

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

PART I.

THE much fuller adhesion of Professor Driver to the still struggling cause of Old Testament criticism is an event in the history of this study. That many things indicated it as probable, can doubtless now be observed; but until the publication in the *Contemporary Review* (February, 1890) of a singularly clear and forcible paper on the criticism of the historical books, it was impossible to feel quite sure where Dr. Driver stood. Up to the year 1882, he was known through various learned publications (notably that on the Hebrew Tenses) as an honest and keen-sighted Hebrew scholar, but in matters of literary and historical criticism he had not as yet committed himself, except of course to the non-acceptance of any such plainly unphilological view as the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes.<sup>1</sup> In 1882, to the great benefit of Hebrew studies, he succeeded Dr. Pusey at Christ Church, and began at once to improve to the utmost the splendid opportunities of his position both for study and for teaching. He now felt it impossible to confine himself within purely linguistic limits, however much from a conscientious regard for the "weak brethren" he may have desired to do so. It is true that in his first published critical essay, he approached the "higher criticism" from the linguistic side (*Journal of Philology*, 1882, pp. 201-236), but there are evidences enough in the pages of *The Guardian* and of THE EXPOSITOR that he was quietly and unobtrusively feeling his way towards a

<sup>1</sup> *Hebrew Tenses*, § 133 (ed. 2, p. 151).

large and deep comprehension of the critical and exegetical problems of the Hexateuch. Nor must the old lecturers of the University be forgotten. These would prove, if proof were needed, that his aspirations were high, and his range of teaching wide, and that the sketch of his professorial functions given in his excellent inaugural lecture was being justified. To the delightful obligation of lecturing on the Hebrew texts, we owe a singularly complete and instructive volume on the Hebrew of Samuel (1890), the earnest of other volumes to come. And that Dr. Driver did not shrink from touching the contents of the Old Testament, the outsider may divine from a small and unostentatious work,<sup>1</sup> which forms an admirable popular introduction to the devout critical study of certain chapters of Genesis and Exodus. In 1888 came the excellent though critically imperfect handbook on Isaiah (in the "Men of the Bible" Series), which very naturally supersedes my own handbook published in 1870.<sup>2</sup> In 1891 we received the valuable introduction which forms the subject of this notice, and some time previously we ought, I believe, to have had before us the articles on the books of the Pentateuch which Dr. Driver had contributed to the new edition of Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

So now Dr. Driver's long suspense of judgment is to a great extent over. The mystery is cleared up, and we know very nearly where he now stands. If any outsider has a lingering hope or fear of an imminent counter-revolution from the linguistic side, he must not look to Dr. Driver to justify it. The qualities which are here displayed by the author are not of the sensational order, as

<sup>1</sup> *Critical Notes on the International Sunday School Lessons from the Pentateuch* for 1887. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.)

<sup>2</sup> It is only just to myself to say that this work is in no sense, as a hostile writer in *The Guardian* states, "a youthful production," but was written at an age when some men nowadays are professors, and both was and is respectfully referred to by German critics.

a brief summary of them will show. First, there is a masterly power of selection and condensation of material. Secondly, a minute and equally masterly attention to correctness of details. Thirdly, a very unusual degree of insight into critical methods, and of ability to apply them. Fourthly, a truly religious candour and openness of mind. Fifthly, a sympathetic interest in the difficulties of the ordinary orthodox believer. Willingly do I mention these points. Dr. Driver and I are both engaged in a work—

“Too great for haste, too high for rivalry,”

and we both agree in recognising the law of generosity. But I must add that I could still more gladly have resigned this privilege to another. For I cannot profess to be satisfied on all really important points with Dr. Driver's book. And if I say what I like, I must also mention what I—not indeed dislike—but to a certain extent regret. But why should I take up the pen? Has not the book had praise and (possibly) dispraise enough already? If I put forward my objections, will not a ripe scholar like Dr. Driver have an adequate answer from his own point of view for most of them? Why should I not take my ease, and enjoy even the less satisfactory parts of the book as reflexions of the individuality of a friend? And the answer is, Because I fear that the actual position of Old Testament criticism may not be sufficiently understood from this work, and because the not inconsiderable priority of my own start as a critic gives me a certain vantage-ground and consequently a responsibility which Dr. Driver cannot and would not dispute with me. I will not now repeat what I have said with an entirely different object in the Introduction to my *Bampton Lectures*, but on the ground of those facts I am bound to make some effort to check the growth of undesirable illusions, or, at any rate, to contribute something to the formation of clear ideas in the popular mind.

I must here beg the reader not to jump to the conclusion that I am on the whole opposed to Dr. Driver. As I have already hinted, the points of agreement between us are much more numerous than those of difference, and in many respects I am well content with his courage and consistency. The debt which Dr. Driver owes to those scholars who worked at Old Testament criticism before him he has in good part repaid. He came to this subject theologically and critically uncommitted, and the result is that, in the main, he supports criticism with the full weight of his name and position. There is only one objection that I have to make to the *Introduction*. It is however three-fold: 1. the book is to a certain extent a compromise; 2. the (partial) compromise offered cannot satisfy those for whom it is intended; 3. even if it were accepted, it would not be found to be safe. Let us take the first point. My meaning is, that Dr. Driver is free in his criticism up to a certain point, but then suddenly stops short, and that he often blunts the edge of his decisions, so that the student cannot judge of their critical bearings. I will endeavour to illustrate this from the book, and, in doing so, never to forget the "plea" which Dr. Driver so genially puts in to be "judged leniently for what he has *not* said" (Preface, p. ix.). At present, to clear the ground for future "lenient" or rather friendly criticisms, let me only remark that I am not myself opposed on principle to all "stopping short," *i.e.* to all compromise. In June and August, 1889, I submitted to those whom it concerned a plan of reform in the teaching of the Old Testament, which included a large provisional use of it.<sup>1</sup> My earnest appeal was indeed not responded to. Even my friend Dr. Sanday passes it over in his well-known recent work,<sup>2</sup> and praises the waiting attitude of our more liberal bishops. But I still reiterate

<sup>1</sup> See *Contemporary Review*, August, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> *The Oracles of God* (1891).

the same appeal for a compromise, though I couch it differently. It is not at all hard to find out what results of criticism are most easily assimilated by thinking laymen, and most important for building up the religious life. Let those results be put forward, with the more generally intelligible grounds for them, first of all for private study, and then, with due regard to local circumstances, in public or semi-public teaching. To *practical* compromises I am therefore favourable, but this does not bind me to approve of *scientific* ones. The time for even a partly apologetic criticism or exegesis is almost over; nothing but the "truest truth" will serve the purposes of the best contemporary students of theology. This indeed is fully recognised in the preface of the editors of the "Library" to which this book belongs, the object of which is defined as being "adequately (to) represent the present condition of investigation, and (to) indicate the way for further progress."

