

and poetical for the multitude; but spread out and popularized, his sermons may win a real command of the masses. Our belief is that Dr. Maclaren, more than any other except Robertson, has altered the whole manner of preaching in England and America, and that immeasurably for the better.

From our point of view he cannot print too much. His literary reputation is not increased by the volumes which are now appearing. But his divisions of texts and his comments are such that one wishes he may be spared to go over the whole Bible. There have been more subtle, learned and poetical preachers in our time, though not many; there have been a few far more profound: but we believe Dr. Maclaren's sermons may be read when the rest are forgotten, because he, above all his contemporaries, has faithfully interpreted the Scriptures.

EDITOR.

---

### JOB AND SOLOMON.

WE congratulate Professor Cheyne<sup>1</sup> on the firstfruits of his return to University life. The brilliant and masterly volume which he has now published is a real contribution to the study of the Old Testament. It embodies evidently the results of long and patient study; it opens new and suggestive lines of reflection; it is enjoyably written; the author's wide and diversified reading makes every page attractive. So full indeed is it of thought, that most readers, probably, will appreciate it better the second time of reading than the first. Nor is the author forgetful of those who may be ambitious to pursue their researches beyond the limits of his own volume: at the end of each division of the book, a paragraph headed "Aids to the Student," acquaints him with all that has been most recently said on the subject of the

<sup>1</sup> *Job and Solomon; or, The Wisdom of the Old Testament.* By Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of Interpretation at Oxford, Canon of Rochester. (London: Kegan Paul, 1887.)

section; and valuable supplementary information is also to be found in the *Appendix*.

The volume consists of four divisions, dealing respectively with Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, and Ecclesiastes. The treatment of each is similar, the only difference being that Ecclesiasticus is handled less comprehensively than the other three books. First the reader is made to understand the contents of the book under examination by means of illustrative quotations, and accompanying comments: the traits in which it reflects the age to which it belongs are noted and discussed: its structure and scope are examined: lastly questions of authorship and date are considered from the points of view successively of history, criticism, and philology. A special chapter is also devoted to a consideration of the moral and religious significance of each book. This outline may suffice to indicate the ground covered by Prof. Cheyne's volume; but his delicacy of touch, and still more his rare power of imparting freshness to all that he writes, and of sustaining his reader's interest even where the subject is of a technical nature, can only be learnt from a perusal of the work itself. We venture, however, to extract one or two passages in illustration of its style. On p. 77, in explanation of the beautiful verses (Job xxxviii. 12-15)—

“ Hast thou ever in thy life given charge to the Morning,  
And shewn its place to the Dawn,  
That it may take hold of the skirts of the earth,  
So that the wicked are shaken out of it,  
And the earth changes as clay under a seal,  
And (all things) stand forth as in a garment,  
And light is withheld from the wicked,  
And the arm lifted up is broken? ”

Prof. Cheyne writes:

“ How very vivid! The personified Dawn seizes the coverlet under which the earth has slept at its four ends, and shakes the evil-doers out of it like flies; upon which form and colour return to the earth, as clay (a Babylonian image) receives a definite form from the seal, and as the sad-coloured night-wrapper is exchanged for the bright, embroidered holiday-robe.”

Was ever a text more graphically expounded? And from the chapter on the “ Praise of Wisdom ” (Prov. i.-ix.), in explanation of the great personification in Prov. viii. 22 ff. (p. 159):

“ Wisdom is now presented to us, in the familiar dialect of poetry, as the first-born Child of the Creator. There is but one Wisdom; though her forms are many, in her origin she is one. The Wisdom who presided over the ‘ birth ’

of nature is the same who by her messengers (the 'wise men') calls mankind to turn aside from evil (ix. 3). There can therefore be no real disharmony between nature and morality; the picture leaves no room for an Ahriman, in this and other respects resembling the cosmogony in Gen. i., and portions of the striking descriptions in Job xxvi., xxviii., xxxviii. There is also no time when we can say that 'Wisdom was not.' Faith declares that even in that primitive Chaos of which our reason has a horror, Divine Wisdom reigned supreme. The heavenly ocean, the ancient hills, the combination of countless delicate atoms to form the ground, the fixing of the vault of heaven on the world-encircling ocean, the separation of sea and dry-land—all these were later works of God than the Architect through whom He made them. And how did the Architect work? By a 'divine improvisation' which allowed no sense of effort or fatigue, and which still continues with unabated freshness. But though her sportive path [viii. 30] can still be traced in the processes of nature, her highest delight is in the regeneration of the moral life of humanity."

