

“Prima salutantes atque altera conerit hora,
 Exercet raucos tertia caudidos:
 In quintam varios extendit Roma labores,
 Sexta quies lassus, septima finis erit.”

My apology for calling this the “Roman” method is that, as opposed to our modern method, and as that which from the fact of its being Roman was likely to be “almost universal,” “Roman” is a convenient and not unusual designation.

I should not have thought it worth while calling attention to this point, had I not feared that Dr. Sanday’s great and well-deserved authority might have led incautious readers of his criticism to suppose that the Romans were in the habit of reckoning the hours from midnight.

MARCUS DODS.

My point was, that as the Romans had *two* methods of reckoning the hours of the day, one in popular and general use, which they shared with many other peoples, from sunrise to sunset, and the other exceptional and peculiar, confined among themselves to certain legal and technical purposes, from midnight to midnight, it was misleading to describe the *former* by the distinctive name of “Roman.” I am afraid that Dr. Dods’ letter still leaves me with this opinion, of which I do not, of course, exaggerate the importance. Full evidence bearing upon the second mode of reckoning will be found in Bilfinger, *Der bürgerliche Tag* (Stuttgart, 1888), p. 198 ff.

W. SANDAY.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

Klostermann versus Kautzsch and Socin.—In the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1891, Heft 9) Professor Klostermann has published a rejoinder to the remarks of Professors Kautzsch and Socin referred to in *THE EXPOSITOR* for August (p. 157). He again insists on the necessity of revising the Hebrew text by the help of conjecture—not mere arbitrary conjecture, but such as is practised in his work on *Samuel and Kings*. It is a fundamental error, he says, to suppose that the genesis of the Tōrah can be traced by analysing the existing

Hebrew text. In the course of the essay he proposes to correct ἡγάπησεν in John xiii. 1 into ἡγάπησεν, which alone, he thinks, makes a faithful exegesis possible. Professor Klostermann admires our own great Bentley. But what has been the fate of Bentley's Horace and Milton?

Psalm li. 5.—In the excellent chapter on the Psalms in Professor Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament* there occurs a forcibly expressed note on Psalm li., at the conclusion of which it is admitted that "even ver. 5 might be parallel, as in thought with Isaiah xliii. 27, so in figure with Isaiah xlv. 2, 24, xlviii. 8," but urged that "probably it is better to suppose the psalmist to be speaking individually as a representative Israelite." Thus in this case Dr. Driver introduces or affirms a variation in the psalmist's mode of thought (the speaker elsewhere in the psalm being the nation, conceived of as an entity), as in vers. 18, 19 (compared with vers. 16, 17) he effaces, or at least denies one. I trust that readers will kindly not overlook the passages in my own *Bampton Lectures* (see pp. 265, 427), in which I have suggested as a probability that the psalmists contemplated the use of certain passages of their writings in a twofold sense, *e.g.* sometimes nationalistic, sometimes individualistic; and again, sometimes of life in God enjoyed on this side the grave, sometimes with regard to the same higher life on the other side. On this theory it is open to any one to suppose that ver. 5 was meant to refer either to the nation or to the individual. Or as a compromise we might apply Stekhoven's theory (that individualizing psalms were expanded and modified so as to suit the nation) to the case of Psalm li. 5. But I cannot see that Professor Driver's view of ver. 5 is either needed or very natural. Surely here, as elsewhere, the psalmist's expressions are modelled on those of his favourite prophet (the Second Isaiah). Notice at once the strength of his faith and the depth of his humility. "Thy first father hath sinned," says Jehovah by the prophet; "therefore I gave Jacob to the ban, and Israel to reproaches" (Isa. xliii. 27, 28). "In sin did my mother conceive me," replies Israel by the psalmist; "therefore, since I am so weak by nature, forgive me, O my God, for the past, and strengthen me for the future." One is reminded of the Syro-Phœnician woman's plea for mercy in Matthew xv. 27.