I regret therefore that Dr. Driver did not leave the task of forming a distinctively Church criticism (of which even now I do not deny the value for a certain class of students) to younger men,<sup>1</sup> or to those excellent persons who, after standing aloof for years, now begin to patronize criticism, saying, "Thus far shalt thou come, but no farther!" I heartily sympathize with Dr. Driver's feelings, but I think that there is a still "more excellent way" of helping the better students, viz., to absorb the full spirit of criticism (not of *irreligious* criticism), and to stand beside the foremost workers, only taking care, in the formulation of results, frankly to point out their religious bearings, of which no one who has true faith need be afraid. I know that this might perhaps have involved other modifications of Dr. Driver's plan, but I cannot help this. I do not feel

<sup>1</sup> A popular semi-critical book on the origin of the Old Testament Scriptures might be of great use for schools and Bible-classes.

called upon to sketch here in outline the book that might have been, but I could not withhold this remark, especially as I am sure that even Dr. Driver's very "moderate" textbook will appear to many not to give hints enough concerning the religious value of the records criticised. And forcible, judicious, and interesting as the preface is, I do not feel that the author takes sufficiently high ground. I am still conscious of an unsatisfied desire for an inspiring introductory book to the Old Testament, written from the combined points of view of a keen critic and a progressive evangelical theologian.

Next, as to the second point. Can this compromise (or, partial compromise) satisfy orthodox judges? It is true that Dr. Driver has one moral and intellectual quality which might be expected to predispose such persons specially in his favour—the quality of caution. The words "moderation" and "sobriety" have a charm for him; to be called an extreme critic, or a wild theorist, would cause him annoyance. And this "characteristic caution" has not failed to impress a prominent writer in the most influential (Anglican) Church paper. The passage is at the end of the first part of a review of the *Introduction*,<sup>1</sup> and the writer hazards the opinion that, on the most "burning" of all questions Dr. Driver's decision contains the elements of a working compromise between the old views and the new. But how difficult it is to get people to agree as to what "caution" and "sobriety" are! For if we turn to the obituary notices of the great Dutch critic who has lately passed away, we find that he strikes some competent observers as eminently cautious and sober-minded, not moving forward till he has prepared the way by careful investigation, and always distinguishing between the certain and the more or less probable. And again, it appears from the recent Charge of Bishop Ellicott that this

<sup>1</sup> *Guardian*, November 25, 1891.

honoured theologian (who alas! still stands where he stood in earlier crises) sees no great difference between the critical views of Kuenen and Wellhausen on the one hand, and those of Dr. Driver and "the English Analytical School" on the other. If the former have "lost all sense of proportion" and been "hurried" to extreme results by an "almost boundless self-confidence," the latter have, by their "over-hasty excursions into the Analytical" prepared the way for "shaken and unstable minds" to arrive at results which are only a little more advanced.<sup>1</sup> And in perfect harmony with Bishop Ellicott's denial of the possibility of "compromise," I find a writer of less sanguine nature than Dr. Driver's reviewer warning the readers of the *Guardian* that the supposed *rapprochement* will not "form a bridge solid enough to unite the opposite sides of the chasm" between the two schools of thought.<sup>2</sup>

This is in my opinion a true saying. Some of those to whom Dr. Driver's compromise is addressed will (like Bishop Ellicott) be kept aloof by deep theological differences. Others, whose minds may be less definitely theological, will place their hope in a critical "counter-revolution" (see p. 82), to be effected either by an induction from linguistic facts, or by means of cuneiform and archæological discovery. I do not speak without cause, as readers of popular religious journals will be aware. The limits of Dr. Driver's work did not permit him to refer to this point; but considering the avidity with which a large portion of the public seizes upon assertions backed by some well-known name, it may soon become necessary for him and for others to do so. Upon a very slender basis of reason and of facts an imposing structure of revived and "rectified"<sup>3</sup> tradition-

<sup>1</sup> *Christus Comprobator* (1891), pp. 29, 59. I cannot help respectfully protesting against the title of this work.

<sup>2</sup> *Guardian*, December 2, 1891.

<sup>3</sup> I borrow the word from Bishop Ellicott.

alism may soon be charmed into existence. We may soon hear again the confident appeal to the "common sense" of the "plain Englishman"—that invaluable faculty which, according to Bishop Ellicott, is notably wanting, "*if it be not insular prejudice to say so,*" in all recent German critics of the Old Testament. Critical and historical sense (which is really the perfection of common sense, trained by right methods, and assisted by a healthy imagination) may continue to be treated with contempt, and Dr. Driver's book may receive credit, not for its substantial merits, but for what, by comparison, may be called its defects. These are real dangers; nay, rather to some extent they are already facts which cannot but hinder the acceptance of this well-meant compromise.

And, lastly, as to the third point. Is even a partial compromise like this safe? I am afraid that it is not. It implies that Biblical criticism must be pared down for apologetic reasons. It assumes that though the traditional theory of the origin and (for this is, in part, allusively dealt with) the historic value of the Old Testament books, has been overthrown, yet we must in our reconstruction keep as close to the old theory or system as we can. This, at the present stage of intellectual development, is unsafe. Dr. Driver's fences are weak, and may at any moment be broken down. Nothing but the most *fearless* criticism, combined with the most genuine spiritual faith in God, and in His Son, and in the Holy Spirit, can be safe. I do not of course judge either friends or foes by their expressed theories. If it should be made decidedly the more probable view that St. John did *not* originate the Fourth Gospel as it now stands, I am sure, in spite of Dr. Sanday's recent words,<sup>1</sup> that all truly religious students would believe, with heart and with head, as strongly as ever in the incomparable nature and the divine mediatorship of Jesus Christ.

<sup>1</sup> *Contemporary Review*, October, 1891, p. 530.



They would do so on the ground of the facts which would still be left by the historical analysis of the Gospels, and on the correspondence between a simple Christian view of those facts and the needs of their own and of the Church's life. And so I am sure that without half so many qualifications as Dr. Driver has given, the great facts left, not to say recovered, by advanced Old Testament criticism are quite sufficient to justify the theory of Hebrews i. 1, which is, I doubt not, of permanent importance for the thinking Christian.

Before passing on, let me crave permission to make two remarks, which may perhaps take off any undue sharpness from previous criticisms. The first is, that in criticising the author, I am equally criticising myself. There was a time when I was simply a Biblical critic, and was untouched by the apologetic interest. Finding that this course cramped the moral energies, I ventured to superadd the function of the "Christian advocate" (of course only in the modern sense of this indispensable phrase). The plan to which I was led (for I do not doubt that the most obscure workers *are* led) was to *adapt* Old Testament criticism and exegesis to the prejudices of orthodox students by giving the traditional view, in its most refined form, the benefit of the doubt, whenever there was a sufficiently reasonable case for doubt. This is what the Germans call *Vermittlung*, and I think that as late as ten or twelve years ago *Vermittlung* was sorely needed. But now, as it seems to me, we have got beyond this. *Vermittlung* has become a hindrance, not only to the progress of historical truth, but to the fuller apprehension of positive evangelical principles. The right course for those who would be in the van of progress seems to be that which I have faintly indicated above, and too imperfectly carried out in my more recent works. A perfectly free but none the less devout criticism is, in short, the best ally, both of spiritual religion and of a sound apologetic theology.