After quoting the passage (Prov. viii. 22-31), Prof. Cheyne continues:

"The bold originality of this passage requires no proof. It cuts away at a blow the old mythical conception of the world as the work of God's hands, and of an arbitrary omnipotence. 'God,' as Hooker says, 'is a law both to Himself and to all things beside': 'His wisdom hath stinted the effects of His power.' 'Nor is the freedom of the will of God any whit abated, let, or hindered, by means of this; because the imposition of this law upon Himself is His own free and voluntary act' ('Jehovah produced me'). The idea then of the world as a Cosmos was not adopted by the Jews from the Greeks: it arose of itself as soon as religious men pondered over the phenomena of nature. The author of *Job* took up the idea, and re-expressed it worthily in xxviii. 12-28, the chief difference between him and his predecessor being that he denies the attainableness for man of wisdom in the larger sense, while the author of the 'Praise of Wisdom' does not raise the question whether the higher department of wisdom is open to human inquiry."

Let these extracts be supplemented by the remarks in the chapter on "the religious value of the Book of Proverbs" (p. 176): 'Can any Christian help seeing the poetic foregleams of Christ in the great monologue of Wisdom in chap. viii.? . . . Will this great section ever lose its value as a symbolic picture of the combined transcendence and immanence of the Divine Being?'

These extracts will exemplify the power possessed by Professor Cheyne of instructing his reader, and elevating him to a higher atmosphere. No doubt the volume sometimes expresses views which may impress some readers by their novelty and boldness. But it must be recollected that the object of most English commentaries is to minimize, or conceal, difficulties, and to lull the reader into a comfortable assurance that the traditional position is everywhere perfectly secure. The ordinary commentator so dreads the abuse

of criticism, that he refuses the use of it altogether; and his philological training is apt to be so imperfect that he cannot distinguish between what is mere arbitrary assertion and what rests upon a solid basis of fact. Moreover he is often deficient in that comprehensive and minute acquaintance with every part of the Hebrew Bible, without which even its shortest sections, even, for example, a single Psalm, do not appear in their proper perspective, and cannot in consequence be estimated aright. Professor Cheyne has the merit of being both outspoken and logical; and he brings to his subject a grasp not of the language merely, but, what is even of greater importance, of the ideas of the Old Testament, which enables him to present it in the most effective manner, and to suggest to the reader new and fruitful points of view. Even where we may hesitate to follow him implicitly in his conclusions, we are grateful for having the issue fairly stated, and a frank and honest endeavour made to meet it.

Prof. Cheyne's treatment of *Job* should be studied in connexion with the singularly powerful commentary on the same book by Prof. A. B. Davidson in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*. Each supplements the other in a welcome manner; the grounds, for instance, for some of Prof. Cheyne's conclusions being stated more cogently and completely in the Commentary.

In their general views of the date and place of composition of the Book of *Job*, the two professors are in substantial agreement. Against the Solomonic age, Prof. Cheyne urges justly (p. 72) "the more advanced stage of society, and greater maturity of the national intellect, presupposed on every page of the poem." Certainly, the argument from xv. 19, and even from xii. 17-19, will not be felt to be conclusive; but other considerations, taken collectively, possess weight, and the book will at least be scarcely *earlier* than the age of Jeremiah. Nor is it improbable that the home of the author was a locality E. or S.E. of Palestine (p. 75, 295). Inscriptions recently discovered have shown us that the neighbours of the Israelites spoke a language only dialectically differing from Hebrew, and that tribes farther to the south used an Aramaic dialect strongly tinged with Arabisms; by analogy, therefore, it is probable that the deviations from normal Hebrew, occurring in *Job*, are due to the fact that the author, while a genuine Israelite,<sup>1</sup> had his home in one of the border districts of Palestine, where the vocabulary was tinged by dialectic usage.

<sup>1</sup> Davidson, p. lvii.

