

'Apart from the sacred character of the well, which some might suppose an attraction, its waters have a great local reputation for purity and flavour amongst the natives of El 'Askar and Nâblus. The excellence of various supplies of water and their respective qualities are a favourite topic of conversation with Easterns, and in a hot climate, and where other beverages are almost unknown, it is not surprising to find that the natives are great connoisseurs as to the quality of water. Pure water is the mineral beverage, in Mohammedan districts at anyrate,—coffee, lemonade, etc., being reserved solely for guests and special occasions. The people, therefore, as we should expect, have a keen appreciation of the various qualities of different waters to a degree which we can scarcely realise in more favoured climes.

'The numerous springs of water at Nâblus are, from the nature of the soil, mostly of very hard water, very "heavy," as the natives expressed it. They, not unjustly, attribute many of their complaints to this cause, and speak with longing of the "light" waters of Gaza and various other places.

'Now, Jacob's Well has a reputation amongst them of containing cool, palatable, and refreshing water, free from the deleterious qualities of their other supplies of water. Frequently I have been told, that after eating a hearty meal (and a hearty meal with them is something appalling!), a good draught of water from this particular well will disperse

the feeling of abnormal fullness in a remarkably short space of time, and, moreover, make one ready for another good meal in an incredibly short space of time.

'The copious fountain at El 'Askar gushes forth from the very bowels of rocky (limestone) Mount Ehab, and is therefore of particularly hard ("heavy") water. The woman would, therefore, gladly take her jar to this celebrated well for a supply of drinking water.

'Although 30 feet and more of rubbish has found its way into Jacob's Well, the supply of water even now lasts till the month of May most years, or even later. The source of supply to this well has not yet been accurately ascertained, but it is doubtless greatly due to percolation and rainfall. The latter may account partly for some of its special qualities as to "lightness" (softness).

'It is not uncommon in the East to send to a great distance for a supply of drinking water, as you may know, especially by those who can afford to do so. The woman of Samaria may, if poor, have been hired to convey the water for some richer person. When at Nâblus, I used to send to a certain spring some mile or so from my house for drinking water, and soon quite a regular little cavalcade repaired to this spring every morning and evening to supply the richer families with water, which the English doctor recommended. Bishop Blyth of Jerusalem sends three miles from Jerusalem, to Ain Karim, for his water supply.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Did the Jews return under Cyrus?

THIS, according to the editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 'is perhaps, for the moment, the most keenly interesting of all Old Testament questions.'¹ In this estimate the editor has the support of a scholar of the first rank, to whose contribution to the discussion it is the aim of these lines to call attention. In the 'fore-word' to his recently published *Origins of Judaism*, Professor Eduard Meyer refers to the rise of Judaism and the question of the genuineness of the Persian documents in the Book of Ezra 'as one of the most interesting problems with which historical research is at present confronted.'

In order, however, to appreciate aright the full significance and value of the results to which Meyer's investigations have led him, it is necessary to supplement the brief indications given last month as to the trend of some recent criticism of the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. To understand this last, again, we must summarise what may be called the traditional view of the course of Jewish

¹ See last month's issue, p. 200.

history during the eventful century that followed the downfall of the Babylonian Empire.²

Very soon after the capture of Babylon in 539 or 538 B.C., the Jewish exiles received from Cyrus permission to return to their ancestral home, in pursuance of which a first band of exiles reached Jerusalem, 537-6, under the leadership of Zerubabel and Jeshua. By these the altar of burnt-offering was re-erected and a beginning made with the rebuilding of the temple. Through the persistent animosity of jealous neighbours the building operations were suspended for some sixteen years, until, at the instigation of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, early in the reign of Darius Hystaspis, 520 B.C., the work was resumed, and at last brought to a successful close in 516. Then follows a blank of almost sixty

