Klostermann versus Kautzsch and Socin.—In the interests of fairness, and to save some readers from useless expenditure of trouble, it may be noted that Professor Klostermann, the Don Quixote of criticism, who has been hailed in America as the discoverer of a new and better theory of the formation of Genesis, has not been left unanswered in Germany. I refer, on the one hand, to the excellent Kiel professor’s “Contributions to the History of the Origin of the Pentateuch,” in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for 1890 (parts 9 and 10); and, on the other, to the preface to the new edition of Kautzsch and Socin’s documentary German edition of the Book of Genesis.¹ Mr. L. B. Paton, in his laudably brief article on Klostermann’s ambitious theory in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for last April, omits all mention of what appears to Klostermann “the most manifest proof” of the justice of his condemnation of “the criticism of Genesis as hitherto [for the last 140 years] practised.” That proof is—the edition of Genesis published in 1888 by Kautzsch (whom we may perhaps venture to call the German Driver) and his eminent non-theological colleague Socin. No wonder that Kautzsch and Socin were moved to reply; and their calm, conciliatory tone is a proof that they have no fear for their cause. Nor, in fact, need most of those who read The Expositor trouble themselves about Klostermann. Klostermann is, upon the whole, disappointing even as a text-critic (see Driver, *Samuel*, preface, p. v), and it would be unwise in the extreme for non-experts to give much weight to his views on the higher criticism. Psychological probability can scarcely be conceded to a view which compels us to suppose that Genesis xxviii. 1–9 was written down as the continuation of chap. xxvii. And with regard to the so called “prejudice of the identity of the text transmitted by the synagogue with the original form of the Torah,” most English students will agree that it would be most unwise (judging from the revision of the text of Samuel and Kings given by Klostermann in Strack and Zöckler’s commentary on the Old Testament)

to found the higher criticism of Genesis on a text revised by Klostermann. This thoroughly well-meaning but too self-centred worker is hurt because Kautzsch and Socin have appeared to him to claim that the analysis of the sources of Genesis is complete, and its results definitive. But as a fact, the two analysts have been “honest enough to confess pretty often their ignorance.” What they do assert is, that “the element which still remains, and perhaps always will remain, doubtful stands in no relation to the large number of sections whose origin is certain, and which enable us to form a well-founded view of the character of the original documents, and the mode in which they were worked up together.” It would be wiser far if Klostermann would recognise these results, and co-operate with those who would fain practise historical criticism of the sources of the Hexateuch upon sounder and more historical principles than those of some of our predecessors.

T. K. Cheyne.

Isaiah lxv. 15: “And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen ones, . . . Jehovah therefore shall slay thee . . .; but his servants shall he call by another name.”—The difficulties of this passage have been somewhat too slightly treated by the commentators. There is, first of all, the philological difficulty of the middle group of words. The extreme harshness of Gesenius’s and Hitzig’s view, that “thee” in “slay thee” is a collective, and the injury to the antithesis which this view produces (see Revised Version, where it is adopted), favours the opinion of Ewald that יי is a part of the curse-formula referred to at the beginning of the verse (comp. Num. v. 21, Jer. xxix. 22). But if so, we cannot suppose the clause to contain the opening words of the curse; some introductory clause must be presupposed, such as, “Since thou hast transgressed thus against Jehovah”; comp. Driver, Hebrew Tenses, p. 168. These words, as well as the closing ones, “as he slew this and that man” (the leaders of the apostate Jews), must be supposed to be omitted under strong excitement; the omission is best indicated by asterisks. There remains the exegetical difficulty of harmonizing the two halves of the verse. The pronoun “thee” in the curse-formula, illustrated by Numbers v. 21, Jeremiah xxix. 22, suggests that “your name”
means “your names,” i.e., in this context, the name of each of you; comp. “their name”=“their names,” Deuteronomy xii. 3, Psalm ix. 5. In this case, consistency seems at first sight to require that “his servants” should mean “each of his servants”; and the net result is, that the name of each unbeliever, according to the prophet, will only survive in the speech of those who curse, but the name of each believer (i.e. his inner nature), will receive a higher and nobler expression in a new title of honour (as in Rev. ii. 17). On the other hand, we gain a more effective rebuke, if we suppose “another name” (N.B., not “a new name”) to have reference to the name which unbelievers as well as believers have hitherto borne, viz. Israel. This name, once so high and holy, has become debased by its application to a numerous and powerful body of apostate Jews (Isa. lxv. 1-5, 11; lxvi. 3, 5, 17); and just as Jehovah said of old to Moses,

“I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiff-necked people: let me alone, that I may destroy them, and blot out their name from under heaven: and I will make of thee a nation greater and mightier than they,”

so the prophet asserts here that the name “Israel” shall give place to a name as much higher than it as “Israel” was higher than “Jacob”—such a name, for instance, as “Jehovah our righteousness” (Jer. xxiii. 6).

It would seem therefore that “your name” in Isaiah lxv. 15a is equivalent to “the name of each of you” (the apostate Jews), while “another name” in ver. 15b means “another name for regenerate Israel” (like “a new name” in Isa. lxii. 2). There is no doubt an inconsistency in this, but only a superficial one. The unbelievers have no collective name; they are but isolated fragments from the “rock” of Abraham (Isa. li. 1, 2). The faithful however form one organism; the true Israelite loves to merge himself in the Church-nation. There are also one or two other points of some interest to be noticed. In Isaiah xliv. 5, “Jacob” and “Israel” are names of honour; in lxv. 15b, however, the prophet seems ashamed of the once dear name of Israel, which is no longer the equivalent of Jeshurun (“the upright”). Notice too the strange implication that the redeemed Israelites may possibly have occasion for a formula of cursing. This is parallel to the oversight in lxv. 20, bearing witness to deficient literary skill, by which, in spite of xxxiii. 24, xxxv. 8, sinners are supposed still to
exist in the new Jerusalem. The writer, it seems, involuntarily carries present experiences into the ideal future. If there were an occasion for cursing, these convicted and punished sinners would furnish an illustration for the curse, and the sinners whom God and man would alike execrate in the new Jerusalem would not reach a second century of life. The peculiarities of chaps. lxiii. 7–lxvi. are indeed great, and must not be explained away to satisfy a theory. Perhaps the πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως ὁ θεὸς λαλήσαι ἐν τοῖς προφήταις of Hebrews i. 1 may be illustrated and confirmed by the "higher criticism" of the second part of Isaiah.

T. K. CHEYNE.