The second is, that in Dr. Driver's case the somewhat excessive caution of his critical work can be accounted for, not merely by a conscientious regard to the supposed interests of the Church, but by his peculiar temperament and past history. In the variety of temperaments God has appointed that the specially cautious one shall not be wanting; and this, like all His works, is no doubt "very good." Caution, like other useful qualities, needs to be sometimes represented in an intensified degree. And Hebrew grammar in England urgently needed a more cautious, more exact treatment. This Dr. Driver felt at the outset of his course, and all recent Hebrew students owe him a debt of gratitude. But what was the natural consequence of his long devotion to the more exact, more philological study of the Hebrew Scriptures? This—that when he deliberately enlarged his circle of interests, he could not see his way as far nor as clearly as those critics of wider range, who had entered on their career at an earlier period. Indeed, even apart from the habits of a pure philologist, so long a suspension of judgment on critical points must have reacted somewhat upon Dr. Driver's mind, and made it at first very difficult for him to form decisions. These have been real hindrances, and yet to what a considerable extent he has overcome them! How much advanced criticism has this conscientious churchman—this cautious Hebraist—been able to absorb? And how certainly therefore he has contributed to that readjustment of theology to the general intellectual progress which is becoming more and more urgent!

I now proceed to such a survey of the contents of the work as my limits render possible. The preface states, in lucid and dignified language, the author's critical and religious point of view, which is that of all modern-minded and devout Old Testament critics. Then follows an introduction on the Old Testament Canon according to the

Jews, which gives *multum in parvo*, and is thoroughly sound. It was desirable to prefix this because of a current assertion that critical views are in conflict with trustworthy Jewish traditions.<sup>1</sup> So now the student is free, both in a religious and in a historical respect, to consider the proposed solutions of the literary problems of the Old Testament, and the accompanying views respecting the objects of the several records. The books are treated in the order of the Hebrew Bible, beginning with those of the Hexateuch, and ending with Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. To the Hexateuch 150 pages are devoted—a perfectly fair allotment, considering the great importance of these six books. The plan adopted here, and throughout the composite narrative books, appears to be this: after some preliminary remarks, the particular book is broken up into sections and analysed, with a view to ascertain the documents or sources which the later compiler or redactor welded together into a whole.<sup>2</sup> The grounds of the analysis are given in small print, without which judicious arrangement the book would have outrun its limits. A somewhat different plan is necessary for Deuteronomy, which is treated more continuously, special care being taken to exhibit the relation of the laws to the other codes, and to trace the dependence of the two historical retrospects in chapters i., iii., and ix.–x. on the earlier narrative of “JE.” Then follows a very important section on the character and probable date of the “prophetical,” and the “priestly” narratives respectively, followed by a compact synopsis of the priestly code. As regards the analysis of the documents, it would be difficult, from a teacher’s point of view,

<sup>1</sup> I have no intention of criticising Dr. Driver’s very useful lists of books. It is however a strange accident that he only mentions Wildeboer’s recent work on the Canon, and not Buhl’s. Each of these books, of course, has high merits of its own.

<sup>2</sup> Note especially the care bestowed on the composite narrative of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram in Num. xvi.–xvii. (p. 59).

to say too much in praise of the author's presentation. *Multum in parvo* is again one's inevitable comment. The space has been utilized to the utmost, and the student, who will be content to work hard, will find no lack of lucidity. No one can deny that the individuality of the writer, which is in this part very strongly marked, fits him in a special degree to be the interpreter of the analysts to young students. One only asks that the cautious reserve, which is here not out of place, may not be contrasted by that untrained "common sense," which is so swift to speak, and so slow to hear, with the bolder but fundamentally not less cautious procedure of other English or American analysts. Such remarks will, I am sure, be disapproved of by the author himself, who willingly refers to less reserved critics. And Dr. Driver's fellow-workers will, on their side, have nothing but respect for his helpful contributions. It should be added that whatever is vitally important is fully granted by Dr. Driver. The documents J, E, D, and P, are all recognised; and if the author more frequently than some critics admits a difficulty in distinguishing between J and E, yet this is but a formal difference. Moreover, no one doubts that J and E were combined together by an editor or (Kuenen) "harmonist," so that we have three main records in the Hexateuch—the prophetic (JE), the Deuteronomic (D), and the priestly (P). On the limits of these three records critics of different schools are practically agreed.

And now, will the author forgive me if I say that neither here nor in the rest of the Hexateuch portion does he, strictly speaking, verify the description of the object of the "Library" given by the general editors? The book, as it seems to me, does not, upon the whole, so much "represent the present condition of investigation, and indicate the way for future progress" as exhibit the present position of a very clear-headed but slowly moving scholar, who stands

a little aside from the common pathway of critics? For the majority of English students this may conceivably be a boon; but the fact (if it be a fact) ought to be borne in mind, otherwise the friends and the foes of the literary study of the Old Testament will alike be the victims of an illusion. There is a number of points of considerable importance for the better class of students on which the author gives no light, though I would not impute this merely to his natural caution, but also to the comparative scantiness of his space. For instance, besides J, E, D, P, and, within P, H (*i.e.* the "Law of Holiness," Lev. xvii.-xxvi.), I find now and then recognised both D<sup>2</sup> and P<sup>2</sup>, but not J<sup>2</sup> and E<sup>2</sup>, though it is impossible to get on long without these symbols, which correspond to facts. Nor do I find any mention of the source and date of Genesis xiv., upon which so many contradictory statements have been propounded. Nor is there any constructive sketch of the growth of our present Hexateuch, though this would seem necessary to give coherence to the ideas of the student. It would however be ungracious to dwell further on this. On the dates of the documents J and E, Dr. Driver is unfortunately somewhat indefinite. It is surprising to learn that "it must remain an open question whether both (J and E) may not in reality be earlier" (*i.e.* earlier than "the early centuries of the monarchy"). I can of course understand that, had the author been able to give a keener analysis of the documents, he would have favoured us with a fuller consideration of their period. But I do earnestly hope that he is not meditating a step backwards in deference to hostile archæologists.<sup>1</sup> One more startling phenomenon I seem bound to mention. On p. 27 we are told that—

<sup>1</sup> I am in sympathy with Prof. Sayce's statements in the *Contemporary Review*, September, 1890, but disagree widely with his papers on Genesis xiv. in the *Newbury House Magazine* and elsewhere, and especially with his (unconsciously) misleading article in the *Expository Times*, December, 1891. He is not however so far astray on the subject of the "higher criticism" as M.

"Probably the greater part of the Song is Mosaic, and the modification, or expansion, is limited to the closing verses; for the general style is antique, and the triumphant tone which pervades it is just such as might naturally have been inspired by the event which it celebrates."

I greatly regret this. To fall behind Ewald, Dillmann, and even Delitzsch and Kittel,<sup>1</sup> is a misfortune which I can only account for on the theory of compromise. I hesitate to contemplate the consequences which might possibly follow from the acceptance of this view.

