

*DR. DRIVER'S INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD  
TESTAMENT LITERATURE.*

PART II.

I VENTURE by way of preface to express the hope that whatever I say here may be read in the light of the introductory pages of Part I. The book before us is not only full of facts but characterized by a thoroughly individual way of regarding its subject. This individuality I have endeavoured to sketch with a free but friendly hand. If the reader has not followed me in this, he may perhaps misinterpret the remarks which this part of my study contains. It is only worth while for me to differ from Dr. Driver because at heart I am at one with him, and on many important points we agree. And I am reconciled to a frequent difference of opinion both as a critic and to some extent as a theologian by the thought that in our common studies it is by the contact of trained and disciplined "subjectivities" that true progress is made.

In the first two chapters of the *Introduction*, a part of which I have called "the gem of the book," Dr. Driver takes the student as near as possible to the centre of the problems. I do not think that this is equally the case throughout the remainder of the work. But I am very far from blaming the author for this relative inferiority of the following chapters. His narrow limits, which he refers to in the preface, go a long way towards accounting for this. And if I add another explanation which seems here and there to be applicable, it is not in the spirit of opposition. Let me confess, then, that some problems of not inconsiderable importance are neglected, possibly because Dr. Driver's early formed linguistic habits of mind hinder him from fully grasping the data for their solution. The reader will see what I mean presently.

Let us now resume our survey. Chapter III. relates to the very important Book of Isaiah. I need not say that it is a very careful and solid piece of work; and yet nowhere, as it seems to me, do the limitations of Dr. Driver's criticism come more clearly into view. How inadequate, for instance, is his treatment of chap. i., the prologue, presumably, of a larger collection of Isaiah's prophecies! Has it, or has it not, more than a literary unity? The question is not even touched. And what is the date of its composition or redaction? Two dates are mentioned, but without sufficient explanation, and no decision between them is made.<sup>1</sup> Is this a laudable "sobriety" and "judicial reserve"? It would be an illusion to think so. And yet, even here there is an indication that the author has progressed since 1888. The curiously popular reason offered (but "without any confidence") in *Isaiah*, p. 20, for assigning this prophecy to the reign of Jotham is silently withdrawn. And just so (to criticise myself as well as the author) I have long ago ceased to assign Isaiah i. to the time of a supposed invasion of Judah by Sargon. I might of course fill many pages were I to follow Dr. Driver through the Book of Isaiah step by step. This being impossible, I will confine myself to the most salient points of his criticism. There is much to content even a severe judge; how excellent, for instance, are the remarks on the origin of Isaiah xv.-xvi. ! Nor will I blame the author much for not alluding to what some may call hypercritical theories; it is rather his insufficient reference to familiar and inevitable problems which I am compelled to regret. Nothing, for

<sup>1</sup> The reference (p. 196, foot) to Gesenius, Delitzsch, and Dillmann as having advocated this date is hardly correct. Gesenius says (*Jesaja*, i. 148), "For Jotham I find no grounds adduced." Delitzsch (*Jes.*, p. 68), "The date of this first prophecy is a riddle," but at any rate it seems, he thinks, to belong to "the time after Uzziah and Jotham." Dillmann (*Jes.*, p. 2) refers Isa. i. to the Syro-Ephraimitish war, but he states emphatically (p. 63) that though the hostilities began under Jotham, they were not very serious till the reign of Ahaz.

instance, is said of the difficult problem of Isaiah xix. 16-25. It may be urged by the author that Kuenen himself pronounces in favour of the integrity of the chapter,<sup>1</sup> and that such a careful scholar as Prof. Whitehouse has recently expressed his surprise at the continued doubts of some critics.<sup>2</sup> That is true, but it should be added that Kuenen fully admits the strength of the critical arguments on the opposite side, and that Prof. Whitehouse pronounces judgment before he has fully heard the case.

Nor can I help being surprised (in spite of the anticipatory "plea" offered in the preface) at Dr. Driver's incomplete treatment of Isaiah xxiii., and for the same reason, viz., that its problems are familiar ones. I will not here argue the case in favour of the theory of editorial manipulation. But among the stylistic phenomena which point to another hand than Isaiah's I may at least mention מְעֻנִיָּה (v. 11), בְּשָׂדֵיִם and יְסֻדָּה לְצִיִּים (v. 13), מְכַסֶּה (v. 18). And why should the unintelligent ridicule directed against so-called "divination" and "guesswork" prevent me from attaching weight to the impression of so many good critics that Isaiah never (if I may use the phrase) "passed this work for publication"? Verses 15-18 are doubtless a post-Exilic epilogue<sup>3</sup> ("doubtless" from the point of view of those who have already satisfied themselves of the existence of much besides that is post-Exilic in pre-Exilic works). Verse 13 is written by one who has both Isaiah's phrases and those of other writers in his head; it may of course even be an Isaianic verse recast. Verses 1-12, 14 are too fine (such is my own impression) for Jeremiah, and now that it is certain (see Niese's text of Josephus) that Me-

<sup>1</sup> *Onderzoek*, ii. 71, 72.

<sup>2</sup> *Critical Review*, January, 1892, p. 10. The case for disintegration is much stronger than this writer supposes, nor are the familiar arguments adduced by him conclusive.

<sup>3</sup> My own original view (in *Isaiah Chronologically Arranged*) from which I ought not to have swerved.

nander, quoted in Jos., *Ant.* ix. 14, 2, referred to Shalmaneser by name (Σελάμψας) as the besieger of Tyre, there seems good reason to believe that Isaiah really wrote Isaiah xxiii. 1-14, but in a form not entirely identical with our present text.<sup>1</sup>

Thus much on Dr. Driver's treatment of the generally acknowledged prophecies of Isaiah. With a word of hearty praise to the useful criticism of chaps. xxxvi.-xxxix. (in which I only miss a reference to the debate as to the Song of Hezekiah), I pass on to that large portion of the Book which is of disputed origin. Here I have been specially anxious to notice any signs of advance, for it is Dr. Driver's treatment of these chapters in his earlier book which prevents me from fully endorsing Dr. Sanday's eulogy of that work in the preface to *The Oracles of God*. First of all, however, I must make some reference to a passage on which I have myself unwittingly helped to lead the author astray. It is one which most critics have denied to Isaiah and grouped with xiii. 1-xiv. 23, but which, following Kleinert, I thought in 1881 might be reclaimed for that prophet by the help of Assyriology—the "oracle on the wilderness by the sea" (xxi. 1-10). Dr. Driver mentions (p. 205) the chief reasons for thinking that the siege of Babylon referred to in this passage is one of the three which took place in Isaiah's lifetime, and tells us that in his earlier work he followed me in adopting this theory, but adds that it has not found favour with recent writers on Isaiah. With these "recent writers" I myself now fully agree. I adopted Kleinert's (or, more strictly, George Smith's<sup>2</sup>) theory as a part of a connected view of a group of prophecies of Isaiah (including x. 5-33 and xxii. 1-14), and I understood the

<sup>1</sup> The adaptation of Isaiah's prophecy to post-Exilic readers will be like Isaiah's adaptation of an old prophecy on Moab in chaps. xv., xvi. (if Dr. Driver is right in agreeing with me, p. 203).