Psalm lxxiv.—It has often been pointed out that one feature

of the pathetic description in Psalm lxxiv. agrees better with the havoc wrought in the temple by Nebuchadrezzar's army than with the outrages of Antiochus Epiphanes, so far as these are known to us; *viz.* the burning of the temple (ver. 7). Some students may perhaps be helped by a quotation from a work of one of the most interesting of the Caroline Anglican divines, Dr. Thomas Jackson, Dean of Peterborough and president of that famous Oxford college (Corpus Christi), of which Jewell and Hooker were also ornaments, who remarks as follows: "Reading Josephus, I cannot but acknowledge Jeremiah's Lamentation, as well for a prophecy of these late times under Vespasian and Titus, as an history or elegy of the miseries that had befallen Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. . . . These words (Lam. ii. 17, 19) perhaps were meant, in divers measures, of both calamities; but the complaint following of the later only under Titus (vers. 20-22)." "Many particulars, here set down by Jeremy, are not so much as once intimated by the sacred story, which describes the siege by Nebuchadnezzar. . . . [His] host perhaps slew some, but had no occasion to make a general massacre in the temple, destitute of attendants ere it was taken, the king and his greatest commanders being first fled into the wilderness; nor was it destroyed until the heat of war was past, and most of the people led into captivity" (Jackson, *Works*, ed. 1844, vol. i., pp. 189, 190). The inference drawn by Jackson, *viz.* that prophecies have a germinal fulfilment, may perhaps point the way to a truth; but we can hardly follow him in the view that prophecies like those of Isaiah and Jeremiah and liturgical psalms like the Lamentations are to be classed together. There seems no way out of the difficulty but to assume that the writers of liturgical poems were sometimes led by the vehemence of their emotion into exaggeration. This would be easiest when they wrote some time after the events described had taken place. For my own part, I cannot see that this solution is the best for Psalm lxxiv., but it is open to any one to think otherwise. In another passage of his *Works*, Dean Jackson virtually assigns Psalm lxxiv. to the Maccabæan age.

The Book of Daniel.—Professor de Lagarde's remarkable article on Havet's *La modernité des prophètes*, which appeared not long ago in the *Götting. gel. Anzeigen*, has now been inserted in vol. iv. of his *Mittheilungen*. It would be unfair, and perhaps imprudent, to attempt to summarise the pages in which this

modern Scaliger justifies his view of the meaning and date of Daniel vii. Suffice it to say, that he places Daniel vii. in 69 A.D.—a development of the not unpalatable theory of the composite origin of the book of Daniel which will surprise many. That the professor does not agree with Havet's view of prophetic "modernity" need not be said.

The Book of Lamentations.—A fresh philological treatment of this interesting book has long been a *desideratum*. This has now been given by Dr. Max Löhr, a young Königsberg scholar. He accepts the results of Budde's very able essay on the Hebrew elegy, mentioning however Mr. Ball's attempt to show a syllabic metre. None of the Lamentations are post-Exilic (against Stade). Chaps. ii.–iv. are connected, chaps. i. and v. having been added to adapt the central portion to liturgical use. The "naive mingling of Jeremianic and non-Jeremianic elements," and the "naive way in which the author allows his personality to appear towards the end of chap. iv," are characteristic of the original writer. Dr. Löhr's philology is careful.

Colossians ii. 18.—Professor de Lagarde in that work of painfully multifarious contents, fitly called *Mittheilungen* (iv. 131), finds a corner for a "noble emendation of Colossians ii. 18" due to "the Englishmen"—ἀέρα κεκεμβατεύων. He feels, as most persons who have a sensitive ear will feel, that ἂ ἐόρακεν ἐμβατεύων cannot be the original reading. But why does he not mention the step towards the "nobler" reading taken by the industrious Griesbach, who is vastly more suggestive on this passage than either Lachmann or Trégelles?

T. K. CHEYNE.