This naturally brings me to the pages on the authorship and date of Deuteronomy. There is here very much which commands one's entire approbation, especially with an eye to English readers. Candour is conspicuous throughout, and whenever one differs from the author, it is reluctantly and with entire respect. The section begins thus:—

"Even though it were clear that the first four books of the Pentateuch were written by Moses, it would be difficult to sustain the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. For, to say nothing of the remarkable difference of style, Deuteronomy conflicts with the *legislation* of Exodus-Numbers in a manner that would not be credible were the legislator in both one and the same" (p. 77). And in particular "when the laws of Deuteronomy are compared with those of P such a supposition becomes impossible. For in Deuteronomy language is used implying that *fundamental institutions of P are unknown to the author.*"<sup>2</sup> Sufficient

Halévy (see the latter's review of Kautzsch and Socin's *Genesis, Revue critique*, September 14-21, 1891). But I will not on these accounts change my own attitude of discipleship towards Assyriologists, but will continue to compare their statements and use them with due discrimination. The fully critical use of the precious Tell-el-Amarna tablets is, of course, still in the future. Let not English Assyriological students imagine that the "higher critics" have no room for fresh facts!

<sup>1</sup> See, besides the works cited by Dr. Driver, Lagarde, *Semitica*, i. 28; Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, p. 239; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 374 [352]; Cornill, *Einleitung*, pp. 68, 69; Kittel, *Geschichte*, i. 83, 187; and my *Bampton Lectures* (which give my own view since 1881), pp. 31, 177.

<sup>2</sup> Here, as always in quotations, the italics are those of the author.

specimens of the evidence for these statements are given with a reference for further particulars to the article "Deuteronomy" in the belated new edition of Smith's *Dictionary*. I look forward with eagerness to the appearance of this article, and meantime venture to state how I have been struck by the author's treatment of the question of *date*. Whatever I say is to be taken with all the qualifications arising from my high opinion of the author, and demanded by a fair consideration of his narrow limits.

In the first place, then, I think that on one important point Dr. Driver does not quite accurately state the prevailing tendency of recent investigations. No one would gather from p. 82, note 2, that criticism is more inclined to place the composition of the original Book in the reign of Josiah than in that of Manasseh. Such, however, is the case. Delitzsch himself says regretfully, "It will scarcely be possible to eradicate the ruling critical opinion that Deuteronomy was composed in the time of Jeremiah."<sup>1</sup>

If this view of the tendency of criticism is correct, it would have been helpful to state the grounds on which the reign of Josiah has been preferred. May I venture to put them together briefly thus? Let the student read once more, with a fresh mind, the famous narrative in 2 Kings xxii. He can hardly fail to receive the impression that the only person who is vehemently moved by the perusal of "the law-book" (more strictly, "the book of *tōrāh*") is the king. How is this to be accounted for? How is it that Hilkiāh, Shaphan, and Huldah display such imperturbability? Most easily by the supposition that these three persons (to whom we must add Ahikam, Achbor, and Asaiah) had agreed together, unknown to the king, on their course of action. It may be thought strange that all these, except Hilkiāh and

<sup>1</sup> Preface by Delitzsch to Curtiss's *Levitical Priests* (1877), p. x. The latest introduction (that of Cornill) verifies this prognostication.

Huldah, were courtiers. But they were also (as we partly know, partly infer) friends of the prophet Jeremiah, and therefore no *mere* courtiers. Huldah, moreover, though the wife of a courtier, was herself a prophetess. We must suppose, then, in order to realize the circumstances at once historically and devoutly, that to the priests and prophets who loved spiritual religion God had revealed that now was the time to take a bold step forward, and accomplish the work which the noblest servants of Jehovah had so long desired. The "pen of the scribes" (Jer. viii. 8) had been recently consecrated to this purpose by the writing down of the kernel of what we now call Deuteronomy. This document consisted of ancient laws adapted to present purposes, and completed by the addition of recent or even perfectly new ones, framed in the spirit of Moses and under the sacred authority of priests and prophets, together with earnest exhortations and threatenings. It had apparently been placed in a repository beside the ark (comp. Deut. xxxi. 9, 26),<sup>1</sup> and there (if we may so interpret the words "in the house of Jehovah") Hilkiyah professed to Shaphan "the secretary" to have "found" it. One of those seeming "chances" which mark the interposing hand of God favoured the project of Hilkiyah. Repairs on a large scale had been undertaken in the temple, and with his mind set on the restoration of the material "house of God," Josiah was all the more likely to be interested in the re-edification of His spiritual house. So Shaphan reported the "finding," and read the book in the ears of the king. The king recog-

<sup>1</sup> Deuteronomy xxxi. 9 belongs to the main body of Deuteronomy, whereas ver. 26 (as a part of vv. 24-30) belongs to the editor. According to Dillmann, however, vv. 24-26a (down to "Jehovah your God") originally stood after vv. 9-13, and belong to Deuteronomy proper. But in any case it is certain that the editor *rightly interpreted* the "delivering" of the Torah to the "Levitical priests," when he made Moses say, "Take this law-book, and put it beside the ark." For of course the persons addressed were to carry both the ark and the "bag" or "box" (*argûz*, see 1 Sam. vi. 8, 11, 15) which contained the most sacred objects of religion.



nised the voice of Moses; this was not one of those law-books which Jeremiah ascribed to "the *lying* pen of scribes." The result is matter of history to all at any rate but the followers of M. Maurice Vernes.

It may doubtless be urged against this view of the circumstances that we have enlisted the imagination in the service of history. But why should we not do so? Of course, we would very gladly dispense with this useful but dangerous ally, but is there a single historical critic, a single critical historian, who is not often obliged to invite its help? Certainly in the case of 2 Kings xxii., which is an extract from a larger and fuller document, it is impossible not to endeavour to fill up *lacunæ* with the help of the imagination. The alternative view—that the "law-book" was written in the reign of Manasseh—is not one which commends itself to the historic sense. Even supposing that some ardent spirit conceived the idea of a reformation by means of a "law-book," yet there is a gulf between such an idea and its successful accomplishment. No prophecy pointed to the advent of a reforming king (1 Kings xiii., as consistent critics agree, is of very late origin); we cannot therefore appeal to the analogy of Ezekiel's ideal legislation. The hopeful and practical spirit which pervades the Book is inconsistent with a time of reaction, when it seemed to a prophet that the "good man" had "perished out of the earth," and that there was "none upright among men" (Mic. vii. 2). I admit that the prophecy from which I have just quoted (Mic. vi. 1-vii. 6), and which was probably written under Manasseh, reminds us somewhat, at the outset, of Deuteronomy, but the gloomy and indignant tone which predominates in it is entirely alien to the great "law-book." The assertion that the date of Deuteronomy must be pushed up a little higher to allow time for literary style to sink to the level of Jeremiah is a doubtful one. Certainly Jeremiah's style *is* less pure than that of Deuter-

onomy (as Kleinert has well shown). But who would maintain that in all the different literary circles of Jerusalem at the same period an equally pure style was in vogue? Proverbs i.-ix. is placed by critics, with whom Dr. Driver (p. 382) seems inclined to agree, in the reign of Josiah, and here at least we have an elevated, oratorical diction, with very little Aramaism. Jeremiah himself was too emotional to be either a purist or an artist. What is the most obvious conclusion from all these facts and indications? Surely this—that while the heathenish reaction under Manasseh, by knitting the faithful together and forcing them to meditate on their principles and on the means of applying these to practice, created some of the conditions under which alone “Deuteronomy” could arise, it is not the period in which the Book (*i.e.*, its kernel) can have been composed. Instead of saying, “not later than the reign of Manasseh” (p. 82), it would have been truer to the actual state of critical study to say (against M. Vernes), “by no possibility later than the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah.”