On the structure of the book, Prof. Cheyne has a somewhat elaborate theory, though it is true it seems to be only offered tentatively as a view of "the *possible or probable* stages of its growth" (p. 66). It cannot indeed be reasonably doubted that the Elihu-speeches are a subsequent insertion—we are glad to observe the protest on p. 90 against the assumption that this view of their origin is an imputation against their "genuineness," and implies a disparagement of their value;—but whether the rest of the book was produced in successive stages as Prof. Cheyne supposes, may still, as it appears to us, be questioned. The purport of the speeches of Jehovah is justly indicated by Prof. Cheyne himself (p. 49 f.); on the Epilogue, it must suffice here to refer to Prof. Davidson's remarks (*Introd.*, p. xxxi., xxxiv. f.). The passages xxvii. 7-23 and xxviii., however, are a source of real difficulty. Each indeed is lucid enough in itself; but each (upon different grounds) is inappropriate in Job's mouth, and inconsistent with the position maintained by him, not before only, but subsequently. The difficulties are cogently stated by Prof. Davidson, pp. xxxv.-xl. and in the notes, pp. 189, 190, 201-2. German critics have spared no pains in the endeavour to establish a connexion: the passages have been made the subject of long and elaborate dissertations: the result is summed up by the last-named author in the discouraging sentence: "After all the efforts that have been made to relieve the difficulties of these two chapters, they still to a considerable extent remain" (p. xl). The fine monologue in which Job draws out the truth that absolute Wisdom belongs to the Creator, and to Him alone, practical religion ("the fear of the Lord") being the substitute appointed by Him for man, seems designed as a solution of the problem of the book; but, if so, it is unskillfully fitted in. The calm and submissive frame of mind in which Job here speaks is inconsistent with what follows, and especially leaves the ironical tone of the Divine speeches in chap. xxxviii., xxxix. unaccounted for. The difficulties which these two passages present must be admitted, though we can but speculate as to the causes to which they are due.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A few words may be permitted here with reference to xix. 26. No doubt the text of this verse is corrupt—certainly in clause *a* (מַלְאכֵי עֵלְיוֹן), if not in clause *b*. Nevertheless we are unable to view the restoration proposed by Bickell as favourably as Prof. Cheyne appears to do. The exposition on p. 289 is indeed excellent; but can it be fairly extracted from Bickell's text, printed

The treatment of the Book of Proverbs is singularly happy. Well-chosen examples are selected; and they are admirably illustrated and discussed. The position occupied in Israel by the "wise men," and their importance as a class, is well brought out. The divisions in the Book of Proverbs are marked by the titles incorporated in the text. The original collection is obviously that extending from ix. 1 to xxii. 16. Chap. i.-ix., the "glorious little treatise" (p. 156) on the Praise of Wisdom, is generally admitted to be later than the principal collections of the book, and to have been prefixed to them as an Introduction. It is assigned by Prof. Cheyne, upon plausible grounds, to a date shortly prior to the Exile. The author's inspiring view of practical ethics as a branch of Divine wisdom, and the warm, affectionate tone in which his admonitions are couched, receive just appreciation at Prof. Cheyne's hands.

Of Ecclesiastes, Prof. Cheyne writes truly (p. 255): "Whichever way we look, whether to the social picture, or to the language, or to the ideas of the book, its recent origin forces itself upon us." The social state reflected in this remarkable book, its local colouring and tone, are well characterized by Dean Bradley in his luminous expositions, delivered in Westminster Abbey in 1884-5, and since published under the title *Lectures on Ecclesiastes*. Professor Cheyne, in agreement with Ewald and Delitzsch, assigns the book to the Persian period, though rightly and fairly admitting (p. 258) that "the evidence of the Hebrew favours a later date than that of Ewald,—favours, but does not actually require it." For he views with a well-founded scepticism the attempts that have been made to trace in it the definite presence of Greek philosophical ideas, and even to discover Græcisms in the language. The style of Ecclesiastes is indeed almost that of the Mishnah (2nd cent. A.D.), and it must be a product of the time when that style was in process of formation; but the alleged Græcisms do not appear to involve more than a normal and intelligible extension of native Hebrew usage. The two chapters devoted to

on p. 288? In *v. 26 a* the construction is incredibly harsh; not only is the *order* incorrect, but a verb is sadly desiderated. In *v. 26 b* the idiom is questionable ("to see from"?). In *v. 27* would not the contrast with *v. 26* need to be more clearly expressed? observe, the *tense* וַיִּשְׁמַר is the same in *v. 26 b* and *27 a*. See further, on the passage, Prof. Davidson's note, and especially the Appendix, pp. 291-6. Prof. Cheyne, it is fair to add, allows Bickell's Hebrew to be "not easy."

“Ecclesiastes and its critics,” and the one on the “Textual Problems of Koheleth,” are discriminating and valuable. Naturally, the clever commentary of Dean Plumptre is one of those most highly commended.

