

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE ENGLISH EXPLORATIONS IN PALESTINE.

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR SOCIN.

HAVING recently returned from South Africa, I have only just had the opportunity of reading Prof. Socin's criticism, in the *EXPOSITOR* for October, 1885, of the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund. The criticism, though at times severe, is that of a fairly competent witness, who does not fail also to point out the good work of the Society. It would therefore be impossible to let it pass without notice; and, indeed, there is much that Prof. Socin says with which I, for one, thoroughly concur. At the same time the general result of such an article would, as I hope to be able to show, be to give an impression unintentionally quite false as to the published work of the Society; and I fear that in some of his criticisms Prof. Socin, who is perhaps best known as the compiler of a useful Handbook to Syria, will not escape the recoil upon himself of those charges of insufficient acquaintance with the results of modern critical or antiquarian research which he brings against those who have laboured in the field of Palestine exploration.

I should myself be the last to claim that any work of mine was free from errors and imperfections. I have taken occasion to say so in the Jerusalem Chamber in 1880; and I hope that since I first went to Syria, in 1872, I have been able to learn a great deal, and have shown myself willing to acknowledge any errors which have been pointed out to me.¹ At the risk, however, of being charged

¹ The task of criticising other men's work appears to me to be a less useful expenditure of energy than that of endeavouring to learn for oneself. At the same time I am tempted to ask, whether Prof. Socin is aware that even his own

with "abusing the plaintiff," I have ventured in a note to remark that there are reasons why Prof. Socin should extend to his brother students in the field the charity which ought to exist between those who wish to do service to science. A review like that of Prof. Socin is, I feel, very healthy. It clears the air, and is quite a relief after fourteen years of rejoicings, in some of which I have never felt able to join with much heartiness.

There are three questions in the review which have perhaps hardly been sufficiently distinguished. 1st, That of the permanent Map and Memoirs by which the Society must be judged. 2nd, Their more ephemeral or speculative publications, the *Quarterly Statement*, and the Old Testament and New Testament Maps, with their popular books. 3rd, Works not published by the Society at all, such as

valuable Handbook is open to criticism which might be made entirely misleading, if the errors were exposed, while no notice was taken of the sound results contained in the book? Prof. Socin is presumably well acquainted with the distinction between *Nahu*, or grammarian's Arabic, and *Hakki*, or the vulgar (often ungrammatical) speech of daily life. His book contains, however, no warning to the traveller that the expressions and sentences which occur in the vocabulary bristle with vulgarisms such as are used, indeed, by dragomans and muleteers, but not by educated Syrians. *Awam* for *Kawam*, *Abl* for *Kabl*, *Ana bakul*, *Addeish* for *Kad ei shi*, *Nuss el leil* for *Nusf el Leil*, are but a few instances of these vulgar phrases. I cannot but suppose that Prof. Socin knows the word *Mueddhin*, why then does he spell it *Mueddin*? Still more curious is the fact that he occasionally confuses the gutturals ح and خ, an error which is indeed common enough among the German residents in Palestine, but which one would scarcely expect of Prof. Socin. For instance, he writes *Dohn* for *دخن* "millet" (p. 45), not to speak of *Kharbaj* for *Herbaj*, and *Sikh* for *Sih*. Probably 'Arbâin for "forty" is a slip of the pen for *Arbâin* اربعين but why is *Jebel et Tor* translated (p. 217) "mountain of light"? Surely the Aramaic word *טור* means a hill top? Again we are told that *عيس* means *Esau* rather than *Jesus* (p. 93); but in Palestine, *Esau* is known as *العيس* and never as 'Aisa. Why again are we told that *Muntâr* is the name of a Moslem saint? (p. 309) It is generally supposed to mean "watch-tower," and the saint's name in this case was 'Aly. I should be sorry to say that Prof. Socin was little acquainted with Italian, but why does he write *Foresteria* for *Forestiera*? I should not presume to doubt his knowledge of Hebrew, but it is not evident why (p. 400) he connects *Harra* with the Hebrew *Charezim*. As to the names in his Handbook, many are wrong, e.g. *Yafufa* (*Yahfufa*), *Jedra*

my Handbook and Primer, and Mr. Henderson's Handbook, for which the Society are in nowise responsible.