² The best English history of this period is the Rev. P. Hay Hunter's *After the Exile, a Hundred Years of Jewish History and Literature*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1890, a work which so competent a judge as the late Professor Kuënen has characterised, 'a popular book written with great talent, with which I rejoice to find myself in agreement as regards all the main positions' (see Kuënen's academic dissertation quoted below).

years, till Ezra comes on the scene with a second band of exiles from Babylon, in the 7th year of Artaxerxes I. Longimanus, 458 B.C. Ezra's attempts at reform had little success until the arrival of Nehemiah, as governor of Judea, in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, 445. The result of the combined activity of these two heroes of the Return we all know: the city walls were rebuilt, and the community reorganised on the basis of Ezra's Torah. The Book of Ezra-Nehemiah then closes with a reference to a second visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem.

The story thus briefly summarised was, until recently, accepted as in its main features historical, with one exception. This was the statement of the Chronicler—so critics call the compiler of the Books of First and Second Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, which were originally *one* Book—that the temple was begun to be built in the reign of Cyrus, in the second year of the Return (Ezr. 3⁸⁻¹³). So long ago as 1867, Professor Eb. Schrader, then in Zürich, proved that this statement of the Chronicler, who compiled his work, we must remember, nearly two centuries and a half after the events, is irreconcilable with the evidence of the *contemporary* prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, according to whom the building was begun in the second year of Darius (*Die Dauer des zweiten Tempelbaus*, etc.; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1867, pp. 460-504). Schrader's careful investigation has been accepted as final by most later critics, but with this exception the above *order* of the events recorded by the Chronicler has been generally adopted as correct. There has always, of course, been considerable variety of opinion as to the historical accuracy of the official documents in the Book, in particular as to the extent to which they had been tampered with by the compiler or his authorities in the interests of his nation.

In recent years, however, efforts have been made from more than one quarter to prove that the Chronicler is untrustworthy, both in his facts and in the order in which he relates them, and that consequently the course of the post-exilic history of the Jews must be practically rewritten. Thus, in 1889, M. Maurice Vernes of the Sorbonne, in his popular *Précis d'histoire juive*, etc., gave currency to a reconstruction of the history of Ezra and Nehemiah differing widely from the traditional version, but his book was altogether

too fanciful to have much influence on critical opinion. The same cannot be said of the writings of Professor Van Hoonacker of Louvain, who, in the following year (1890), published an essay entitled *Néhémie et Esdras*, in which he sought to prove that the arrival of Ezra and the subsequent events recorded in Ezra 7-10 belong not to the 7th year of the reign of Artaxerxes I., but to the corresponding year of Artaxerxes II. Mnemon, whose acquaintance we made in our *Anabasis* days. Van Hoonacker's essay called forth a masterly examination of Jewish history in the Persian period from the pen of Professor Kuenen, which was read before the Dutch Academy in 1890, and is now accessible to all in Budde's collection of Kuenen's *Abhandlungen zur biblischen Wissenschaft* 1894 ('*Die Chronologie des persischen Zeitalters der jüdischen Geschichte*,' pp. 212-254). Hoonacker's later contributions, in one of which (*Zorobabel et le second Temple*, 1892) he undertakes to defend the historicity of Ezra 3⁸⁻¹³, the great Leiden master did not live to see.

A new and more alarming attack on the traditional view of the post-exilic history of the Jews, along the whole line, was inaugurated by Kuenen's successor in the university of Leiden, Professor W. H. Kusters, whose *Restoration of Israel in the Persian Period*¹ has made more noise in the critical world than almost any book since Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*. Nor is this result to be wondered at when we consider the surpassing importance which the two centuries of Persian supremacy have assumed in the critical reconstruction of Old Testament literature and theology. Not only is a right conception of this eventful period indispensable to the understanding of the post-exilic prophets, usually so called, but also to the final settlement of many disputed questions regarding the closing chapters of Isaiah and much of the Psalter, let alone the great problem of the Pentateuch, and all that thereon depends. What, then, has Kusters to tell us regarding the period in question?