<sup>2</sup> *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, ii. 329.

words "O my threshed and winnowed one" (xxi. 10) to refer to Sargon's supposed invasion of Judah. A change in my view of these prophecies, however, naturally led me to reconsider the date of the prophecy xxi. 1-10, which I now understand as written at the close of the exile ("Elam" in *v.* 2 = "Anzan," of which Cyrus was king before he conquered Media). The strange thing to me is that Dr. Driver should ever have agreed with me: 1, because, as I warned the student, there were "reasons of striking plausibility" for not separating this prophecy from the other prophecies on Babylon which were undoubtedly not of Isaiah's age; 2, because Dr. Driver differed from me as to the reality of Sargon's supposed invasion, and had therefore a much less strong case to offer for the new theory. The truth is that the author was biassed by a false apologetic and an imperfect critical theory. Isaiah xxi. 1-10 could hardly refer to the capture of Babylon in 538. Why? Because, "firstly, no intelligible purpose would be subserved by Isaiah's announcing to the generation of Hezekiah an occurrence lying like this in the distant future," etc. (*Introd.*, 205). In other words, Dr. Driver quietly assumes (inconsistently, I gladly admit, with his own words on Isaiah xiii. 2, etc.) that Isaiah xxi. 1-10 must be Isaiah's work, or, at least, that any other view is too improbable to mention. And in order to interpret the prophecy in accordance with an isolated part of Kleinert's and of my own former theory, he is forced to interpret "O my threshed one" in *v.* 10 as a prediction ("he foresees the sufferings which the present triumph of Assyria will entail upon them," etc., p. 205), whereas the only natural view of the words is that which explains them as descriptive of past sufferings. It is important to add that Dr. Driver seems now inclined to retreat from his former position (which was in the main my own), though he does not mention the mixture of Isaianic and non-Isaianic phenomena in the passage.

Bishop Ellicott may perhaps be severe on our supposed changeableness. But if he will refer to my own *Isaiah* (ed. 3, vol i., p. 127), he will find these words, "I gladly admit that a further knowledge of the circumstances of the Jews might conceivably enable us to reconcile the prophecy with a date at the close of the Exile." Here there was no dogmatism, no determination to treat the point as finally settled. And undue dogmatism is, I am sure, not less abhorrent to Dr. Driver than to myself.

Next with regard to the more commonly controverted prophecies in *Isaiah* i.-xxxix. The remarks on *Isaiah* xiii. 1-xiv. 23 are excellent. If they appear to any one somewhat popular and obvious, let it be remembered that this section is the first of those which are written from an Exilic point of view. It was therefore specially needful to be popular; I only regret not to find it pointed out that whatever you say about the prophecy, to assign an ode like that in *Isaiah* xiv. 4-21 to *Isaiah* is the very height of unreason. Dr. Driver's treatment of the other prophecies shows increased definiteness and insight. Chapters xxxiv. and xxxv. were not expressly dated in the *Isaiah*; they are now referred to the period of the Exile, and grouped with *Isaiah* xiii. 2, etc., and *Jeremiah* l., li. This however is not a sufficient step in advance. Long ago (see *Isaiah* i. 194)<sup>1</sup> I ventured to maintain that these chapters are post-Exilic works of the imitative school of prophecy, and ten years have only deepened my convictions. Dr. Driver may indeed claim for his own view the high authority of Dillmann, who thinks that the phenomena of these chapters "bring us at any rate to the close of the Exile," but would it not have been well to give the grounds of that cautious critic's significant qualification (*jedenfalls*)? Let us pass on now to

<sup>1</sup> See *Ency. Brit.*, art. "Isaiah" (1881); *Jewish Quarterly Review*, July, 1891, p. 102; Jan., 1892, p. 332; and cf. Dillmann, *Jesaja*, p. 302; Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, ii. 91-93; Grätz, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1891, pp. 1-8.

chaps. xxiv.—xxvii.—a dangerous hunting-ground for young scholars in search of distinction, as Mr. W. E. Barnes has lately proved by his elaborate defence of Isaiah's authorship of these chapters against all modern critics (including among these even Delitzsch.)<sup>1</sup> Dr. Driver himself, though not a young scholar, was led astray for a time by the same spirit of compromise which has so often injured him as a critic. In 1888 he was "disposed" (as he remarks, p. 209) "to acquiesce in the opinion that it might have been written on the eve of the Exile," a most unfortunate and scarcely critical opinion which isolated the author from his natural allies. The consequences of this violation of all historical probability has since then become visible to the author, who remarks that this prophecy—

"Differs so widely from the other prophecies of this period (Jer. Ezek.) that this view can scarcely be maintained. There are features in which it is in advance not merely of Isaiah, but even of Deutero-Isaiah. It may be referred most plausibly to the early post-Exilic period" (p. 210).

Well, perhaps it may—for the present. At any rate, Dr. Driver grants that a post-Exilic writing has found its way into the Book of Isaiah. I am not without hope that further study of the later prophetic writings and of the post-Exilic period in general may convince him that he is still somewhat too cautious, and that the ideas of this singular but most instructive prophecy can only be understood as characteristic of the *later* Persian age. Far be it from any one to disparage this period. The Spirit of the Lord was not suddenly straitened; the period of artificial prophecy (artificial from a literary point of view) was not without fine monuments of faith and hope and religious

<sup>1</sup> Delitzsch, it is true, had not made himself fully at home in the results of that criticism to which he was so late a convert. He can only satisfy himself that the author is "not Isaiah himself, but a disciple of Isaiah who here surpasses the master." But he is not only a disciple of Isaiah, but of other prophets too (see Dr. Driver's selection of allusions).

thought. But to carry this subject further would compel me to enter into the history of religious ideas,<sup>1</sup> and to exceed the limits of this review.

And now we can no longer avoid applying to the author one of the crucial tests of criticism, and ask, How does he stand in relation to the critical problems of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. ? That Dr. Driver neither could nor would assign these chapters to Isaiah was indeed well known from his *Isaiah*, nor need I stint my eulogy of the general treatment of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. in that book as compared with most other popular works on the subject. Very heartily do I wish the *Isaiah* a long career of usefulness. For though *unsophisticated* common sense may recognise at once that these chapters can no more have been written by Isaiah than Psalm cxxxvii. can have been written by David, there are still, I fear, not many persons like—

“ My friend A, who, reading more than twenty years ago the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, and passing without pause from the 39th to the 40th chapter, was suddenly struck with amazement and the conviction that it was impossible that one man should have written both chapters.”<sup>2</sup>

In such a brilliantly intellectual paper as the *Spectator* it is still possible to read vehement defences of the unity of authorship, and who can wonder that less literary Bible-students, in spite of their “ English common sense,” cling to the same belief ? It is very necessary therefore for some competent scholar like Dr. Driver to remedy, so far as he can, what may be called the sophistication of our native good sense. Still an older student of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. may be permitted to regret the imperfection of Dr. Driver’s work. To treat Isaiah xl.-lxvi. as a “ continuous prophecy,” written from the same historical and religious standpoint, and dealing throughout with a common theme, is a retrograde

<sup>1</sup> Comp. my *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 120, 133, 402, 403.

