to other contributors to the book, and, above all, to approach with sympathy the work of, perhaps, many nameless writers that now forms so large a part of it. . . . None of these nameless writers may have possessed the religious genius of Isaiah, but together they represent the play of the earlier prophetic teaching on the Jewish Church. . . . The student of the Book of Isaiah has but half entered into his inheritance, if he communes with Isaiah and the great exilic prophet, but fails to feel the life of that post-exilic religious community which not only preserved for themselves and us the words of the earlier prophets, but preserved them in books which were also made to breathe the hopes and aspirations that sustained the Jews through centuries of isolation, oppression, and temptation.' These are wise and weighty words, that deserve to be pondered.

We have tested the Commentary in many important passages, and have never been disappointed. We may note, for instance, the Immanuel prophecy of chap. vii., where full account is taken of the manifold interpretations, and the reader is thus placed in the position of being able to form a judgment of his own. We are a little doubtful of Professor Gray's conclusion, although he has much to say for it, that to Ahaz the prediction was essentially a promise and not a threat. The interpretation of 'curds and honey' as symbolical of prosperity does not appeal to us.

Altogether the Commentary reaches the high standard for which Driver and Moore have taught us to look in this series. We shall look with eagerness and confidence for the second volume.

2. The Books of Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel have been entrusted to three American scholars. The first of these, Professor J. M. Powis Smith, who assisted the late Professor W. R. Harper in his *Amos and Hosea* (in the present series), took up the unfinished work of that scholar on Micah, and now assumes the entire responsibility for the treatment of that prophet, as well as of Zephaniah and Nahum. He declines—wisely, we think—to stretch the text of Micah upon the Procrustean bed of a metrical system.' In discussing the unity of the book, he comes to the conclusion that chaps. 6 and 7 'seem to be a collection of miscellaneous fragments coming from widely scattered periods, and from at least four different authors.' The 'Message of Micah' forms the subject of an interesting section. The Book of Zephaniah has more justice done to it by Professor Smith than it has received at most hands. Nahum's message is well characterized, and in the commentary the mysterious 'Huzzab' passage is adequately discussed.

In treating of Habakkuk, Dr. Ward says of chap. 3 that 'it is a separate prediction, arranged for temple worship, and may or may not be by one of the authors to whom we owe 1¹²⁻²⁰. It belongs to a troubled period following the Captivity, but contains no definite indications of its age beyond its quotations.'

The little book of Obadiah is adequately treated by Dr. Bewer. With regard to the familiar controversy as to the relation of Jer 49^{ff.} to Ob 1-9 his conclusion is that 'Obadiah quoted in vv. 1-9

an older oracle, the original of which is better preserved in Jer 49.' The question is a difficult one. A different view has been maintained by the present writer in Hastings' *D.B.*, art. 'Obadiah.' We are doubtful as to the validity of Dr. Bewer's argument that the references to the Day of Jahweh in chaps. 2 and 3 of Joel are interpolations, and consequently as to his

judgment on the question of the unity of the book. But we are quite at one with him in holding that Joel is post-exilic.

Though this volume has not the interest attaching to Professor Gray's on Isaiah, it contains excellent work, and will be found invaluable for the study of those of the Minor Prophets with which it deals.

Positive Theological Research in Germany.

BY DR. PAUL FEINE, PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE-WITTENBERG.

III.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

IN systematic work the feeling of progress on the side of conservative theology is very clearly expressed. In this connexion we would refer to R. H. Grützmacher, 'Die prinzipielle Eigenart der positiven Theologie,' in *Studien zur systematischen Theologie*, 1909, vol. iii., and in the reports of publications in the field of systematic theology in the separate volumes of the magazine *Die Theologie der Gegenwart*; A. W. Hunzinger, *Theologie und Kirche: Beiträge zum gegenwärtigen Kirchenproblem*, 1912; F. Kattenbusch, art. 'Theologie' in *PRE*³, 1908, vol. xxi. pp. 900-913; Horst Stephan, *Die neuen Ansätze der konservativen Dogmatik und ihre Bedeutung für uns.*, lecture to the 'Friends of the Christian World' in Goslar, on 2nd Oct. 1911, published in *Die Christliche Welt*, Nos. 44-48, 1911. The two first mentioned are representatives of the positive branch, the two last-named belonged to the school of Ritschl.

In Germany at the present day there are a great number of systematic scholars who are striving, with all earnestness and much intellectual power, to establish a synthesis between the old faith and the modern spirit. They are convinced that the ancient Christian faith has in no way been rooted out by modern science, but that it ought rather to be re-founded with the help of the scientific means and methods of the present day. These theologians have displayed great energy in penetrating into all the separate branches of knowledge which have any connexion with theology, have adopted their methods and principles, and have set to work on a discussion of these sciences in their bearings

upon theology. They have no intention of undertaking to restore ancient dogmas, but on the other hand they are firmly convinced that they have no need to give up, under the pressure of modern research, any of the essential truths of the Christian faith. On the contrary, they retain the firm conviction that theology will issue from this process of refining strengthened and deepened.

There is still considerable difference of opinion as to how this is to be worked out in detail. Programmes have been made out, and negotiations have been entered into about them. For a long time the demand for a 'Modern Theology of the Ancient Faith' and a 'Modern Positive Theology' has been exciting the attention of theologians. The first of these catchwords was introduced by Th. Kaftan, in his *Moderne Theologie des alten Glaubens*, 1906; the second by R. H. Grützmacher, in his *Studien zur systematischen Theologie*, vol. ii., and his *Modern-positive Vorträge*, 1906; and by R. Seeberg, in *Die Kirche Deutschlands*². Kaftan was closely connected with Kant and Ritschl; Seeberg and Grützmacher with Schleiermacher and the Erlangen school, and partly too with positive mediating theology. A third attitude, in close relationship to Cremer and the philosophical currents of the present day, is represented by Dunkmann, *Moderne Theologie alten Glaubens*, 1906, and 'Ueber Begriff und Methode einer kirchlichen Theologie' in *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1908, pp. 254-300. Another position is represented by C. Stange, a striking figure among modern German systematic scholars, whose studies are for the most part in the direction of the philosophy of religion. In 1907 Stange published his *Grundriss der Religionsphilosophie*, and in 1911,