Kusters' results may best be set forth in the form of a series of *negative* propositions somewhat as follows:—(1) There was no return of Jewish exiles under Cyrus; (2) the temple was not built

¹ *Het Herstel van Israël in het Perzische Tijdvak*, 1894. The references in the sequel are to the German translation by Basedow, *Die Wiederherstellung Israels*, etc., Heidelberg, 1895, pp. 127.

by any such incomers in the reign of Cyrus, but in that of Darius Hystaspis, by the descendants of the original inhabitants by whom Jerusalem was now re-peopled; (3) Zerubbabel and Jeshua were not the leaders of a band of exiles, but the official heads of the re-established Jewish community in Jerusalem; (4) the walls of Jerusalem were not built by returned exiles either of a first or a second detachment, but by the same community as before, under the leadership of Nehemiah; (5) and more vital still—Ezra and his company arrived in Jerusalem not in the 7th, but in the 32nd year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 433, under Nehemiah's second governorship; and consequently (6) it was not, as has hitherto been supposed, on the basis of the Priests' Code, but on that of an older legislation that the Jewish community had been previously reorganised by Nehemiah.

This overturning of all our hitherto accepted notions of the course of Jewish history in this period has not been reached, as may well be supposed, without the most drastic handling of the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Thus, Kusters proves to his own satisfaction that the following must have been the original order of the main portion of the latter Book:—Neh. 11³⁻³⁶ (completed by 12¹⁻²⁶) 11¹⁻² 12⁴⁴⁻⁴⁷ 13⁴⁻³¹—here take in Ez. 7-10 (pp. 95 ff.)—9. 10 (with 13¹⁻¹³) 7⁶⁻⁸¹⁸ (see *Wiederherstellung*, pp. 63 ff.). I am not prepared on this occasion to offer a detailed criticism of Kusters' position.¹ I would only say that his Book seems to me a sustained illustration of the dangers of the *argumentum e silentio*. The purpose of these lines is a different one, but, before I come to specify that purpose more precisely, I shall bring to a close this historical sketch of the recent contributions to the subject with a reference to the latest attack on the historical trustworthiness of the much-maligned Chronicler. I refer to Dr. Charles Torrey's essay on *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*, 1896.²

Dr. Torrey's treatment of the compiler of these Books in question recalls the Red Indian, of the

¹ This has been done by Elhorst in his review of Kusters' book in the *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1895, pp. 77-102, and by Wellhausen in the *Nachrichten d. Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1895 (Heft 2). Kusters has replied to Wellhausen in the *Tijdschrift*, 1895, pp. 549 ff., and to Elhorst, *ibid.* 1896, pp. 489 ff. Van Hoonacker's *Nouvelles Etudes*, etc., 1896, I have not seen.

² The above appears as the second of the *Beihäfte* to Stade's well-known *Zeitschrift*.

stories of our youth, brandishing his tomahawk over the scalp of the pale-face. No language is too strong for the ignorance and incapacity, the blundering forgeries and wilful perversity of the Chronicler. 'He distorts facts deliberately and habitually; invents chapter after chapter with the greatest freedom; and, what is most dangerous of all, his history is not written for its own sake, but in the interests of an extremely one-sided theory' (p. 52). And, again, in the the closing paragraph we read: 'The result of the investigation as to the historical content of Ezra-Nehemiah has thus been to show, that, aside from the greater part of Nehemiah 1-6, *the book has no value whatever as history*'³ (p. 65).