<sup>2</sup> From a letter signed “ Hope ” in the *Times*, Jan. 7th, 1892.

policy which I cannot help lamenting. As long as this theory was advocated in a semi-popular work, it was possible to hold that Dr. Driver adopted it from educational considerations. There is, of course, no competent teacher who does not sometimes have to condescend to the capacities of his pupils. It *is* no doubt easier for a beginner to take in the view of what I have heard called the "dual authorship of the Book of Isaiah" than a more complicated, even though a sounder theory. But when the statements of Dr. Driver's *Isaiah* are repeated in a work which aims at "representing the present condition of investigation," it becomes more difficult to account for them. For the progress of exegesis has revealed the fact that there are several striking breaks in the continuity, changes in the tone and the historical situation, modifications of the religious ideas. "Revealed" may seem a strong word, but the truth is that though some early critics had a glimpse of these facts, the knowledge was lost again in a very natural rebound from the pernicious extreme of the fanatical disintegrators. It was Ewald who rectified the new error of Gesenius and Hitzig, and the example of *moderate* disintegration set by him was followed, not of course without very much variety of view, by Bleek, Geiger, Oort, Kuenen, Stade, Dillmann, Cornill, Budde, and in England by myself in 1881, and by Mr. G. A. Smith in 1890. The principal exegetical facts which require disintegration will be found in my own commentary on Isaiah (1880-1881), my own latest explanation of them in two published academical lectures.<sup>1</sup> I have no feverish anxiety to make converts;

<sup>1</sup> See *Jewish Quarterly Review*, July and Oct., 1891. Budde approaches very near to me, confirming his view by his researches into the "elegiac rhythm" (Stade's *Zt.*, 1891, p. 242). Those who wish for bolder theories may go to Kuenen and Cornill. The gradualness of Kuenen's advance adds special weight to his opinions. I will not deny the plausibility of his arguments, especially in the light of a more advanced view of the date of Job. But I can only write according to the light which I have at the time.

I am perfectly willing to be converted to other theories by more acute and thorough critics than myself. But what is desirable is this: that the exegetical facts which so many trained critics have noticed should be recognised and critically explained by all earnest scholars, and that some credit both for priority among recent analysts and for caution and moderation should be awarded where it is due. Such remarks as these ought to be impossible in the principal literary organ of Anglican Churchmen.

“ We think that there is at present in some quarters [‘ another professor ’ had been already indicated] a readiness to break up works on utterly insufficient grounds, which is almost wantonly provoking, and we are heartily glad that Dr. Driver gives no countenance whatever to such a proceeding.”<sup>1</sup>

The pretension here and elsewhere set up on behalf of Dr. Driver is doubtless most repugnant to that candid scholar, but it is, I fear, his own imperfect exhibition of the “ present condition of investigation ” which has produced the serious errors and illusions of a conscientious but ill-informed writer.

I will now advance a step. It is in the interests, not only of criticism, but also of that very view of the “ prophecy of restoration ” which Dr. Driver himself values so highly that I venture to criticise his treatment of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. For although there is much in these chapters which, as conservative scholars admit, may be taken to favour an Exilic date, there are also, as they rightly maintain, other phenomena which seem inconsistent with this date. Dr. Driver has, of course, an explanation for those phenomena which do not altogether suit him, and so, too, have his conservative opponents for those which do not suit them. It is impossible therefore that either side should gain an undisputed victory.<sup>2</sup> Seeing this, the

<sup>1</sup> *Guardian*, Dec. 2, 1891 (p. 1953).

<sup>2</sup> Even if it be granted that Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is not Isaiah's work, there is no

*moderate* disintegrating critics intervene with an *eirenicon*; why should not Dr. Driver join them, and claim for himself a share in the blessing of the peace-makers? There is room enough for the linguistic and the rhythmical keys, as well as for that which I myself chiefly applied to these problems. But I will not dwell longer on this thorny subject.

The next prophets in order are Jeremiah and Ezekiel. On these the "higher criticism" has less to say than on the Book of Isaiah. With regard to Jeremiah x. 1-16, Dr. Driver tells us that either it belongs to the latter part of Jeremiah's career, or it is the work of a prophet at the close of the Exile. But why hesitate? Surely the two theories are not *equally probable*, and interesting as the linguistic remarks on the interpolated Aramaic verse (*v.* 11) may be, are they not somewhat out of place? At any rate the facts want a little more theory to illuminate them. Nor are they complete. If אַרְקָא occurs in x. 11 *a*, is not the ordinary form אַרְעֵא found in x. 11 *b*? And does not the less usual form occur in the Midrashim (e.g., *Ber. R.* 13)? Moreover, does not the suffix הוּם deserve mention? It agrees with the Aramaic part of Ezra, but not with that of Daniel<sup>1</sup> (which always gives הוּן). I do not (as the reader will see later) undervalue linguistic data; but would not these particular facts have been more in place in the great forthcoming Hebrew Dictionary? And why is there no reference to Mr. Ball's somewhat elaborate discussion of chap. x. in his contribution to the *Expositor's Bible*?<sup>2</sup> Consider how much else has been "crowded

absolute necessity to adopt Dr. Driver's view. For it may be asked, May not the prophecy be a *work of the restoration-period*? (So not only Seinecke but Isidore Loeb, *Revue des études juives*, juillet-sept., 1891.) My own answer, of course, is ready; but what can Dr. Driver say?

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bevan omits to notice this point in his excellent work on Daniel (p. 36).

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Ball's *Jeremiah* has escaped the notice of the author, who takes such pleasure in recognising English work.

out." For instance, though perhaps enough is said of the two texts of Jeremiah (Dr. Driver, on the whole, prefers the Hebrew; Cornill the Greek text), there is no sufficient discussion of the method and plan of Jeremiah's editor, nor are any hints given with regard to possible interpolations other than those to which the Septuagint can guide us (*e.g.* xvii. 19-27). Another interesting question (raised by Schwally) is that of the authorship of Jeremiah xxv. and xlvi.-li. Though Jeremiah l.-li. is fully admitted (on grounds which supplement those given in 1885 in my "Pulpit Commentary") to be Exilic, the larger problem is not referred to. On the contents of Ezekiel, too, much more might have been said. There are difficulties connected with the question of Ezekiel's editorial processes—difficulties exaggerated by a too brilliant Dutch scholar (A. Pierson), and yet grave enough to be mentioned. But of course a difference of judgment as to the selection of material is occasionally to be expected. At any rate, valuable help is given on Ezekiel xl.-xlviii., which, by an instructive exaggeration, some one has called "the key to the Old Testament."<sup>1</sup> It remains for some future scholar to rediscover this great pastor, patriot, and prophet.<sup>2</sup>

The Minor Prophets are by no means all of them either of minor importance or of minor difficulty.<sup>3</sup> In some cases, it is true, the date and authorship are on the whole free from difficulty. Hence in treating of Hosea, Amos, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Malachi, it is the contents and special characteristics of the books to which Dr. Driver mainly directs his attention. Not that

<sup>1</sup> J. Orth, *ap.* Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 447.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Davidson's *Ezekiel* (in the Cambridge Biblical series) has not yet come into my hands.