Ecclesiastes, however, not less than Job, when treated as a whole, taxes severely the logical ingenuity of the critic. The author's theism is, indeed, untouched by his questionings; nevertheless, the book as a whole knows nothing of a future world, and the practical maxim which it lays down for life is a temperate and discreet enjoyment of the present, *without any accompanying reference to God* (p. 225). What, then, is to be done with iii. 17, xi. 9b, xii. 1a, 7b, 13, 14? If these passages allude to a judgment hereafter, they are not only at variance with the general tenor of the book, but are expressly contradicted by iii. 19-21 (R.V.). For there are not in reality “Two Voices” in Ecclesiastes. The author's aphorisms are no statement of the arguments for and against future retribution; nor is the higher faith (if it can be rightly so termed) of chapter xii. in any way the outcome of a previous train of reflection. It thus differs from the poem of Tennyson. In the poem there is a real debate; and the voice of doubt, having shown itself powerless in argument, is finally silenced by a particular observation of the poet. Making every allowance for the less artistic form of Ecclesiastes, had it been really the expression of a mental conflict, we should have expected the two sides to be more equably represented and more distinctly placed in opposition to one another. But this is not the case. The passages in question stand isolated. Prof. Cheyne has anticipated (p. 225) the objection to which the change in xii. 1, quoted (but not adopted) by him from Grätz, is likely to give rise: and we must frankly admit that we feel it. In Prov. v. 15-18 the figure is preserved throughout: is not the verb *Remember* here unsuitable to the metaphor supposed? Indeed, Prof. Cheyne owns (p. 226) that he wishes “some better remedy could be devised.” And (pp. 211, 234, 238-9, cf. p. 300) he in fact gives his preference to the view advocated chiefly by Luzzatto, according to which both this and the other verses referred to were additions made by an editor (see below) for the purpose of qualifying the too sustained scepticism of the book. This must be admitted to be a possible explanation; <sup>1</sup> certainly, in the case of xii. 1, a preferable alternative

<sup>1</sup> Compare the striking manner in which in the Targum to this book, a

to the desperate resort of Grätz. Is it however a necessary one? In the light of other passages, which Prof. Cheyne has not noticed in this connexion, it is difficult at least to feel confident that it is. In spite of the despondent thoughts which experience and the observation of life evoked in the author's heart, there is no hint that he is ever tempted to abandon his theistic faith: as Prof. Cheyne observes<sup>1</sup> (p. 201-2), he is not really a pessimist: he is conscious of a moral order in the world, and never loses his belief in a providential guidance of human affairs. Thus ii. 26 the man who is well pleasing before God *has* an advantage over the sinner; in v. 7 (Heb. 6) Qoheleth inculcates the fear of God—a fear which, though “cheerless,” is still “not an ineffectual” fear (*ib.* p. 217): vii. 18, 26, two other cases are mentioned in which the God-fearing man has an advantage over others. It is true, these passages do not imply a belief in future retribution; but there is no obligation to interpret the verses objected to in that sense. In iii. 17 even Delitzsch prefers the punctuation  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  *hath appointed* for  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  *there*. The verse will then be referred quite naturally to temporal judgments. xi. 9 may be interpreted similarly,—of course, without any alteration of the text. Is xii. 1, now, it may be asked, more than the application to a particular case of the belief expressed in ii. 26, and implied in the other passages quoted? If Qoheleth believes that, in spite of many disappointments and unredressed wrongs, the God-fearing man has still a comparative advantage over others, is there any inconsistency in his inculcating godliness? And xii. 7 expresses just the reversal of Gen. ii. 7. The question of the continued consciousness of the  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  does not appear to be before the author.<sup>2</sup> xii. 13 f. may be actually (as Dean Plumtre also thinks) the words of the editor of Qoheleth, defining what he conceived to be the true moral of the book, and stating it in a fuller and more pointed form than had been done by the author himself.

The passages as regards which the decision is most difficult are, it will be seen, xi. 9*b* and xii. 1*a*. If the words in xi. 9*b* cannot

reference to a future life and retribution is repeatedly introduced—far more frequently than in any other Targum—as though similarly for the purpose of counteracting the sceptical inferences which the text might be supposed to warrant.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. also the remarks of Bickell in the Introduction to his little book on Qoheleth, *Der Prediger über den Wert des Daseins* (1884), p. 37-9.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. civ. 29, the  $\text{אֲנִי}$  of *animals* is “gathered in” by God at their death.