After this long preamble, I come at length to the main purpose of these lines, to which I referred at the outset. The ink on Dr. Torrey's pages was scarcely dry when there appeared in Germany a work which may well give pause to some of our recent reconstructionists, Eduard Meyer's *Entstehung des Judenthums, eine historische Untersuchung*, Halle, 1896. Professor Meyer of Halle is known to every student as the author of a standard—some would say *the* standard—*History of Antiquity*,⁴ and of the *History of Egypt* in Oncken's series, and to Old Testament students in particular, as a contributor to Stade's *Zeitschrift*, of decidedly advanced critical views. The special value, then, of the book now before us is that it is the work of an historic specialist of the first rank, who, without the faintest suspicion of apologetic bias, tests and tries the documents before him as he would a Greek inscription or an Egyptian papyrus. The result is sufficiently surprising; Meyer himself does not conceal the fact. *The documents preserved in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are (substantially) genuine official documents, and the chronology of the Chronicler is correct in every particular.* The result of the minute historical and philological investigations of this accomplished historian and scholar is, in a word, this: the reconstruction of Jewish history proposed by Kusters and his allies falls to pieces like a house of cards! So far from the Book of Ezra having 'no value whatever as history,' it is here convincingly proved that this Book embodies, as scarce another of antiquity, the very corner-stones of history, royal rescripts and government archives. Alongside of these, it is

³ The italics are mine.

⁴ *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. i. 1884; ii. 1893.

true, there are not a few places where the Chronicler seems to have set down what he *inferred* must have been in the absence of documentary evidence of what really took place; but, so far from being himself an impudent forger, and withal a most unskilful one, the Chronicler followed his authorities, on the whole, faithfully, and has preserved for us the only picture we are ever likely to possess of the origins of Judaism.

It would prolong these notes beyond due measure to attempt to sketch, even in outline, the method pursued by Eduard Meyer in his *Untersuchung*. All should read it who would know what modern historical research demands and implies. I cannot, however, bring this notice to a close without setting down Professor Meyer's conclusion as to the 'Rise of Judaism,' since it is certain to provoke discussions for more reasons than one. The final triumph of Judaism was not, as one might infer, the outcome of the voluntary acceptance of Ezra's Torah on the part of the Jewish community. On the contrary, it was due in the last resort to the fact that Ezra and Nehemiah, rank Erastians both, *had behind them the strong arm of the civil power*. 'The die is cast (these are the closing words); Judaism has been created in the name of the king of the Persians, and in virtue of the authority of his empire, and thus the influence of the Achæmenid empire reaches without a break, and almost without a parallel, down even to the present hour' (p. 243). It is a far cry from the Jewish Chronicler to the Scottish magician, who loved so intensely the ancient chronicles of his country; but has not Sir Walter in one of the finest creations of his genius, portrayed the revolt against such 'absolute Erastianism or subjection of the Church of God to the regulations of an earthly government' (*Old Mortality*, chap. xxi.)?

A. R. S. KENNEDY.

Edinburgh University.

Among the Periodicals.

A New Theory of the Deluge.

IN *Th. Literaturzeitung* (1897, No. 1), Professor MARTI reviews the work of Fr. v. Schwarz, *Sint-*

fluth und Völkerwanderungen. It is frequently asserted that the biblical Deluge has left no traces on the earth's surface. Schwarz believes that he has discovered evidence to the contrary in the course of geological investigations in Turkestan, and that both the time and the place of the Deluge can be fixed. For he does not believe in a universal Deluge, and points out that all the known traditions on this subject, with the exception of the Greek legend, have emanated from Central Asia. According to our author, the cradle of the human race was in the south of the Sahara. The first circumstance that led to a migration and new settlements was the drying up of the Sahara Sea. The human race now spread over Africa, Asia, and Europe, the latter continent being still connected with Africa by an isthmus at Gibraltar. The second great movement proceeded from the peoples around Mongolia. Some of these found their way to Europe or Western Asia, some moved towards the south, while others proceeded east or north, some even making their way by Behring's Straits to America. In the last-named continent there was also a later arrival of Phœnicians, who laid the foundation of the Central American civilisation, which has such striking affinities with the Egyptian. And now for the Deluge, which our author, from Chinese, Israelitish, and Babylonian data, fixes at 2297 B.C. Peculiar water-marks discovered by him in Dzungaria, lead him to infer the existence at one time of an extensive Mongolian inland sea which occupied the whole of Dzungaria, the Desert of Gobi, and the Tarim basin, and whose level was 6000 feet above that of the ocean. The encircling mountain wall having been broken through by an earthquake at the north-west corner, the waters rushed furiously westward along the Balkash plain, flooded the Aralo-Caspian lowlands, and poured into the Black Sea. The Bosphorus and the Dardanelles were now opened, the Mediterranean overflowed (hence the Greek story of the Deluge), the Sahara again filled with water, and finally the isthmus of Gibraltar was broken through. In Europe the consequence of the discharge of the waters of the Mongolian Sea was a new Ice Age, while in Central Asia drought and barrenness of the soil occasioned a new migration of races. Marti has nothing but praise for the painstaking character of Schwarz's book, with the data so laboriously gathered from ethnology, ethnography, archæology,