Indeed, the sole advantage of Dr. Driver's present theory is that it will enable popular writers to defend Hilkiah the more easily from the charge (which conservative scholars sometimes imagine to be involved in the other theory) of complicity in a “forgery.” But may it not be questioned whether even for popular writers it is not best to approach as near as they can to the truth? The test of a forgery suggested by Mr. Gore, *viz.* to find out whether the writer of a particular book could have afforded to disclose the method and circumstances of his production, can be successfully stood by the writer of Deuteronomy. Hilkiah, as representing this writer,<sup>1</sup> could well have afforded to make

<sup>1</sup> Hilkiah may possibly (in spite of Deut. xviii. 6-8) have had to do with the composition of the Book. He was certainly concerned in its publication, and, as Eudissin remarks, was probably above the narrow class-feelings of his corporation.

such a disclosure to literary students familiar with the modes of thought of priestly and prophetic writers. But was Josiah such a student, and even if he were, was this a time for any such minute explanation? Practical wisdom required that the account given to Josiah should be the same which would have to be given to the people at large. The Book *was* "the *tōrah* of Moses," and the basis of the legal portion of it (viz. the "Book of the Covenant") had no doubt been kept in the temple archives. What, pray, could be said of it, even by a *religious* statesman, but that it had been "found in the house of Jehovah?" If any one calls this a "falsehood," must he not at least admit that it is defensible on the same principle by which Plato defends certain select legendary tales, viz. that such falsehood is "the closest attainable copy of the truth?"<sup>1</sup> Such conduct as that of Hilkiyah is, I maintain, fully worthy of an inspired teacher and statesman. It is also not without a distant resemblance to the course of Divine Providence, so far as this can be scanned by our weak faculties. Indeed, if we reject the theory of "needful illusion," we are thrown upon a sea of perplexity. Was there no book on Jeremiah bringing home the need of this theory to the Christian conscience, to which Dr. Driver could have referred?

But no doubt the student will here ask, How can the kernel of the Book of Deuteronomy be justly described as the "*tōrah* of Moses"? Dr. Driver devotes what space he can afford to this most important question (see pp. 83-85). He begins by drawing the distinction (on which great stress is also laid by Delitzsch) that—

"Though it may seem paradoxical to say so, Deuteronomy *does not claim to be written by Moses*. Wherever the author speaks himself, he purposes to give a description *in the third person* of what Moses did or said. The true "author" of Deuteronomy is thus the writer who *introduces Moses in the third person*; and the discourses which he is

<sup>1</sup> *The Republic of Plato*, 332.

represented as having spoken fall in consequence into the same category as the speeches in the historical books, some of which largely, and others entirely, are the composition of the compilers, and are placed by them in the mouths of historical characters. . . . An author, therefore, in framing discourses appropriate to Moses' situation, especially if (as is probable) the elements were provided for him by tradition, could be doing nothing inconsistent with the literary usages of his age and people."

This hardly goes far towards meeting the difficulties of the student. In a footnote (p. 84) there is a list of passages of Deuteronomy describing in the third person what Moses did or said, which closes with Deuteronomy xxxi. 1-30. I do not forget the demands on Dr. Driver's space, but in this closing passage there occur two statements, "And Moses wrote this *tōrah*" (ver. 9), and "When Moses had made an end of writing the words of this *tōrah* in a book, until they were finished" (ver. 24), which demanded special consideration. Let us listen to the candid and devout Delitzsch. "If the statement, 'And Moses wrote,' were meant to be valid for the whole of Deuteronomy as it stands, Deuteronomy would be a pseudepigraphon" (*Genesis*, p. 23): In the sequel Delitzsch communicates his own explanation of the difficulty. Now should not Dr. Driver have given two or three lines to a mention of the difficulty, and a particularly full reference to the sentences in Delitzsch's *Genesis*, which contain that scholar's solution, if he was not prepared to give one of his own? What Dr. Driver tells us in the text is, that ancient historians (including those of Israel) habitually claimed the liberty of composing speeches for the personages of their narratives. But where, it may be replied, is there any instance of this liberty being used on such a large scale as in the discourses of Deuteronomy? If indeed Ecclesiastes had been introduced by the words, "And Solomon said," and inserted in the Book of Kings, an Old Testament parallel would not be wanting. But Ecclesiastes bears no such heading, and was presumably

designed by the unknown writer for the narrow circle of his friends or disciples. The license appealed to by Dr. Driver will hardly bear the weight which he puts upon it. Josiah certainly did not conceive that it was used in the composition of the Book, which he received with alarm as the neglected law-book written of old by Moses. As for the statement that the elements of the discourses in Deuteronomy were provided for the writer by tradition, if it means that the writer reproduces the substance of what Moses really said, somewhat as the writer of the Fourth Gospel is held to reproduce sayings or ideas of the Lord Jesus, I should think this, historically, a very difficult position. This does indeed appear to have been the belief of Delitzsch, but the principles which underlie it are not those which Dr. Driver would, as I think, deliberately desire to promote.

Dr. Driver's second argument in justification of the writer of Deuteronomy relates to the legislative portion of the Book. He says:—

“It is an altogether false view of the laws in Deuteronomy to treat them as the author's “inventions.” Many are repeated from the Book of the Covenant; the existence of others is independently attested by the “Law of Holiness”: others, upon intrinsic grounds, are clearly ancient. . . . The new element in Deuteronomy is thus not the laws, but their *parenthetic setting*. Deuteronomy may be described as the prophetic re-formulation and adaptation to *new needs of an older legislation*.”

Dr. Driver does almost too much honour to a view which is only worthy of some ill-instructed secularist lecturer. The statement that “the laws in Deuteronomy” are “the author's inventions,” is, of course, utterly erroneous. But Dr. Driver's statement of his own opinion may possibly bear amendment. He at any rate appears to identify himself with the view of Kleinert that Deuteronomy consists of “old statutes worked over and adapted to later circum-

stances,"<sup>1</sup> and as an instance of a law which has an ancient kernel, he proceeds to adduce the so-called "law of the kingdom" (Deut. xvii. 14-20). But the former view seems to have been refuted by Kuenen, and on the latter I may appeal to Dillmann's judgment that "the law is *new and purely Deuteronomic*." It seems to me even possible that Kleinert and Stade may be right in regarding this law as a later Deuteronomistic insertion. Dr. Driver refers next to the "law of the central sanctuary" (Deut. xii. 5, etc.). He states distinctly that it "appears, in its exclusiveness, to be of comparatively<sup>2</sup> modern origin," but seems to weaken the force of this remark by saying that "it only accentuated the old pre-eminence [of the sanctuary where the ark for the time was placed] in the interests of a principle which is often insisted on in JE, viz. the separation of Israel from heathen influences." Surely the important thing to know is that the law itself is not old but new, and that even Isaiah does not appear to have conceived the idea of a single sanctuary. "The one and essential point," says Dr. G. Vos, "which we wish the higher criticism to establish, is this, that the (Deuteronomic) Code does not fit into the historical situation, by which, according to its own testimony, it was called forth."<sup>3</sup> Dr. Driver should, I think, have had some regard to this, even though he was not directly speaking of the date of the law-book. And in order more fully to represent the strictly critical point of view, he should (if he will excuse me for seeming to dictate to him) have mentioned other laws besides that of the central sanctuary, which, even if more or less developments of ancient principles, are held by consistent critics to be of modern origin.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker*, p. 132.