<sup>3</sup> I venture to regret that no mention is made of Renan's interesting study on the Minor Prophets in the *Journal des savants*, Nov., 1888. Renan may have great faults, but cannot be altogether ignored. Taylor's *Text of Micah* (1891) might also claim mention.

there are no critical questions of any moment, but, as a rule, they are of a class in which the author is not as yet much interested. It were ungracious to touch upon them here, except in the case of Habakkuk iii. In omitting all criticism of the heading of this ode, or psalm, Dr. Driver seems to me inconsistent with himself; for though he leaves the authorship of the "Song of Hezekiah" unquestioned, he has no scruple in holding that the psalm in Jonah ii. was not the work of Jonah. In the "present state of critical investigation" it has become almost equally difficult to defend tradition in any one of these cases. Certainly neither the expressions nor the ideas of Habakkuk iii. agree with those of Habakkuk i., ii.; they favour a post-Exilic rather than a pre-Exilic date. The most reasonable view is that both the psalms of Hezekiah and that of Habakkuk once formed part of a liturgical collection (cf. Hab. iii. 19, Isa. xxxviii. 20).<sup>1</sup> Had Dr. Driver omitted the reference on page 283 to a bold conjecture of Prof. Sayce,<sup>2</sup> he would have gained more than enough space for some mention of this important critical point. He might also have gracefully referred to Mr. Sinker's *Psalm of Habakkuk* (1890). I venture to add that caution is carried too far when the date of Nahum is placed between B.C. 664 and 607. The prophecy must, it would seem, have been written either *circa* B.C. 660 (as, following Schrader, Tiele and myself dated it in 1888), or *circa* 623, the date of the first campaign of Cyaxares against Assyria (as recently both Kuenen and Cornill).

The other Minor Prophets are considerably more difficult. Obadiah, for instance, well deserves a closer investigation. Dr. Driver's treatment of the book is, as far as it

<sup>1</sup> So Stade and Kuenen; see also my *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 125 (top), 156, 157, 210, 214, and *Isaiah*, i. 228-9.

<sup>2</sup> For which, besides Dr. Driver's references, see *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, ii. 18-22.

goes, excellent. On Obadiah 1-9 he adopts the most critical view, viz., that Obadiah here takes for his text a much older prophecy, which is also reproduced with greater freedom in Jeremiah xlix. 7-22. But he makes no attempt to fix the period of the prophecy more precisely. I will not presume to censure him for this. But if the book was to carry out the promises of the programme, I venture to think that the two views which are still held ought to have been mentioned, viz. (1) that Obadiah wrote soon after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar (Schrader, Riehm, Meyrick); and (2) that his date is some time after the re-establishment of the Jews in their own land (Kuenen, Cornill). The latter view seems to me to be required by a strict exegesis.

There is also another omission of which I would gently complain. Dr. Driver undertakes to give some account of the contents of the several books. But here he omits one most important feature of Obadiah's description, which I venture to give from a critical paper of my own (printed in 1881) which has escaped the notice of Dr. Driver.

"One very singular feature requires explanation. The captives of the northern kingdom are not to settle in their old homes; their kinsmen of the southern tribes have expanded too much for this. They are therefore compensated by the gift of that border-land, which had never as yet been thoroughly conquered, 'the cities of the Canaanites as far as Zarephath' (this is the most probable view of the first half of v. 20)—they became, in fact, the guardians of the northern marches just as the captives of Judah are the keepers of the southern. Tyre is excepted, for a great future is reserved for Tyre (Isa. xxiii. 17, 18). But in speaking of the captives of Judah we must draw a distinction. The guardians of the 'south-country' (the *Negeb*, or 'dry land') are, not the mass of the captives of Israel, but those 'who are in Sepharad.'" <sup>1</sup>

Now, what is "Sepharad"? If this had nothing to do with the date of the book, Dr. Driver might simply have referred to a dictionary of the Bible. But it has very much

<sup>1</sup> "The Book of Obadiah," *Homiletic Quarterly*, Jan., 1881, pp. 114-117.

indeed to do with it, and Prof. Sayce may justly complain of the author for this neglect of archæological evidences. I am aware of the diversity of opinion which exists among scholars as to the locality of "Sepharad"; the evidence and the arguments lie before me. But it is clear that if the prophecy, as it stands, is post-Exilic, we can hardly help identifying "Sepharad" with Çparda, the name of a province of the Persian empire, which stands between Cappadocia and Ionia in the inscription of Darius at Naksh-i-Rustam.<sup>1</sup> What now becomes the most natural view of the date of the prophecy? When can there have been a captive-band from Jerusalem in Phrygia or Lydia? The earliest possible time known to us is about B.C. 351, when Artaxerxes Ochus so cruelly punished the participation of the Jews in the great revolt. I have remarked elsewhere that this was "the third of Israel's great captivities,"<sup>2</sup> and have referred various psalms to the distress and embitterment which it produced. It is very noteworthy that the prophet nowhere mentions either the Chaldeans or *Babylon*. Also that Joel iii. 6, refers to "children of Judah and of Jerusalem" as having been sold to the "sons of the Javanites" (Ionia was close to Çparda = Sepharad). Now Joel, as Dr. Driver and I agree, is post-Exilic, and *appears to refer in ii. 32 to Obad. 17*. Is all this of no importance to the student? I cannot think so, provided that the critic also points out the religious elements which give vitality to this little prophecy.

Here let me remind the reader that I am no opponent of Professor Driver. Most gladly would I have given him unmingled thanks for all the good that is in his book. I am only hindered from doing so by those very serious mis-

<sup>1</sup> See *Records of the Past*, V. 70 (where however "Sparta" is an incorrect identification of "Çparda"). On "Sepharad," Lassen, Spiegel, Oppert, Sayce, but especially Schrader, have learnedly discoursed. See the latter's *The Cuneiform Inscriptions*, etc. (by Whitehouse) on Obad. 20, and his *Keilschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, pp. 116-119.