mythology, philology, anthropology, zoology, botany, mineralogy, etc. But he is doubtful whether the theory will stand examination. Its chronological data are not to be depended on, and Marti pertinently asks why all the peoples *south*, *east*, and *north* of the Mongolian Sea have transformed the sinking and disappearance of the latter (which was all that they could have observed) into a universal Deluge.

A Babylonian Trinity.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September 1896 (p. 550) we noticed Zimmern's *Vater, Sohn, u. Fürsprecher in d. Bab. Gottesvorstellungen*. The question raised in the latter, whether the Christian doctrine of the Trinity stands in an historical relation to the Babylonian triad, Ea, Marduk, and Gibil, is unhesitatingly answered in the negative by Professor JENSEN in *Th. Literaturzeitung* (1897, No. 1). To begin with, he denies that the three above-named Babylonian deities are so uniformly associated in their working one with another as to be in any proper sense entitled to the name of a triad. Again, the function of intercession ascribed by Zimmern to Gibil is shared by many other gods, and it is not only with Marduk that they intercede, but with Sin and Samas. Jensen refuses absolutely to find any connexion between the Paraclete of Christian theology and the Babylonian Gibil. If a Babylonian triad is to be recognised at all, it would rather consist of Ea, Marduk, and the latter's son, Nabû or Nebo. It is true that there are affinities between the Christ of the Gospels and Marduk of Babylon, but it is generally recognised nowadays that the evangelists have given us a picture of Jesus which, in all essentials, is historical; and nothing could be more far-fetched than the notion that Christ is a kind of incarnation of Bel-Marduk.

Chedorlaomer.

The *Rev. de Théologie* for January 1897 contains a careful article, by Professor BRUSTON, on a communication of the distinguished Assyriologist, P. Scheil, read last August at a meeting of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Scheil claims to have read the name *Ku-dur-la-ukh-gamar* (Kudur-Lagamar) on a tablet of Khammurabi, king of Babylon, in the 23rd century B.C.

Both the name and the personage Bruston would identify with the Chedorlaomer of Gen. xiv. He differs, however, from Scheil as to the translation of the newly-recovered text. For the rival renderings we must refer the reader to the article. Amongst the conclusions Bruston reaches are the following:—(1) The identification of Khammurabi with Amraphel of Gen. xiv. is no longer possible; (2) equally impossible is it to identify Rim-Sin, king of Larsa, with Arioch of Ellasar, although Sayce seems to regard their identity as beyond question; (3) the history of the period when Chedorlaomer was brought into connexion with Abraham, and of the period immediately subsequent to it, may be constructed thus: Towards the end of the 24th century B.C., Kudur-Lagamar, king of Elam, extended his power over Lower Chaldæa, and set up there a viceroy, Immeru (Amraphel?). The family of Terah fled before this Elamite invasion and settled in Harran (Gen. xi.). Kudur-Lagamar next gained possession of the whole valley of the Tigris and Euphrates; the western peoples as far as the Dead Sea submitted to his sway. Abraham, flying once more before an invasion, retreated to Canaan. For twelve years the western nations obeyed Kudur-Lagamar, the thirteenth year they rebelled, and then came the campaign of Gen. xiv. After the death of Kudur-Lagamar, Babylon revolted, and, after a severe struggle, Khammurabi succeeded in expelling the Elamites and reuniting the whole of Chaldæa under his own sway.