be reasonably interpreted except of a judgment hereafter, we are indeed almost compelled to follow Prof. Cheyne in holding them to be an addition made by the editor to the text of Ecclesiastes, similar in scope to xii. 14 (which they also resemble in expression). If future retribution had been a *certainty* to Qoheleth ("and *know* that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment") as it was, for instance, to the author of the Book of Wisdom, it seems impossible but that the allusions to it would have been more frequent and distinct, and indeed that the whole tenor of his writing would have been different. For (Cheyne, p. 231) "all is *not* 'vanity,'<sup>1</sup> if there is in human nature a point connecting a man with that world, most distant and yet most near, where in the highest sense God is." And, as regards xii. 1a, the exhortation, it must be owned, agrees imperfectly with the sequel, when viewed in the light thrown upon it by the entire book. The importance of beginning the service of God in youth, whether for its own sake, or before it is too late and a premature death renders it impossible, is not what the passage expresses. "What is the natural inference from the fact that at an advanced age life becomes physically a burden? Surely this—that man should enjoy life while his powers are fresh" (*ib.*, p. 225; comp. ii. 24, iii. 22, ix. 7, 9). And if the words, "And remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth," be treated as a subsequent insertion, this is the sense which the original text will have expressed. The omission does not injure the continuity of the passage: nor, if we may adopt the hypothesis proposed (*ib.*, p. 204) upon independent grounds, that the author's meditations were left by him in an unfinished state, and only published after his death, will the addition of such a clause by the editor imply on his part any unreasonable or extravagant liberty. It is, of course, not the *fact* that the author inculcates godliness, but the *manner* and *connexion* in which he inculcates it, that arouses suspicion of the integrity of the text. And the parallels referred to above, though they sufficiently justify the former, do not altogether explain the latter. The critic distrusts his own judgment. Perhaps, after all, we are too exacting in our demand upon Qoheleth for entire consistency, and the best possible form of expression. Or are we, on the

<sup>1</sup> The limitation of "all is vanity," in xii. 8, to man's earthly life, as opposed to a higher life that is not vanity, adopted by Delitzsch and Dean Plumtre, is arbitrary, and introduces a distinction of which the author does not show that he is conscious.

other hand, unconsciously influenced by sentiment, by a secret reluctance to disown Qoheleth's authorship of a familiar and impressive text? Let those who are satisfied that they possess a judgment free of bias resolve the uncertain issue.

But whatever may be the case with xi. 9 and xii. 1, the passages which have been referred to, viz. ii. 26, v. 7, vii. 18, 26, appear to us to constitute an ample defence of the Massoretic text of viii. 12 f. Bickell's restoration, adopted by Prof. Cheyne (p. 220) is, it is true, extremely clever, and gives a thought in agreement with the context; but it is violent;<sup>1</sup> nor, if it be true that the passage is not substantially more than a re-assertion of the conviction in a moral order expressed in the verses quoted, is it required.

The student acquainted with Hebrew, and interested in the comparison of the Massoretic text with the versions, will naturally not overlook the chapters on the text of the books discussed. The emendations proposed from time to time in the notes will nearly always repay careful consideration.

In conclusion, two or three *lapsus calami*, which may be a source of some confusion, may be corrected. P. 85, line 6 from bottom, for *reversed*, read *the same*; p. 86, line 4 of par. 2, for *Job*, read *Jeremiah*; p. 88, line 6 from bottom, omit *Lamentations* (see p. 86); p. 178, line 7, the name "Aben Ezra" should be enclosed in brackets; the commentary referred to is identical with one published by the present writer in 1880 from a MS. in the Bodleian Library (with which Horowitz was unacquainted) which it is clear from internal evidence cannot be the work of Aben Ezra; p. 175, on Almodad, the note of D. H. Müller (with whom Nöldeke and Dillmann [1886] agree), should be compared in Mühlau-Volck's Gesenius, ed. 9 (1883), p. 975; or ed. 10 (1886), *s.v.*

S. R. DRIVER.

<sup>1</sup> Is it moreover probable that an editor or scribe, having before him the words כי גם יודע אני אשר יהיה אשר חטא עשה רע מאז ומאריך לו ולא יאריך ימים and desiring to modify their meaning, would write אשר חטא עשה רע מאז ומאריך לו כי גם יודע אני אשר יהיה טוב ליראי האלהים אשר ייראו מלפניו וטוב לא יהיה לרשע ולא יאריך ימים כצל אשר כי גם יודע אני? The retention of the identical words, כי גם יודע אני in a different place, and *in a different sense*, strikes us as a suspicious element in the hypothesis.