It is only fair to the committee of the Society to remember, that library scholars and the conductors of exploration parties are not made always of the same stuff. The committee choose the commander; they ask him for a professional report, whereby he must be judged; and if he choose to add the results of his own literary studies, and if they publish these always with the caution that for such suggestions the author is responsible, it is, I think, clear that they have fulfilled at once their duty to the public and to the explorer. This is what the Society have always done. It is a question then: 1st, As to the professional report; 2nd, As to the explorer's opinions; but in both cases a question between the explorer and the critic, not between the committee and the critic. I think that within the limits at his disposal, Prof. Socin might have

(Jidru), Sedeideh (Jedeideh), Yasir (Teiastr, etc. etc., but I feel convinced that these are printer's errors. There are, however, other points where such explanation is of no avail. The Maronites were reconciled to Rome in 1183, not "about 1600" (p. 88). Again we are told that Syria (סוריא) is derived from Assyria (אשר), p. 39. These are instances picked at random from many other minor blemishes in Prof. Socin's work. Even in matters of modern topography there might be improvements. Why, I may ask, in publishing a bad copy of my Survey of Carmel, has Prof. Socin written Khân to every ruin? was he misled by the abbreviation Kh. for Kharbeh on my map, or does he really think every ruin on Carmel is a Khan? Again, Sarona (p. 131) is not in Jaffa, but a distinct colony. The north gate of Jerusalem is called Bab ez Zahrah, not Sahrah (the old title); the Lacus Germanus was not named from a Germanus, but because constructed by knights of the German hospice. There is only one inscription at Arak el Emir (p. 308), and no philologist would agree with Prof. Socin that this is written in ancient Hebrew. Eleazar and Abishuah at 'Awertah (p. 328) are not known as "two famous teachers of the Talmud," but as the immediate descendants of Aaron. When Prof. Socin says that "the Arabic characters have been developed from the Syriac" (p. 104), he lays himself open to the charge of being only very slightly acquainted with the history of Semitic alphabets. There are many similar criticisms which I might add, but these are sufficient to show that even so careful and comparatively simple a work as that of the compiled Handbook bearing Prof. Socin's name, cannot be made quite perfect all at once. I again call attention, however, to the fact that it is by far the best yet written. But I am tempted to add, "People who live in glass houses, etc."

said more than he has about the professional reports—as to the physical description of the country, the minute accounts with plans and photographic drawings of the ruins, the legends and notes as to population, the inscriptions, and other details tending to establish date or historical sequence, the accounts of masonry dressing and other distinguishing peculiarities. Prof. Socin has, however, preferred to confine his notice to picking holes in the results which have been published outside this professional report on Palestine, which forms the main material of the Memoirs, and the most solid basis of the reputation which the Palestine Exploration Fund enjoys, at all events in England; and with his criticisms, therefore, we are now more immediately concerned.

As regards Prof. Socin's preference for the work of Guerin,¹ over the trigonometrical survey, I can only say that I am prepared to show that the methods and results of our professional work in Palestine are correct. There are small ruins not shown on my map which appear on the sketch maps made by various travellers. In some cases I know that those sketch maps are, in this respect, incorrect, special inquiry having been made at the time. In other cases the alternative name will be found in the Memoir. In others, the evidence did not appear sufficient to justify placing the name on the map. It is curious that Prof. Socin, who objects to a supposed "apologetic tendency" in the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund, has raised no such objection to the orthodox Romanism of M. Guerin, which, from an English point of view, detracts from the scientific value of his work.

¹ Some of the objections are very trivial. Taiyibeh (G. Thayibeh) is spelt طيبه. Deir es Surian (G. Deir Sirian) the survey spelling is clearly the more probable. Radj for Ráj is the well-known French transliteration dj for ج. As to position, I see no reason why Guerin's sketch should be more correct than a survey.

As regards the enumeration of my published works, I presume *Heth and Moab* is omitted as not treating of Western Palestine. I hope, however, that in this work Prof. Socin may recognise an advance on earlier attempts in *Tent Work in Palestine*, which was pointed out by my English reviewers. I regret that he has not thought well to mention this later publication, which is, I hope, an improvement on former publications of the Society bearing my name.