<sup>2</sup> *Bampton Lectures for 1889*, p. 53; cf. p. 229.

apprehensions of the public, which I have endeavoured to combat, and to which, in one respect, the editors of the "Library" have unintentionally contributed. It was perhaps specially difficult for Professor Driver to explain the prevailing tendency of critical opinion on the Minor Prophets because of the attention naturally directed in the Anglican Church to the successor of Dr. Pusey, a scholar who not only worthily summed up and *closed* a philological period, but represented a school of orthodoxy which is still powerful among us. Dr. Driver would not, I believe, say that he has as yet given us all that he hopes to know about Joel. This little Book is one of those which suffer most by a separate treatment, and every advance which we make in our study of the other post-Exilic writings must react (as I have shown in one case already) on our view of Joel. But what Dr. Driver does give us is excellent; I only miss the definite statement (which is surely a necessary inference from the facts produced) that the Book of Joel is at any rate hardly earlier than the age of Nehemiah (*i.e.* the second half of the fifth century).<sup>1</sup> It might also have been mentioned that the early Jewish doctors were rather for than against a late date for Joel.<sup>2</sup>

I now come to a Book which, by the common consent of sympathetic readers, is one of the most beautiful in the Old Testament Canon—the Book of Jonah. It is also however one of the most controverted, and one cannot but admire the quiet dignity with which Dr. Driver sets forth his own free but devout critical views. In the first place, as to the date. By four (or rather five)<sup>3</sup> arguments unconnected with the extraordinary character of the story, it is shown that the Book finds its only natural home in the

<sup>1</sup> So Merx, Kuenen, Cornill, and Prof. Robertson Smith. On the linguistic argument see further on.

<sup>2</sup> See Rosenzweig, *Das Jahrhundert nach dem bab. Exile*, p. 45.

<sup>3</sup> See note 1, p. 301.

post-Exilic period. I think myself that we might go further, and that from a fuller study of the literature and history of the post-Exilic period, and also (if I may say so) of *psalm-criticism*, Dr. Driver may obtain a still more definite solution of the critical problem. But the main point has been settled beyond dispute. It remains however to determine (1) What the didactic purpose of the Book is, and (2) Whether, or to what extent, the narrative is historical. On the latter point Dr. Driver says that "quite irrespectively of the miraculous features in the narrative, it must be admitted that it is not strictly historical," but also that—

"No doubt the materials of the narrative were supplied to the author by tradition, and rest ultimately on a basis of fact: no doubt the outlines of the narrative are historical, and Jonah's preaching was actually successful at Nineveh (Luke xi. 30, 32), though not upon the scale represented in the Book" (p. 303).

May I be allowed gently to criticise the latter statement, which yields too much to stationary thinkers like Bishop Ellicott? The author speaks here as if, whenever the Saviour referred in appearance to historical individuals, He necessarily believed Himself that the persons named were actually historical. This in Sir Philip Sidney's time appears to have been commonly held; for in mentioning the story of the rich man and Lazarus<sup>1</sup> he apologetically refers to "the learned divines" who account the narrative to be a parable. But what necessity is there for this view with regard to Christ's words in Luke xi. 30, 32? Considering how temporary and therefore how superficial the "repentance" of the Ninevites (if historical) must have been, and how completely different was the repentance which Christ demanded, it becomes surely the most natural view that Jesus Christ interpreted the story as an instructive parable. We cannot indeed prove this; and even if He did,

<sup>1</sup> *An Apologie for Poetrie* (Arber), p. 35.

with His wonderful spiritual tact, so interpret it, we cannot be sure that He would have communicated His interpretation to His dull disciples, on whom probably the distinction between history and quasi-historical didactic fiction would have been lost.

I venture also to object that Dr. Driver's reference to the New Testament will give offence to many young men who, without being in the least undevout, desire to *study the Old Testament historically*. He who would guide this best class of students must not even seem to be biassed by a disputable theological theory respecting the knowledge of the Saviour. To me it appears in the highest degree probable that the story of the Book of Jonah is not merely not in all points, but not in any point, historical, and I have on my side such a moderate and orthodox critic as Riehm.<sup>1</sup> The romantic form of literature which flourished among the later Jews must have had a beginning; Tobit cannot have been its first specimen. It also appears to me more than probable that there is a mythic element in the story of Jonah. I do not mean that this story is itself a popular myth, but that, as I showed in 1877,<sup>2</sup> the author of "Jonah" (like the writer of Jeremiah li. 34, 44) adopted a well-known Oriental mode of expression, based upon a solar myth.<sup>3</sup> Bishop Ellicott, whom I meet with regret as an opponent, thinks this view dishonouring to the Bible. To the younger generation however who have felt the fascination of myths, the word which has dropped from the Bishop's pen in connection with myself,<sup>4</sup> will appear strangely mis-

<sup>1</sup> Riehm, *Einleitung*, ii. 167 ("eine reine Dichtung").

<sup>2</sup> See *Theological Review*, 1877, pp. 211-219.

<sup>3</sup> See my *Jeremiah*, vol. ii. (1885), pp. 293, 294, and my *Job and Solomon* (1887), pp. 76, 77 (where allusions to the Babylonian myth of the struggle between Marduk (Merodach) and the dragon Tiāmat are pointed out). In Jer. li. 34, 44, which very possibly furnished the author of "Jonah" with the basis of his story, it is Israel whom Nebuchadrezzar "hath swallowed up like the dragon."

<sup>4</sup> *Christus Comprobator*, p. 186.

placed. They will be well pleased at the discovery that the story of Jonah (like that of Esther) contains an element of mythic symbol. They will reverence its writer as one of those inspired men who could convert mythic and semi-mythic stories and symbols into vehicles of spiritual truth. Dr. Driver, it is true, is not on my side here. He timidly refers to the allegoric theory, without himself adopting it, and even without mentioning how I have completed the theory by explaining the allegoric machinery. Still, what Dr. Driver does say (p. 302) as to the aim of the Book of Jonah is in itself excellent, and may, without violence, be attached to the mythic-allegoric theory. The story of Jonah did in fact teach the Jews "that God's purposes of grace are not limited to Israel alone, but are open to the heathen as well, if only they abandon their sinful courses, and turn to Him in true penitence." And I think these words may be illustrated and confirmed by a passage from my own discussion of the relation of the Jewish Church to heathen races.

"The author [of Jonah] belongs to that freer and more catholic school, which protested against a too legalistic spirit, and he fully recognises (see Jonah iv. 2) that the doctrine of Joel ii. 12 applies not merely to Israel, but to all nations. He is aware too that Israel (typified by Jonah "the dove") cannot evade its missionary duty, and that its preaching should be alike of mercy and of justice."<sup>1</sup>

There still remain Micah and Zechariah. Both books are treated with great fulness, and with results which fairly represent the present state of opinion. I would gladly quote from both sections, but especially from that on Micah. On Micah iv. 10 the author agrees with me that the words, "and thou shalt go even to Babylon," are an interpolation. This is a brave admission, though the author does not

<sup>1</sup> *Bampton Lectures for 1889*, pp. 294-5. Why is Israel called Jonah? Because Israel's true ideal is to be like, not the eagle, but the dove. See my note on Ps. lxxviii. 14 (end), and comp. a beautiful passage in *Links and Clues*, p. 113.