<sup>2</sup> I understand the qualification. But in view of the want of any confirming evidence from Isaiah, one may, with Stade, doubt whether Hezekiah did indeed formally and absolutely abolish all the local sanctuaries throughout his kingdom, as 2 Kings xviii. 4 appears to state.

<sup>3</sup> *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes* (1886), p. 90.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Dillmann, *Num.-Deut.-Jos.*, p. 604.

Upon the whole I desiderate a larger theory to account for, and therefore to justify, the statements in Deuteronomy, "And Moses said," "And Moses wrote." May we perhaps put the whole matter thus? The Book is at once legal, prophetic and historical. Under each of these aspects a fully instructed Israelite might naturally call it "Mosaic." In so far as it was legal, it could be said that the author belonged to the "Mosaic," or, as we may describe it (in opposition to certain "lying pens," Jer. viii. 8), the "orthodox" school of legalists. Its priestly author claimed, virtually at any rate, the name of Moses (just as the school of the prophet-reformer Zarathustra, not only virtually, but actually, called itself by its founder's name), because he "sat in Moses' seat," and continued the development of the antique decisions of the lawgiver. That Deuteronomy xii.-xxvi. was intended as a new edition of the old "Book of the Covenant," admits of no reasonable doubt. It was possibly in the mind of the author, a "legal fiction," like similar developments in English, and more especially in Roman law,<sup>1</sup> though this may not have been understood by Josiah. In so far as the Book was prophetic, it was a "Mosaic" work, because its author summed up the religious ideas of that prophetic succession of which Moses, as the writer fully believed, was the head.<sup>2</sup> And in so far as it was historical, it was "Mosaic," because the facts which it recorded were based on traditional records which the author believed to have come from Moses or his circle. Yes; even the statement that Moses delivered laws to the people in the fortieth year of the wanderings, has very probably a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 385.

<sup>2</sup> See Deut. xviii. 18, "A prophet will I [from time to time] raise up unto them . . . like unto me." Note the emphasis laid upon the truthfulness of the prophet; how could the writer of such a passage be—a "forger"? Even M. Darmesteter holds that the ideas of the Book are derived from the great prophets (review of M. Renan's *Histoire d'Israel* in *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1 avril, 1891).

traditional basis. In JE, as it stands, both the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 22-xxii.) and the Words of the Covenant (Exod. xxxiv. 10-28) form part of the Sinaitic revelation. But Kuenen has made it in a high degree plausible that in the original JE they were revealed indeed at Sinai, but not promulgated by Moses till just before the passage of the Jordan. It was, as he has sought in a masterly way to show, the Deuteronomic writer of JE who transposed the scene of the promulgation from Moab to Sinai, thus making room in the narrative of the fortieth year for the new edition (as Kuenen well calls it) of the Book of the Covenant (*i.e.* Deut. xiii.-xxvi. with the "parenthetic setting").<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Driver's treatment of the other problems of Deuteronomy shows learning, but no special critical insight. In dealing with the date of Deuteronomy xxxii., no arguments are adduced from the religious contents of the Song. Indeed, it is here once more shown how unsatisfactory it is to treat the lyric products of the old Hebrew poetry *separately*. But let us pass on to the Priestly Code. Here the evidence of date is abundant, though complicated, and Dr. Driver's treatment of it shows him at his very best. I should say that this portion (pp. 118-150) is the gem of the whole book. Here too at any rate there is no deficiency of courage. The author is strong in the confidence that all that orthodoxy really requires is, that the chief ceremonial institutions referred to in P should be "*in their origin of great antiquity*," and that the legislation should be based on legal traditions which, though modified and adapted to new circumstances from time to time, were yet in unbroken connexion with Israel's prime. This he believes that a patient criticism can show. He is therefore free to admit

<sup>1</sup> See Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, pp. 258-262, and (especially on Exod. xxiv. 4) cf. Cornill, *Einleitung*, p. 75; Montefiore, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January, 1891, p. 280, etc.



(frankly and without reserve) that P in its completed form is later than Ezekiel, who was the first to introduce the radical distinction between priests and Levites which we find in P (see Ezek. xliv. 6-16). The arguments for a later date are so fully and clearly presented, that I can hardly conceive any fresh mind resisting their force. I can only here refer to the linguistic argument. Dr. Driver has, I observe, made progress since 1882, when he subjected the not sufficiently exact philological argument of Giesebrecht (in Stade's *Zeitschrift* for 1881) to a somewhat severe criticism.<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that the writer was still feeling his way in a complicated critical problem, and did not as yet see distinctly the *real value* of the linguistic argument. His criticism of Giesebrecht's details is indeed upon the whole sound, but, for all that, Giesebrecht was right in his general principles. It was Ryssel (in a somewhat earlier treatise, praised by Dr. Driver in 1882) and not Giesebrecht who overrated the value of the linguistic argument, and Giesebrecht has in the article referred to already, put forward what Dr. Driver, in 1891, expresses thus:—

“The phraseology of P, it is natural to suppose, is one which had gradually formed; hence it contains elements which are no doubt ancient side by side with those which were introduced later. The priests of each successive generation would adopt, as a matter of course, the technical formulæ and stereotyped expressions which they learned from their seniors, new terms, when they were introduced, being accommodated to the old moulds” (p. 148).

It is possible indeed, that Dr. Driver, writing in 1891, would assert the presence of a larger traditional element in the phraseology of P than Giesebrecht did, writing in 1881. But whatever difference there may now exist between the two scholars must be very small, and not of much importance, except to those who attach an inordinate value to proving the archaic origin of Jewish ritual laws. To Dr.

<sup>1</sup> See reference, p. 81; and comp. Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, p. 291. Cornill (*Einführung*, p. 66) is slightly too eulogistic towards Giesebrecht.

Driver's excellently formulated statement I only desire to add the remark of Kuenen :—

“Linguistic arguments do not furnish a positive or conclusive argument. But they do furnish a *very strong presumption* against the theory that the priestly laws were written in the golden age of Israelitish literature. As long as P<sup>2</sup> [Dr. Driver's P] is regarded as a contemporary of Isaiah, the ever-increasing number of parallels [to later writers] must remain an enigma. A constantly recurring phenomenon . . . must rest on some general basis.”