Respecting the arrangement of the Memoirs, I agree with Prof. Socin, that it is clumsy. The committee adopted it, I believe, on the model of the Memoirs of the Ordnance Survey of Great Britain. I always objected to the arrangement, and they allowed me to choose my own arrangement in writing the Memoir of the Eastern Survey (as yet unpublished), which arrangement will, I trust, be found more concise and easier for reference. As regards the proposed paper on the Siloam text, I may suggest to Prof. Socin that the volume of special papers was published before this inscription was discovered. A full account of the text occurs in the Jerusalem volume. Again, the suggestion that a treatise on physical geography is wanted, seems to leave out of sight the fact that each sheet of the Memoir commences with an account of the orography, hydrography, and topography of the sheet, and of the cultivation of the district. In this Prof. Socin will find the account of the water supply, which he seems to have vainly sought among the special papers. I have, however, no doubt that a clear abstract of these detailed accounts of physical geography would give a better result than that which Mr. Trelawny Saunders attained, before the publication of the Memoir, by simply describing in detail on paper the features which any intelligent student can trace for himself on the map.

Another point where Prof. Socin seems to assume

ignorance on the part of the authors of the Memoir, is that of Biblical criticism. Can he point to any statement of mine to the effect that I refer the list of desert stations to Moses, or the statistics of the division of Palestine to Joshua? He seems himself to see that my paper on Samaritan Topography tells a different tale. I may however say, that I agree with Prof. Socin in thinking the Levitical division of the land to represent a late condition of society. On the other hand, I think that Prof. Socin speaks far too confidently as to "different documents," and I regard the German views as to the distinction of such documents as being much too speculative. A school of more sober criticism, which acknowledges our inability to dogmatise as to the exact date and tendency of every episode of Old Testament books, is fast arising, and I look to see the fashionable views of Wellhausen and others pass into the limbo of former theories, as being the work of men far too self-satisfied concerning their infallibility and keen acumen as exegetical critics.

I am not aware that the permanent publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund can justly be said to have an "apologetic tendency." Survey and the description of ruins have no tendency at all; they represent the collection of facts on which the reader may put any construction he pleases. The strength of the Society lies in the fact that officially it recognises no *views*, only dealing with ascertained facts. It is clear, from Prof. Socin's misconstruction of my views on Biblical criticism, that there can have been nothing in the Survey Memoirs to allow of his knowing what those views are.

As regards the identification of the Akkadians with Mongols, I am not sure what Prof. Socin's objection can be. Perhaps I should have written Finns or Uralo-Altaic races, but this is a very slight alteration. I can hardly believe that Prof. Socin is ignorant of the results of philo-

logy in this case. The labours of Lenormant have proved beyond doubt that the old non-Semitic speech of Mesopotamia of the Akkadians, Sumerians, early Elamites and Cosseans, was closely akin to the Finnic language, and (according to the ordinary use of the word) was therefore Turanian.¹ Again, as regards the Amorites, Prof. Socin says, "It is the name in a particular document for the Canaanites in general." I presume he is referring to one of the hypothetical documents into which some German scholars divide the Pentateuch; but considering how various are the views as to these components, no ordinary student is as yet bound to accept any one among them in particular as belonging to the category of ascertained fact. Prof. Socin is presumably aware that the Amaur are mentioned in Egyptian inscriptions, and I may remark in the known instances that they always appear as inhabiting the "high lands."

It is not exactly representing my views to say that I regard the Nestorians as the Ten Tribes; and as regards Neby Saleh, I should no doubt have mentioned the story of his dromedary (found in the Koran), but Neby Saleh still remains a peculiar figure in Arab folklore not yet identified with any figure in other systems. Respecting the Fellah language and the Aramaic of the fourth century, I must refer Prof. Socin to St. Jerome and to Cyril—or even to Robinson. The evidence of the Aramaic influence on Syrian speech is, I think, far too strong to be hastily set aside by a dictum like that of my critic, that it "rests upon lack of knowledge," and far better students than

¹ If this "makes a very painful impression on a serious German student," I can only suppose that the student in question knows very little of Assyriology. As to the Phœnicians coming from Mesopotamia, the evidence is not only that of Strabo or Herodotus, but includes philological considerations which seem to me of great weight, such as the name Akharu, the worship of Nergal and Tammuz, and other indications of a like kind. I am aware that this migration is doubted by some, but it is accepted by good authorities.

myself have remarked upon this peculiarity in the case of the Nabatheans. I however maintain my original view, that the Bedawin are very little touched by Islam, often mere pagans still. Such was my experience at least, after living among them for a considerable time, and the question is fully examined in *Heth and Moab*, to which I refer Prof. Socin for details.