Whether the above tentative scheme be accepted or not, Bruston is clear that the history of the period, as given even in such recent and excellent works as those of Maspero, will have to be revised.

The Order of the Pauline Epistles.

In *Studien u. Kritiken* (1897, Heft ii. pp. 219–270), Dr. CARL CLEMEN returns to the discussion of the above subject. It is now more than three years since the publication of his *Chronologie der Paul. Briefe*, a work which has received a great deal of attention, and has been the object of a good many attacks. In the essay before us, Clemen adheres in all essentials to his former positions, which he defends vigorously against Joh. Weiss, Von Soden, and others. The main point of contention concerns the place of the Epistle to

the Galatians. While there is a difference of opinion as to whether Galatians should be placed before (German scholars) or after (English scholars) the two Epistles to the Corinthians, there has been till lately comparative unanimity in placing *Galatians before Romans*. It is this last order that Clemen would reverse, and he writes a very interesting and clear paper in justification of his theory. Whether he will succeed in convincing any of the formidable array of his opponents remains to be seen, but, at all events, he will have to be answered. His paper will serve also to put the reader in possession of the main points in this whole controversy. The arguments of Clemen are drawn from the Epistles themselves, under the three heads of (1) Paul's theology, (2) his polemic, and (3) his attitude to the Apostolic Council. Taking it for granted that a development may be traced in the theological conceptions of the Apostle, Clemen seeks to show that this development proceeds consistently only if Romans was written before Galatians. This is illustrated from Paul's doctrine of the law, of justification and sanctification, and of the prerogative of Israel in opposition to the Gentiles. Still stronger, according to Clemen, is the argument drawn from the polemical methods of the different epistles, for the Apostle, however lightly he might himself think of slight inconsistencies in his ideas, would have to avoid giving his opponents any handle against him. Comparing Rom. ii. 25 with Gal. v. 2; Clemen finds it inconceivable that if Paul had once made the strong assertion of the latter, he could have subsequently made the concession of the former. On the other hand, if Romans preceded Galatians, it is easy to see how the Judaizers in Galatia could have used Rom. ii. 25 against the Apostle. A number of other texts are similarly placed side by side with a view to the same conclusion. In discussing the third of the above heads, Clemen has to go fully into the relation of Gal. ii. to Acts xv., a question of much interest, which, however, we have not space on this occasion to discuss, and which would carry us beyond the scope of this note.

By Faith not by Sight.

This is the title of the opening article in the January number of the *Rev. Chrétienne*. Its writer, M. PUAUX, takes as his motto the words

of the Risen Lord to Thomas: 'Because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed. Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.' The contention of the paper is that this declaration of Jesus marks a crisis in the history of the Christian religion, henceforth faith and not sight is to be the guide of disciples. If we are to know Jesus or to love Him, the necessary condition is by an act of freewill to believe without having seen. M. PUAUX defends this thesis against the charge of unreasonableness by showing that acts of faith are demanded of us in the business of life every day. He has no patience with the desire of many for a religion without mysteries, maintaining that such a system is doomed to speedy decay. Religion must be above us in order to act in us. Nay, even in the material universe, realities exist which cannot be brought into the realm of experiment, but whose effects we can note while we cannot get at the causes. The Christian will recognise the right of exact science to pronounce on what lies within its own domain, but outside this he will assert the equal rights of faith in a domain as real, and will triumphantly repel the demand for *sight* with the word, 'This is the victory that hath overcome the world, our *faith*.'

The Biblical Notion of Sin.

