

Jewish political influence, but that it had been to a considerable extent actually Judaized. However this may be, it may be safely set down as established that events just such as those ascribed in Chronicles to Uzziah must necessarily have occurred, else Jewish history would have been quite different from what we know it to have been. The failure to recognise this outstanding fact serves to illustrate the principle that historical investigation must not be made an occupation secondary and ancillary to the criticism of the documents which constitute its basis. Theoretical reconstructions of history are always to be suspected which lose sight of historic cause and effect under an engrossing anxiety lest current data should prove untrustworthy.

J. F. McCURDY.

THE ROMAN RECKONING OF THE DAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR."

DEAR SIR,—

In Dr. Sanday's notice of my volume on the Gospel of St. John, he finds fault with the statement that St. John probably adopted the Roman reckoning of the hours of the day and counted noon the sixth hour. "This method of counting," says Professor Sanday, "was not at all peculiarly 'Roman,' but was, in fact, almost universal. It was rather the other method of counting—the evidence perhaps does not permit us to say the *hours*, but the *day*—from midnight which more properly deserves to be called 'Roman.'" I should be glad to believe that this is the grossest inaccuracy in my volume. The fact is, I was at some pains to ascertain the Roman method; and besides the evidence adduced in Mr. Cross' paper, to which Professor Sanday refers, two other witnesses convinced me that the Romans did reckon from sunrise. The one witness is that of the ancient Roman sun-dials, on which noon is denoted by VI. This is decisive. The other witness is the epigram (iv. 8) of Martial on the routine of the Roman day.

“Prima salutantes atque altera conerit hora,
 Exercet raucos tertia caudidos:
 In quintam varios extendit Roma labores,
 Sexta quies lassis, 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