Prof. Socin again seems to fail in making a point as regards the worship of the Makams, "a worship," he says, "as different from the old idolatry as is the Catholic image worship." Has he, I would ask, reflected on the mass of evidence which shows that Catholic image worship also is directly founded on paganism, and that throughout Europe pagan deities of the Kelts or Gauls or Germans are still adored as Christian saints. The parallel is at least an unfortunate one for the critic.

As to the acceptability of Talmudic tradition in topography, there may be differences of opinion. My own belief is, that the earlier works of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, included under this general title with others of later date, are of very high value, as representing indigenous tradition. Like all other evidence, it cannot of course be accepted unquestioned. The question of identification is again one of opinion, but the rules of the interchange of certain letters which I have always attempted to follow are recognised by every student. Why Prof. Socin should prefer Talluza (طلوزة) to Teiasir (تياصير) as representing Tirzah (תרצה) I cannot see; the former word has not a single letter in common with the Hebrew.¹

As regards the Tomb of Rachel, I can only say that I

¹ As regards the cases (four out of more than 150) to which Prof. Socin takes exception—

Hosah = Ezzīyah is suggested for topographical reasons.

Hannathon = Kefr 'Anān is also chiefly on account of geographical position. The Talmudic Caphar Hananiah seems however to give an intermediate stage.

Neiel has the article in the Hebrew, which Prof. Socin seems to neglect.

have no confidence in Mr. Schick's supposed discovery. I investigated the matter carefully on the spot and found no basis for his assertion, nor has any one since confirmed the supposed existence of the name at Mr. Schick's site. Nor do the passages mentioned by Prof. Socin (1 Sam. x. 2; Jer. xxxi. 15) prove that Rachel's tomb was ever north of Jerusalem, while Gen. xxxv. 19, not mentioned by Prof. Socin, distinctly states that this tomb was near Bethlehem (see 16).

Prof. Socin does not believe that the Cities of the Plain were north of the Dead Sea. Josephus said they were under it, and the Biblical account may mean the same, but I can hardly think that any one who has visited the southern shores of the Dead Sea could believe it had ever been a district capable of supporting a settled population, whereas the plains of Jericho still are so capable. This, however, is not a matter in any way affecting the credit of the survey of Palestine.¹

As regards my identifications of Neby Námán with Micah, and of Neby Māshûk with Melkarth, Prof. Socin has omitted all reference to the historical evidence on which alone they rest. Perhaps he has not been able to find it in the Memoir, but I assure him that it is there awaiting his perusal. I am perhaps to blame for not giving cross references, but must beg for indulgence, as I was again exploring in Palestine while the memoirs of my first survey were being published in England.

I now come to the question of the Arabic name lists, where I am more in accord with the critic. I cannot,

Tell en Nahl is quite out of the question, but I am not responsible for this rather wild shot of Mr. T. Saunders.

Chephar Haamonai is also supported by topographical requirements as to situation.

¹ The suggestion that Kasim was Cadmus was made by Prof. Palmer. It certainly seems unfounded. As to Jisr Mujâmiâ there is a legend attached to the bridge, of a great gathering which once occurred there.

however, think that Prof. Socin can have read my account in the first volume of the *Memoirs of the Method of Execution of the Survey*. It is hardly possible that he can mean flatly to contradict—without any personal knowledge of the survey operations—my direct statement to the effect that the names were *never* repeated by the surveyors to the scribe. Each surveyor had with him invariably a local guide. Every name was taken down from the mouth of that guide in my presence, and in that of the surveyor, by the scribe. The error, if any, must have been that of the native guide. I do not, however, note any instances of such error mentioned by Prof. Socin, and I have no doubt that my assurance will induce him not again to repeat his hasty assertion, which is contrary to fact.¹