In the *Rev. de Théologie* for January, Professor WESTPHAL writes *De la Valeur religieuse de la notion biblique du Pêché*. He argues that when the knowledge of sin is reached, the spiritual life is begun, and bewails the fact that in many French pulpits where Christ is preached as having died for our sins according to the Scriptures, there is a very inadequate presentment of the nature of the offences that demanded His sacrifice. Yet the Bible, which reveals the Saviour, reveals also the character of sin, and it is impossible to conserve the first of these truths while neglecting the second. The author adduces three illustrations of the loss of spiritual life through loss of the sense of sin. The first is presented by the history of Judaism. Although the Jew was the heir of the Hebrew, we behold a terrible falling off when we compare the scribal with the prophetic spirit. The atmosphere of the second temple was one in which the sense of sin did not thrive. Hence when the Saviour came, he was rejected because no need was felt of a Saviour.

Westphal takes his second illustration from the Roman Catholic Church. This system of religion he characterises as a return to Judaism in ritual, and to paganism in superstition. It started with a Pelagian conception of the value of good works and the merits of the saints, and it ends by leaving no place for a Saviour. Once more Christ is rejected when He comes to His own.

Thirdly, Westphal finds as little of the biblical doctrines of sin and salvation in the so-called 'liberal' Churches of the Reformation as in Judaism or Catholicism. Such doctrines, being repugnant to human pride, are rejected. But this conduct on the part of the Church brings punishment in its train. This the author seeks to illustrate by examining some of the types of character that are portrayed in the literature and exist in the real life of to-day. He quotes with approval the saying of Desjardins: 'The world has come back exactly to the point where it was found by nascent Christianity,' and he concludes that what is required is the revelation of sin to the human conscience, and the reproclaiming of the Baptist's message, 'Repent.'

Driver's 'Introduction' in German.

In *Th. Literaturzeitung* (1897, No. 2), Professor Kautzsch reviews Rothstein's translation of the *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Owing to additional matter and the personal revision of the author, the German translation may be reckoned as the sixth edition of Dr.

Driver's work, which has happily passed through five editions at home, and has gained a world-wide reputation for its author, who, as Kautzsch remarks, had previously enjoyed the highest repute as a Hebraist. The reviewer emphasises the fact that it was gradually, and by force of conviction, that Driver came to accept of the critical method pursued in Old Testament study by such scholars as Reuss, Kuenen, and Wellhausen. And it is to his caution and the care with which he always distinguishes between established conclusions and mere hypotheses that Kautzsch would ascribe the confidence which is extended to Dr. Driver by many who would be slow to give that confidence to a more radical or less cautious critic. Along with the pioneers, Canon Cheyne and Dr. Robertson Smith, it is Driver above all who has gained England for Old Testament criticism. The points to which Kautzsch takes exception in the *Introduction* are surprisingly few, being concerned chiefly with such questions as the unity of Isa. xl.-lxvi., the disputed passages in Amos and Zephaniah, Stade's analysis of Micah 4f., Wetzstein's view of the Song of Songs, etc., of which he desiderates a fuller discussion. The bibliography of the volume receives special commendation. Finally, the reviewer has nothing but praise for Rothstein, alike as a translator and as the contributor of a number of notes which supplement and materially enrich the volume.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

Frederick Field, M.A., B.D.

BY THE REV. JOHN HENRY BURN, B.D., RECTOR OF DEER, EXAMINING CHAPLAIN
TO THE BISHOP OF ABERDEEN.

II.

THE population of the parish of Reepham is less than 600, and Mr. Field constantly employed the services of an assistant curate. He thus had ample leisure for literary research, without in any way neglecting the souls committed to his charge. He was a most indefatigable worker. Many hours of each day were devoted to study, and it was commonly reported in the village that his lamp

was always alight up to the small hours of the morning. The following passage, which occurs in one of his sermons, must have appeared to his hearers peculiarly appropriate as coming from him: 'To the labouring man, his early commencement of the day makes early repose necessary; and contracts the evening hours within a very short compass. But to those who are not so