recognise the consequence which follows from this for the criticism of Isaiah xxxix. 6, 7.<sup>1</sup> On Micah vi., vii. (later additions), able as the author's criticisms are, they are lacking in firmness. In the Zechariah section, the great result is attained, that not only Zechariah i.-viii., but also Zechariah ix.-xi., and xii.-xiv., come to us from post-Exilic times. Not that Dr. Driver, like another able philologist, Professor G. Hoffmann,<sup>2</sup> goes back to the old view of the unity of authorship—a plurality of authors is evidently implied by his remarks. Nor yet that he accepts the somewhat radical theory of Stade, published in his *Zeitschrift* in 1881-82. He holds that in Zechariah ix.-xi. we have a post-Exilic prophecy, which was modified in details, and accommodated to a later situation by a writer who lived well on in the post-Exilic period. This is substantially the view which I have already put forward and to which Kuenen has independently given his high authority. Nor ought I to pass over the fact that though Stade has done more than any one for the spread of a similar view, my own theory was expounded at length by myself in 1879, in a paper read before the Taylerian Society, and briefly summarized in the same year in print in the *Theological Review*.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Driver is so kind as to refer to this paper, which only lately reached publication. For this I thank him. There is too little recognition of work done by Englishmen in darker days, before criticism began to be fashionable. But the greater becomes my regret at Dr.

<sup>1</sup> Nothing in Dillmann's note on Isaiah, l.c., affects the main points urged in my own commentary. For my matured opinion on Micah iv. 10, and a vindication of its essential reverence, see my note in the small Cambridge edition of Micah.

<sup>2</sup> *Hiob* (1891), p. 34, note.

<sup>3</sup> See *Theological Review*, 1879, p. 284; *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1889, pp. 76-83. I must add that Professor Robertson Smith said in 1881 that he had long held Zechariah xii.-xiv. to be post-Exilic, and that Stade had convinced him that Zechariah ix.-xii. was of the same period (*The Prophets of Israel*, p. 412).

Driver's neglect of similar work of mine, which also stands chronologically at the head of a movement, on Isaiah xl.-lxvi.<sup>1</sup>

The remaining six chapters of the *Introduction* relate to the Kethubim or Hagiographa. May they be widely read, and stir up some students to give more attention to these precious monuments of the inspired Church-nation of Israel! Prefixed are some excellent pages on Hebrew poetry, in which some will miss a reference to Budde's important researches on the elegiac rhythm (the omission is repaired on p. 429). After this, we are introduced to the first of the Hagiographa, according to our Hebrew Bibles—the Book of Psalms. Surely there is no book in the Canon on which an Anglican Churchman and a member of a cathedral chapter may more reasonably be expected to throw some light than the Psalter. It must however be remembered that Dr. Driver's space is limited. He has only twenty-three pages—all too few to expound the facts and theories to which the Christian apologist has by degrees to accommodate himself. Let no one therefore quarrel with the author, if on the religious bearings of his criticism he withholds the help which some students will earnestly desire; and let it be also remembered that Dr. Driver is one of a band of scholars who supplement each other's work, and that every good special work on the Psalms which in any large degree deviates from tradition supplies (or should supply) some part of the apologetic considerations which are here necessarily omitted. He had only twenty-three pages! But how full these pages are of accurate and (under the circumstances) lucidly expounded facts! Nor is this all. His critical argument opens up very instructive glimpses of the actual condition of investigation. How difficult his

<sup>1</sup> I ought, however, to add that my articles receive a bare mention in the Addenda to Dr. Driver's second edition.

task was, I am perhaps well qualified to judge, and the regret which I feel at some undue hesitation in his criticism is as nothing to my pleasure at the large recognition of truth.

For there is in fact no subject on which it is so easy to go wrong as in the criticism of the Psalter. It is to be feared that English scholars in general do not take up the inquiry at the point to which it has been brought by previous workers.<sup>1</sup> Here, for instance, is Professor Sanday—that fine New Testament critic and catholic-minded theologian—expending twelve pages on the proof that the age of the Maccabees is the latest possible period for the completion of the Psalter, and then expressing a half-formed opinion on Maccabean Psalms; and these pages form part of a work designed as a guide to opinion on some current Biblical controversies.<sup>2</sup> And here is Professor Kirkpatrick, from whom as a Hebraist one hopes so much, entering on one of the most complicated critical inquiries without telling us clearly where he stands with regard to any of the other questions of the “higher criticism.”<sup>3</sup> Other persons may find, in facts like these, nothing to

<sup>1</sup> The best general introduction to the Psalms is still Professor Robertson Smith's article “Psalms” in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1886). As a contrast see M. de Harlez's article on the age of the Psalms (*Dublin Review*, July, 1891)—a singular specimen of crude and fallacious criticism.

<sup>2</sup> Sanday, *The Oracles of God*, 2nd ed., pp. 129-140. I am, of course, only speaking of the appendix of this useful book.

<sup>3</sup> See Kirkpatrick, *The Psalms: Book I.* (1891). Another work by Professor Kirkpatrick (*The Divine Library of the Old Testament*) just received, enables me to supplement the above remark. The book is written in a good spirit, and in a limpid style, and will be useful to many as a temporary compromise. Since however the author directly challenges me to speak, I must venture to say that I am not convinced of the maturity of his critical studies. On some parts of the Old Testament, indeed, he expresses himself in a not un-critical way. But it is only on Isaiah that anything like a date is given, Isaiah xl.-lxvi. being assigned to a prophet in Babylonia, near the close of the Exile. On the results of modern criticism of the Books of Samuel the author is still as silent as he was in his early work (*Samuel*, 2 vols., 1880-81). I am afraid that from these roots a healthy and mature historical criticism of the Psalms will but slowly spring.

regret. I confess that I do myself regret them very much. Criticism appears to me a historical and a European movement, and I am sure that this view is endorsed by the editors of this "international and interconfessional" series. But let me hasten to add that I do not feel this regret in reading Dr. Driver on the Psalms. He does not, indeed, tell us much about his method of research; the plan of his work forbade him to exhibit his results genetically. But on pages 360-362 he gives hints of great value to students, on which I will only offer this remark—that with all his love for the Hebrew language he cannot bring himself to say that the linguistic argument is a primary one (to this point I may return later). One thing at least is certain, that the author is not in that stage represented provisionally by Professor Kirkpatrick, when "internal evidence, whether of thought, or style, or language," seems to be "a precarious guide," and when the student who has become sceptical of the titles of the psalms feels that he is "launched upon a sea of uncertainty."<sup>1</sup>

But to proceed to details. One of the most important things for Dr. Driver to bring out was the composite origin of the Psalter. At the very outset we are met by the fact that in the Hebrew Bible (comp. the Revised English Version) the Psalter is divided into five books. Four of these books are closed by a doxology, which Dr. Driver explains by the custom of Oriental authors and transcribers to close their work with a pious formula (p. 345). But how strange it is, on this theory, that the Psalter itself is *not* closed by such a formula, but only certain divisions of the Psalter! If the doxologies are expressions of personal piety, the fact that Psalm cl. is a liturgical song of praise constitutes no reason for the omission of a closing doxology. And when we examine the doxologies more closely, we find

<sup>1</sup> Kirkpatrick, *The Psalms: Book I.*, Introd., p. xxxi.

that they all have a pronounced liturgical character.<sup>1</sup> This is of some consequence for the controversy with traditionalistic writers on the Psalms. Next comes the great fact of the existence of internal groups, marked by the headings; Dr. Driver sums up the best that has been said in a small space. On the titles he is somewhat tantalizing; a disproportionate amount of space is given to the demolition of the historical value of the title "To David" as a record of authorship. At least, my own feeling is that the small-print illustrations on pp. 353-355 could have been omitted, and that the author should have trusted to the natural impression of an honest reader of the Psalms. At any rate, no one who has followed Dr. Driver thus far can doubt that, in Prof. Robertson Smith's words, "not only are many of the titles certainly wrong, but they are wrong in such a way as to prove that they date from an age to which David was merely the abstract psalmist, and which had no idea whatever of the historical conditions of his age."