The grammatical points raised by Prof. Socin do not show, as he supposes, our ignorance of Arab grammar. They evince clearly to any one who has for six years² been living among the Fellahin, writing down their words, inquiring into the peculiarities of their dialect, and with the aid of experienced natives and residents examining the question of nomenclature, that Prof. Socin has himself very little knowledge of these dialectic peculiarities. Had he possessed such knowledge he would not have prepared a vocabulary of “townsman’s Arabic” only, for his travellers, and he might even be puzzled to understand a fellah of the outlying districts when he spoke. Thus, for instance, Burāk is no doubt not the proper plural of Birkeh, but it is certainly a form used by the peasantry,

¹ There is one instance in the north where the name Tireh is spelt تيره, yet translated “fortress,” by Prof. Palmer. I was, I believe, the first to show how this Aramaic word طيره (טירה) survives in Palestine, though its meaning is lost to the natives. They translate it “bird” (طير) and in the same way Râmeḥ (“the hill”), they translate “the tank.”

² I spent the years 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1881, 1882, among Fellahin and Arabs. I do not know how many years Prof. Socin includes under the term “a considerable time,” nor do I know if he actually lived among the peasantry and conversed with them daily in their own language.

as is Buwâb instead of Abwâb for gates. The correct form was constantly suggested to me by our scribe, but I always insisted on the fellah form being that written down. The various sounds of the feminine ending faithfully reproduce the fellah intonation. Surely Prof. Socin does not suppose that Prof. Palmer was capable of ignorance on such an elementary point as that of the *status constructus*, and I may tell the critic, that the list of abbreviations and explanations for those who could not read Arabic, was prepared, not by me, but by Prof. Palmer. The question of transliteration is one of very secondary importance. Robinson's earlier method was adopted by the committee because it was familiar in England. It is not in itself a good system; but no student would rely on the English lettering when he could find the original Arabic in the name lists.

The strictures on translation are more justifiable.¹ For this translation Prof. Palmer is responsible. In my own opinion he often introduced confusion, by rejecting a translation obtained on the spot with great care, for one found in the dictionary. On the other hand, some of my translations which Prof. Socin calls wild, rest on the respectable authority of Lane and Freytag. In the case

¹ Far from its being true that etymologising has fallen into discredit, many of our most advanced critics attach high importance to the right translation of Old Testament names, *e.g.* Prof. Robertson Smith. It is only in the future that we shall be able to judge how many of the one hundred and fifty new Biblical identifications Prof. Socin accepts. Nor has he said anything about the Byzantine sites and the Crusading places newly identified from the survey, of which there are very many.

As regards the "assistance of thorough professional scholars," I may say that Prof. Socin's Handbook seems in want of a scholarly revision which should prevent the confusion of such words as Syria and Assyria, or the writing of Dohn for Dokhn. I however agree that an index and a proper abstract of the Memoirs are wanted. I beg Prof. Socin also clearly to understand, that I am in no way responsible for Mr. T. Saunders' Old Testament Map, which I have had occasion to criticise elsewhere, and which I consider to be quite unsatisfactory. The new maps of the Bible Society, which I have revised for their committee, will be found to differ entirely from that of Mr. Saunders.

of Neby Duh, Prof. Socin fails to tell me what I have discovered since the Memoirs were published—viz. who this personage was, and where he is mentioned in Moslem literature.

The critic again objects to the translation of Shem (שׁוֹן) as meaning “brown.” It is not, however, my ignorance which is thus shown. The careful note on this question by Prof. Sayce in the *Proceedings of the Biblical Archaeological Society* seems to me to leave no doubt on this subject. This is one of several instances in which I think Prof. Socin hastily condemns statements as to the foundation for which he knows nothing.

As regards other writers, it is not my business either to defend or to condemn. The contributors to the *Quarterly Statements* of the Society are of very various calibre. It is not I think undesirable that, in an ephemeral production of this kind, all who wish should find room to write, but the value of their contributions is matter of opinion. Personally, I should prefer not to see its columns filled with endless discussions on unimportant points which can probably never be settled. I should prefer not again to read therein bad jokes, or personal details of ordinary travellers’ mishaps; but these are rare and unimportant details, and no doubt much very valuable information has been obtained from outsiders through the columns of the *Quarterly Statement*.

I would make an exception in the case of the Rev. A. Henderson to the criticisms of Prof. Socin. This writer has always been remarkable for moderation, modesty and freedom from prejudices. We may not always agree with his views, and I hear, in corresponding with him, that there are a few slips and printer’s errors in his Handbook, which he expects to amend in a future edition. I think, however, that this work—which has, by the bye, nothing to do with the Palestine Exploration Fund—is generally

so sound and useful that it cannot fail to be acceptable in the class for which it is intended.