On linguistic arguments I may find space to speak later on. It is, at any rate, not unimportant to know that an “induction from the facts of the Hebrew language” cannot prevent us from accepting a post-Deuteronomic (*i.e.* post-Josian) date for P, indeed that it furnishes good presumptive evidence in its favour.

I do not, however, forget, nor does Dr. Driver, that the Priestly Code contains many very early elements. Leviticus xi. for instance, which is virtually identical with Deuteronomy xiv. 4–20, is, no doubt, as Kuenen says, “a later and amplified edition of those priestly decisions on clean and unclean animals, which the Deuteronomist adopted.”<sup>1</sup> And above all, Leviticus xvii–xxvi., when carefully studied, is seen to contain an earlier stratum of legislation (known as H, or P<sup>1</sup>), which “exhibits a characteristic phraseology, and is marked by the preponderance of certain characteristic principles and motives” (p. 54). That the greater part of this collection of laws dates from a time considerably prior to Ezekiel, may now be taken as granted. But what is the date of the writer who arranged these laws in the existing “parenthetic framework”; or, in other words, the date of the *compilation* of H? Dr. Driver replies that he wrote shortly before the close of the monarchy; but this relatively conservative conclusion hardly does justice to the natural impression of the reader that the predicted devastation of the land of Israel is really

<sup>1</sup> *The Hexateuch*, p. 264.

an accomplished fact. It appears safer to hold that H as it stands was arranged by a priestly writer in the second half of the Babylonian exile. On the question, When was H absorbed into P? and, indeed, on the larger question of the later stages of our present Hexateuch, Dr. Driver still holds his opinion in reserve. No reference is made to the important narrative in Nehemiah viii., which seems the counterpart of that in 2 Kings xxii.

And now as to the character of the Priestly Narrative. The view of things which this narrative gives seems, according to our author,

“To be the result of a systematizing process working upon these materials, and perhaps also seeking to give sensible expression to certain ideas or truths (as, to the truth of Jehovah’s *presence in the midst of His people*, symbolized by the “Tent of Meeting,” surrounded by its immediate attendants, in the centre of the camp),” p. 120.

And in a footnote he says that,—

“It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the representation of P contains elements, not, in the ordinary sense of the word, historical” [*e.g.* especially in his chronological scheme, and in the numbers of the Israelites.—See Numbers i.-iv.].

Similarly, in speaking of P’s work in the Book of Joshua, he says that,—

“The partition of the land being conceived as *ideally* effected by Joshua, its complete distribution and occupation by the tribes are treated as his work, and as accomplished in his life-time” (pp. 108, 109).

Let me honestly say that these views, though correct, present great difficulties to those whose reverence is of the old type; and that in order to understand, and, if it may be, to justify the author or compiler of P, careful historical training is necessary. Dr. Driver’s book does not give any of the hints which the religious study of criticism appears at this point to require. But, no doubt, he was hampered equally by his want of space and by his plan.

As to the ascription of the laws to Moses, on the other hand, the author is really helpful. He points out the double aspect of the Priestly Code, which, though Exilic and early post-Exilic in its formulation, is "based upon pre-existing temple-usage" (p. 135). In taking this view he is at one with critics of very different schools, so that we may hope soon to hear no more of the charge that, according to the critics, the translation of P was "manufactured" by the later priests. Dr. Driver would rather have abstained altogether from touching on Biblical archæology, his object (an impossible one) being to confine himself to the purely literary aspect of the Old Testament. But, as Merx long ago said, a purely literary criticism of the Hexateuch is insufficient. To show that there is a basis of early customary law in later legal collections, we are compelled to consider historical analogies. In spite of Kuenen's adverse criticism of Mr. Fenton's explanation of the law of "jubilee" (Lev. xxv. 8-55), I still feel that their may be a kernel of truth in it; and much more certainly the sacrificial laws have a basis of pre-exilic priestly ordinance. But can those institutions and rites be traced back to Moses? Dr. Driver feels it necessary to satisfy his readers to some extent on this point. What he says is, in fact, much the same as Kuenen said in the *Godsdienst van Israel* in 1870.<sup>1</sup> It is however from an orthodox point of view, startling; and considering that Kuenen became afterwards more extreme in his views,<sup>2</sup> Dr. Driver may fairly lay claim, not merely to courage and consistency, but also to moderation and sobriety. Certainly I fully approve what Dr. Driver has said. It is "sober," *i.e.* it does not go beyond the facts, nor is its sobriety impaired by the circumstance that the few facts at his disposal have had to be interpreted imaginatively. How else, as I have

<sup>1</sup> Kuenen, *Godsdienst van Israel*, i. 278-286; ii. 209 (E.T. i. 282-290, ii. 302).

<sup>2</sup> Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, i. 238 (*Hexateuch*, p. 244).

said already, can the bearing of these few precious but dry facts be realized? I am only afraid that some readers will think that Moses was more systematic, more of a modern founder and organizer than he can really have been; but I suspect that a fuller explanation would show that there is no real difference between Dr. Driver and myself. I am in full accord with him when he says (in tacit opposition to Kuenen's later view) that "the teaching of Moses on these subjects (civil and ceremonial precepts) is preserved in its least modified form in the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant." It becomes any one to differ from Kuenen with humility, but my own historical sense emphatically requires that from the very beginning there should have been the germ of the advanced "ethical monotheism" of the prophets; and if only it be admitted that even the shortened form of the Decalogue proposed by Ewald<sup>1</sup> has probably been modified (we have no right to equalize Moses with Zoroaster),<sup>2</sup> we may not unreasonably suppose that the "Ten Words" are indeed derived from "Moses, the man of God," and that the other similar "decads"<sup>3</sup> were imitated from this one. That Dr. Driver has made no reference in this important passage to Exodus xv. (in spite of his conservative view on the authorship of the Song), deserves recognition.

There is only one other point which I could have wished to see stated. I will express it in the words of Kuenen:—

"It is Moses' great work and enduring merit—not that he introduced into Israel any particular religious forms and practices, but—that he established the service of Jahveh among his people upon a moral footing."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, *Geschichte*, ii. 231 (E.T. ii. 163). Comp. Driver, *Introduction*, p. 31, with the accompanying discussion of the two traditional texts of the Decalogue. A conjectural but historically conceivable revision of Ewald's form of the Decalogue has been given by Mr. Wicksteed, *The Christian Reformer*, May, 1886, pp. 307-313.

<sup>2</sup> See my article in *Nineteenth Century*, Dec., 1891.

<sup>3</sup> See Ewald, *Geschichte*, l.c.; and cf. Wildeboer, *Theolog. Studien*, 1887, p. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, i. 292 (*Godsdienst*, i. 289).

This surely ought to satisfy the needs of *essential orthodoxy*. For what conservatives want, or ought to want, is not so much to prove the veracity of the Israelitish priests, when they ascribed certain ordinances to Moses, as to show that Moses had high intuitions of God and of morality. In a word, they want, or they ought to want, to contradict the view that the religion of Israel—at any rate, between Moses and Amos—in no essential respect differed from that of “Moab, Ammon, and Edom, Israel’s nearest kinsfolk and neighbours.”<sup>1</sup> Their mistake has hitherto been in attributing to Moses certain *absolutely* correct religious and moral views. In doing so, they interfered with the originality both of the prophets of Israel and of Jesus Christ, and they have to avoid this in future by recognising that Moses’ high intuitions were limited by his early place in the history of Israel’s revelation.