There are three points which I should have been specially glad to see mentioned. First, that the Septuagint differs considerably from the Hebrew text in its psalm-titles. A careful study of the Greek titles would be most illuminative to the ordinary student. Secondly, that in order properly to criticise the ascription of any particular psalm, the student must first of all obtain a historical view of the picture of David in different ages, beginning with that disclosed by a critical study of the Books of Samuel, and ending with that in the Books of Chronicles. More especially he must to some extent assimilate a free (but not therefore undevout) criticism of the two former books. Dr. Driver's work does not give as much help as could be wished in this respect, but his results on the "Davidic" psalms really presuppose a critical insight into the David-

<sup>1</sup> See *Bampton Lectures for 1889*, p. 457, and cf. Abbott, *Essays on the Original Texts* (1891), p. 222.

narratives. And thirdly, something should, I think, have been said about the titles of Psalms vii. and xviii;—of the former, because conservative scholars maintain that the mention of the otherwise unknown “Cush” proves the great antiquity of the title, or at any rate of the tradition embodied therein,<sup>1</sup> and of the latter, because of its unusual fulness, and because the psalm occurs again in a somewhat different reunion with almost exactly the same title near the end of the second Book of Samuel, which latter circumstance has been supposed greatly to increase the probability of the accuracy of the title.<sup>2</sup> With regard to the former title, it ought to be admitted that “Cush” is no Hebrew proper name; there must be a corruption in the text.<sup>3</sup> With regard to the latter, it can hardly be doubted that it comes from some lost narrative of the life of David, which on critical grounds can hardly be placed earlier than the reign of Josiah.<sup>4</sup> (There seems to be no reason for thinking that the editor of the “Davidic” psalter took it from Samuel).

The result of the argument against the universal accuracy of the title “To David” is thus summed up by Dr. Driver:—

<sup>1</sup> So Delitzsch, followed by Prof. Kirkpatrick.

<sup>2</sup> M. de Harlez thinks that “if we choose to look upon the testimony of 2 Kings (Sam.) xxii. as false, then the whole Bible must be a gigantic falsehood, and there is no use troubling ourselves about it” (*Dubl. Rev.*, July, 1891, p. 76).

<sup>3</sup> Cornill (*Einkl.*, p. 208) proposes to read “Cushi” (following Sept.’s *Χουσι*); but the episode of “Cushi” (see 2 Sam. xviii.) was surely most unlikely to have been thought of. The corruption must lie deeper. “A Benjamite” certainly looks as if intended to introduce a person not previously known (otherwise, as Delitzsch remarks, we should have “*the* Benjamite”). But such a person would be sure to have his father’s or some ancestor’s name given. The Targum substitutes for Cush, “Saul, the son of Kish.” But Saul is a well-known person, and elsewhere in the titles has no appendage to his name. Shimei, who reviled David, might be thought of, but he is called (2 Sam. xix. 16) “Shimei, son of Gera, *the* Benjamite.” The conjecture adopted in *Bampt. Lect.*, pp. 229–243 alone remains. “Targum sheni” on Esther expressly credits David with a prevision of Mordecai (cf. Cassel, *Esther*, p. 299). I hesitate between this conjecture and the preceding one.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Bampt. Lect.*, p. 206 (foot).

“Every indication converges to the same conclusion, viz., that the ‘Davidic’ psalms spring, in fact, from many different periods of Israelitic history, from the period of David himself downwards; and that in the varied words which they reflect . . . they set before us the experiences of many men, and of many ages of the national life” (p. 355).

It is however scarcely possible to say that this inference is logical. It is, of course, an idea which involuntarily suggests itself at the point which Dr. Driver’s argument has reached, but it is not a legitimate “conclusion” from the data which have as yet been brought forward, and to dally with it disturbs the mind, which henceforth has to contend with a conscious or unconscious bias. The author however still strives hard to reason fairly. “The majority of the ‘Davidic’ psalms,” he says, “are thus certainly not David’s; is it possible to determine whether any are his?” (p. 355).

He then examines the evidence respecting David’s musical and poetical talents. Here he is less tender to conservatism than I should have expected. He gives no testimony to David’s composition of religious poetry earlier than the Chronicler<sup>1</sup> (about 300 B.C.); it is only later on, in connexion with criteria of David’s poetical style, that the poems in 2 Samuel xxii. (=Ps. xviii.) and xxiii. 1-7 are referred to. He says, too, that even if David did compose liturgical poems, this would not account for his authorship of more than a very few of the “Davidic” psalms, most of the psalms ascribed to David not being adapted (at least in the first instance) for public worship. This remark seems not very cogent, especially when limited by what is said afterwards respecting the “representative character” of many psalms. What we really want, is something that Dr. Driver could not, consistently with his plan, give us;

<sup>1</sup> At first I wrongly inferred from this that Dr. Driver regarded the poems in 2 Sam. xxii. and xxiii. as post-Exilic, which is at least a plausible view (see Cornill, *Einl.*, p. 119).

viz., a statement of the grounds on which psalms similar to those which we possess can (or cannot) be supposed to have existed prior to the regenerating activity of Isaiah and his fellow-prophets (if indeed they can historically be imagined at all in the pre-Exilic period).<sup>1</sup> That admirable scholar, Dr. A. B. Davidson, whom I respect even when I cannot follow him, will no doubt supply the omission in his *Old Testament Theology*.

One group of interesting facts is relegated by the author to a footnote (pp. 356, 357). Among the Jews who returned from Babylon in B.C. 536, the contemporary register (Neh. vii. 44 = Ezra ii. 46) includes 148 (128) "sons of Asaph, singers" (they are distinguished from "the Levites"). On the other hand, there is no allusion whatever to a special class of temple-singers in the pre-Exilic narratives. It seems to follow that the official singers cannot have been very prominent before the Exile. I should like to have seen this more developed; the footnote will be obscure to some readers. But of course the strength of the argument for the late date of the psalms is wholly apart from "doubtful disputations" respecting pre-Exilic music and singing. I will only add that Jeremiah xxxiii. 11 ought hardly to have been quoted as an evidence for the early existence of a class of singers (for those who blessed Jehovah were not necessarily temple-officers), but in relation to the probable contents of pre-Exilic psalms.