We have come thus to the end of the Professor's criticisms. We must thank him for his expressions of approval and also for a good many really valuable suggestions and objections, but at the same time we may fairly expect him to withdraw many others which are hasty and ill-informed. We may also be allowed to suggest to his consideration, that no work—not even his own—undertaken by mortal man is perfect, and that it is necessary to look at the general character in pronouncing a verdict. The task of exploring 6000 square miles, and then preparing and publishing the results, is not a small task. It has fallen mainly on the shoulders of Mr. W. Besant and of myself, though there have been many distinguished contributors. I have no doubt Mr. Besant feels as I do, that we have learned as we went on. The task of final assimilation of the huge mass of material is not yet complete. It will probably not be complete for many years. I hope soon to offer a contribution to such assimilation in a work on which I am still engaged; but I fully expect to see, even in Prof. Socin's future editions of his Handbook, the influence of the work that has been already done. Prof. Socin's time is, no doubt, mainly occupied by original research rather than by criticism, and we may hope to obtain some results which may be more valuable even than his critical comments on the Palestine Exploration Fund, from the labours of the German Palestine Society. As yet we have had nothing very striking from them either in the way of exploration or of literature. The papers by Herr Schick and his plans are welcomed as the work of an old and zealous workman, but they are open to criticism far more severe than that levelled against the English Society. After all, we have given the public a solid mass of infor-

mation, vouched for by professional men, and accepted by students of a very high class in England. The critical school is fast being superseded by the historical in England. The study of monuments and inscriptions, coins, statues and buildings, gives us more certain results regarding the vexed questions of Oriental antiquity than any amount of exegetical criticism can be expected to give. If Prof. Socin doubts the existence of non-Semitic races in Syria, his doubt is not shared by those who have studied the records of Egyptian and Akkadian monuments, and I for one believe that more is to be learned from such comparative study than from any amount of theorising on "documents," "editors," "first and second Elohist," and the rest; at the same time it does not follow that because our line of research leads away from these bitter controversies to the safer path of contemporary monumental evidence, we are therefore ignorant of what has been written in these matters. I have studied the works of Kuenen, Ewald, Colenso, Robertson Smith, and other critics, and have become generally acquainted with the views of Hitzig, Wellhausen, and other German critical writers, and I have read Renan's great work, as well as numerous books of Lenormant; but there are many other branches of study which must yield their contributions to the study of Syrian antiquity and to which Prof. Socin does not refer. Such are the publications of the Biblical Archæological Society, the *Records of the Past*, the Sacred Books of the East, the works of Smith, Layard, Rawlinson, Boscawen, Taylor, Sayce, Chabas, Brugsch, Birch, Mariette, De Rougè, and many more. There is so much to do in collating all that these great scholars have written respecting Syria, that the study might well fill a lifetime without leaving time for exegetical works. I think Prof. Socin will agree, that time is better spent in trying to learn than in trying to pick holes in other men's

work. As regards the word already spoken—that is past. If there has been error or shortcoming, all that can be done is to amend in the future, and to strive through the aid of one's critics to avoid the perpetuation of error. In the end, the true lives, the false dies away. All we have a right to require of every writer is, that he should be honest, well-informed and open to conviction, conscientious in doing his best, and conscious of his own fallibility.

Prof. Socin is not the only competent critic who has reviewed the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Others have done so, and have pronounced it good, recognising that it has no "tendency," but is based on observation of fact, leaving to others to draw their own inferences, and embracing the labours of men of very different casts of thought, united only by a desire to ascertain the truth. I hope that Prof. Socin will recognise that it is the design of the English explorers rather to work in friendly emulation than to waste the time by carping at the efforts of others in the same line of study.

C. R. CONDER.

THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

II. THE FOURTH VISION.—ZECH. iii.

THE object of the fourth vision which was seen by Zechariah, was to restore the confidence of the people in the priesthood and its ministry. In commencing to rebuild the Temple the people naturally felt some doubt whether it was any use doing so. A temple without an inhabiting God is a mockery. No doubt the preceding vision had contained the promise, "I will dwell in the midst of thee." But they needed a further assurance. They knew that they