I am most thankful that in this very important matter (which, even in an introduction to the Old Testament literature, could not be passed over) Dr. Driver has not felt himself obliged to make any deduction from critical results. The second chapter is one which makes somewhat less demand than the first on the patient candour of orthodox readers. It may also appear less interesting until we have learned that the narrative books are of the utmost importance for Hexateuch students, as supplying the historical framework for the Hexateuch records. In fact, all the Old Testament Scriptures are interlaced by numberless delicate threads, so that no part can be neglected without injury to the rest. Undoubtedly, the criticism of Judg.-Sam.-Kings has not reached such minute accuracy as that of the Hexateuch, and it was a disadvantage to Dr. Driver that he had to write upon these books before the researches of Budde and Cornill (to whom we may now add Kautzsch and Kittel) had attained more complete analytical results.

<sup>1</sup> Wellhausen, *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah* (1891), p. 23.

Still one feels that, with the earlier pioneering works to aid him (including Budde's and Cornill's earlier essays), Dr. Driver could have been much fuller, with more space and perhaps with more courage. At any rate, the most essential critical points have been duly indicated, and I welcome Dr. Driver's second chapter, in combination with his work on the Text of Samuel, as materially advancing the study of these books in England.<sup>1</sup> A valuable hint was already given in chapter i. (pp. 3, 4). With regard to Judges and Kings we are there told that "in each a series of older narratives has been taken by the compiler, and fitted with a framework supplied by himself"; whereas in Samuel, though this too is a compilation, "the compiler's hand is very much less conspicuous than is the case in Judges and Kings" (pp. 3, 4). Of the work of the compiler in Kings, we are further told in chapter ii. that it included not only brief statistical notices, sometimes called the "Epitome," but also the introduction of fresh and "prophetic glances at the future" and the "amplification" of already existing prophecies (see pp. 178, 184, 189). He judges historical events by the standard of Deuteronomy, and his Deuteronomizing peculiarities receive a careful description, which is illustrated by a valuable list of his characteristic phrases (with reference to Deuteronomy and Jeremiah). We are introduced, in fact, to what Kleinert calls the *Deuteronomistische Schriftstellerei*, and realize how great must have been the effect of that great monument both of religion and of literature—the kernel of our Deuteronomy.

On the historical value of Judges, the author speaks cautiously, following Dr. A. B. Davidson, who has remarked (EXPOSITOR, Jan., 1887) on the different points of view in the narratives and in the framework, and who finds in the latter, not, strictly speaking, history, but rather the

<sup>1</sup> A forthcoming work of my own on the Study of Criticism will, I hope, slightly supplement and strengthen this part of Dr. Driver's book.

“philosophy of history.” To this eminent teacher the author also appeals as having already pointed out the combination of different accounts of the same facts—a striking phenomenon which meets us in a still greater degree in the first part of Samuel. It was surely hardly necessary to do so. Support might have been more valuable for the ascription of the Song of Hannah to a later period, though here Dr. Driver is relatively conservative. The other poetical passages in Samuel have no special treatment. Still a generally correct impression is given of the composition of our Samuel, and the praise given to “the most considerable part which appears plainly to be the work of a single author” (2 Sam. ix.–xx., to which 1 Kings i.–ii. in the main belongs) is not at all too high.

It strikes me, however, that in this chapter Dr. Driver does not show as much courage as in the preceding one. Not to dwell on the cautious reserve with which he alludes to questions of historicity, I must regret that the duplicate narratives in Samuel are so treated, that some of the chief critical points are missed, and that the true character of the record does not fully appear.

And how strange it is to read of 1 Samuel xxiv. and xxvi., that

“Whether the two narratives really relate to two different occasions, or whether they are merely different versions of the same occurrence, is a question on which opinion will probably continue to be divided”<sup>1</sup> (p. 171)!

Nor is anything said either of 1 Samuel xvi. 1–13 (the anointing of David),<sup>2</sup> nor of the prophecy of Nathan (2 Sam. vii.), except that the latter is included among the “relatively latest passages” (p. 173), where I am afraid that the reader may overlook it. The former passage was no doubt difficult to treat without a somewhat fuller adoption

<sup>1</sup> See Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel*, p. 227.

<sup>2</sup> It is less important that nothing is said on the “doublets,” 1 Sam. xxxi., 2 Sam. i. 1–16.



of the principles which govern, and must govern, the critical analysis of the Hebrew texts. Nor can I help wondering whether there is the note of true "moderation" in the remark on 1 Kings xiii. 1-32, that it is "a narrative not probably of very early origin, as it seems to date from a time when the names both of the prophet of Judah, and of the 'old prophet' were no longer remembered" (p. 183). I turn to Klostermann, whom Professor Lias at the last Church Congress extolled as the representation of common sense in literary criticism, and whose doctrinal orthodoxy is at any rate above suspicion, and find these remarks:—

"The following narrative in its present form comes in the main from a book of anecdotes from the prophetic life of an earlier period with a didactic tendency, designed for disciples of the prophets. . . . It is probable that the reminiscence of Amos iii. 14; vii. 16, 17; ix. 1, etc., influenced this narrative, as well as *the recollection of Josiah's profanation of the sanctuary at Bethel*" (2 Kings xxiii.).

So then this narrative is later than the other Elijah narratives; is, in fact, post-Deuteronomic. To the original writer of 2 Kings xxii., xxiii., it was unknown. Obviously it occasioned the later insertion of 2 Kings xxiii. 16-18 (notice the apologetic interest in Lucian's fuller text of the Septuagint of v. 18). Why not say so plainly?

And why meet the irreverence of the remarks of Ewald and of Wellhausen on 2 Kings i.<sup>1</sup> (an irreverence which is only on the surface, and is excused by manifest loyalty to historical truth) by the something less than accurate statement that this chapter "presents an impressive picture of Elijah's inviolable greatness" (p. 185)?

I know that Dr. Driver will reply that he desired to

<sup>1</sup> See Ewald, *History*, iv. 112; Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, etc., pp. 284-5. The fundamental reverence of all Ewald's Biblical work is, I presume, too patent to be denied. He would not have spoken as he did on 2 Kings i. without good cause.

leave historical criticism on one side. By so doing he would, no doubt, satisfy the author of the *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*, who, if I remember right, tolerates literary, but not real historical, criticism. But Dr. Driver has already found in chapter i. that the separation cannot be maintained. Why attempt what is neither possible, nor (if I may say so) desirable, in chapter ii. ? Here let me pause for awhile ; the first section of my critical survey is at an end. But I cannot pass on without the willing attestation that the scholarly character of these two chapters is high, and that even the author's compromises reveal a thoughtful and conscientious mind. May his work and mine alike tend to the hallowing of criticism, to the strengthening of spiritual faith, and to the awakening in wider circles of a more intelligent love for the records of the Christian revelation.

T. K. CHEYNE.