Dr. Driver's remarks on Ewald's *æsthetic* criteria of really Davidic psalms are on the whole very just. But how strange it is that after admitting that we have no tolerably sure standard for David's poetry outside the psalter except 2 Samuel i. 19-27 and iii. 33, 34 he should close the paragraph thus,—

<sup>1</sup> That there are no psalms of Jeremiah has lately been shown afresh by W. Campe (1891). Dr. Driver's judgment (p. 360) might be more decided.

“On the whole, a *non liquet* must be our verdict; it is possible that Ewald’s list of Davidic psalms is too large, but it is not clear that none of the psalms contained in it are of David’s composition.”

Surely here Dr. Driver is not untouched by the spirit of compromise. The reader will, I hope, not misunderstand me. I mean that in his desire to help those whose spiritual faith is (unfortunately) bound up with an intellectual belief in Davidic psalms he sometimes sympathizes with them more than is good for his critical judgment, and I wish, not that his desire to help were diminished, but that he could adopt a “more excellent way” of helping. Dr. Sanday works, I imagine, in the same spirit, and consequently “rests for the moment in temporary hypotheses and half-way positions, prepared to go either forwards or backwards as the case may be,” and disposed to idealize Dr. Driver’s hesitations and inconsistencies as “the combined open-mindedness and caution which are characteristic of a scholar.”<sup>1</sup> I respect Dr. Sanday very highly, but I have an uncomfortable suspicion that his language helps to foster the “undesirable illusions” to which I referred in Part I. I hope that it may not be thought unreasonable if I decline either to “go backwards” or to adopt a “half-way position” until it has been shown that the hypothesis of Davidic elements in the Psalter has any practical value. Unless Books I. and II. date from the age before Amos, any Davidic elements which they contain<sup>2</sup> must have been so modified as to be practically unrecognisable. To analyse the Psalms with the view of detecting Davidic passages would be the most hopeless of undertakings. David may have indited religious songs; but how far removed was David’s religion from that of the Psalms! The song of Deborah is perhaps not alone the highest thoughts of David; but can it be said that the tone of this poem approaches

<sup>1</sup> Sanday, *The Oracles of God*, pp. 141, 143.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Bampt. Lect.*, p. 193.

the spirituality of the Psalms? I think therefore that Dr. Driver's verdict is premature. It would have been safer from his point of view to say, "It is not clear that some of the Psalms may not be pre-Exilic, and that even post-Exilic Psalms may not contain unrecognisable Davidic fragments."

But why all this eagerness to rescue a small Davidic Psalter within the undoubtedly much larger non-Davidic one? Was it David who founded the higher religion of Israel? Surely, as Professor Robertson Smith in his article on the Psalms has remarked, "whether any of the older poems really are David's is a question more curious than important." For the question of questions is, *To what period or periods does the collection of the Psalters within the Psalter belong?* For what period in the religious history of Israel may we use the Psalter as an authority? This was what I had chiefly in view when I prefixed an inquiry into the origin of the Psalter to a sketch of the theology of the psalmist. I cannot find that any help is given to the student of this subject in the *Introduction*, and this is one of the points in which this valuable chapter appears to me to fail. Nor can I express myself as satisfied with Dr. Driver's remarks on the means, which we have of approximately fixing the periods of the Psalms. I can divine from it that there is much which enters into a full discussion of this subject upon which Dr. Driver and I would at present differ. Nor can I content myself either with the author's neutrality on Psalm cxviii., or with his vague remarks on Psalm cx., that "though it may be ancient, it can hardly have been composed by David,"<sup>1</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> These words are from the footnote on pp. 362, 363. In the text it is said that Psalm cx. "may be presumed to be pre-Exilic." I cannot but regret the misplaced moderation of the words "can *hardly* have been composed by David," and the deference to a tradition admitted to be weak in the extreme which expresses itself in the "presumption" that the psalm is pre-Exilic. I can enter into the reasoning so skilfully indicated in the reference to Jer. xxx. 21,

that "the cogency of [Christ's] argument (in Mark xii." 35-37) is unimpaired, as long as it is recognised that the psalm is a Messianic one," or with the remark (p. 367) on the accommodation of individualistic psalms to liturgical use by slight changes in the phraseology.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand I am much gratified to find that Dr. Driver accepts the theory that Psalm li. is "a confession written on behalf of the nation by one who had a deep sense of his people's sin." That he adds "during the Exile" is comparatively unimportant; on the main point he accepts my own view already expressed in *The Book of Psalms* (1888). His arguments are identical with those which I have myself repeatedly urged.<sup>2</sup> The only objection which I have to make relates to his treatment of verse 5, but as I have put it forward already in *THE EXPOSITOR*, 1892 (2), p. 398, I will here only express the conviction that the Church-nation theory can, without violence, be applied

but what this naturally leads up to is—not that the psalm refers to an actual pre-Exilic king, but that it is a thoroughly idealistic lyric prophecy of the early post-Exilic period, when both psalmists and prophets devoted themselves largely to the development of earlier prophetic ideas. The author follows Riehm in the stress which he lays on Jer. xxx. 21, but significantly omits Riehm's second reference (*Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 121, 284) to Zech. iii. vi. I must also express my regret at his useless attempt to soften opposition by a necessarily vague description of the contents of the psalm. Such a description can be made to suit any theory, as Dr. Gifford (the eminent commentator on Romans) has shown, by basing upon it the conclusion "that the whole course of thought" favours the old theory of the Davidic authorship of the psalm. The whole footnote, in its present form, seems to me out of place; it fosters unfortunate illusions. One result is that Dr. Driver is praised for his weak as well as for his strong points, and another that many theologians will not give a patient hearing to a scholar who cannot adopt Dr. Driver's manner. If Dr. Gifford, for instance, had read the notes to my *Bampton Lectures*, he would have been enabled (from note <sup>1h</sup> p. 39) to correct his own hasty criticism of a well-weighed statement (see *The Authorship of the 110th Psalm*, by E. H. Gifford, D.D., Oxford, 1891, p. 9). I could also wish that he had noticed a careful statement of Dr. Driver (in Sanday's *The Oracles of God*, p. 142), which bears strongly *against* even the relative antiquity of Ps. cx.

<sup>1</sup> Similarly Stekhoven, on whom see *Bampt. Lect.*, p. 277.

<sup>2</sup> Most recently in sermon-studies on Ps. li., which will be included in *Aids to Study* (see above, p. 111, note).

throughout the psalm. I know how much untrained English common sense has to say against it, but I think it quite possible by a few historical and exegetical hints to make common sense agree entirely with the experts. We must however make it perfectly clear that the person who speaks in the 51st and other psalms is not a mere rhetorical collective expression for a number of individuals, but that complete living organism of which Isaiah said, "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint."<sup>1</sup>

T. K. CHEYNE.

<sup>1</sup> See *Banpt. Lect.*, pp. 261-265, 276-278.

(*To be concluded.*)