

nor mature. His was a moral insight so keen, a moral integrity so strong, a moral passion so intense, that the temptations must have come to Him in forms far more disguised than the literal explanation of the narrative offers; and His conflict with evil must have been much more varied and strenuous than the simple repetition of texts of Scripture. We do not honour Jesus by assuming that He was capable of being tempted by any of the three forms of temptation taken literally; assuredly the disciples might have been, and for that reason Jesus reported His personal experience in this symbolic form.

Again, it has been said that the suggestions of evil must have come to Jesus from without: they could not come to Him as sinless from within; and accordingly it is assumed there must have

been an external personal tempter. This is an example of a psychology too simple for truth. 'The without' and 'the within' of a man's moral personality are not convertible with outside or inside his body. There are contents in every man's memory, instincts and impulses in his heart, and influences over his will which are not of his own making, over which he has not complete control, and for which he cannot be held personally responsible. Jesus did not live in moral isolation, with a moral vacuum in His spirit. Sinless He was, but not on that account incapable of being tempted from within, for in Him as in other men there were thoughts, feelings, wishes, not of His own making, not yet proved sinful, the raw material out of which in due season temptations might be made.

---

## The International Critical Commentary on 'Samuel.'

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, M.A., MARVCULTER.

'THE International Critical Commentary' series has long ago gained for itself the highest reputation. Not only from England and America but from the Continent has abundant testimony been borne to the exact scholarship and scientific methods it exhibits, as well as to its practical use for all who desire to learn the true meaning of Scripture. In the department of the Old Testament the work before us has been preceded by Driver's *Deuteronomy* and Moore's *Judges*. Both these commentaries had to deal with books of no ordinary difficulty, and both by universal confession have executed their task with brilliant success. It was no light undertaking for Professor H. P. Smith to produce a work that must, as a matter of course, challenge comparison with them. He evidently felt this, for in his Preface he remarks: 'In preparing the present number of the series I have constantly had occasion to admire the work of these predecessors, and I shall be gratified if the present volume shall be found worthy of a place by the side of theirs.'

<sup>1</sup> *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel.* By Henry Preserved Smith, Professor of Biblical History and Interpretation in Amherst College. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899. Price. 12s.

Hitherto we have had no scientific English commentary on *Samuel*. Much has been done for the text (which disputes with Ezekiel the claim to be the most corrupt in the O.T.) by Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Budde, and Driver. The latter scholar, indeed, gives us in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* much that is of exegetical value as well, and to some of us the work just named has almost supplied the place of a commentary. It is unfortunate, considering the importance of the Books of Samuel as sources for the history of Israel, that the text should often be so uncertain and that the analysis into sources should present such difficulties. In dealing with these perplexing problems Professor Smith appears to us to exhibit the very ideal of the critical spirit. He handles thorny questions with caution but without timidity.

In his Introduction our author treats summarily but sufficiently (1) *the Title*: pointing out how what was originally one book came to be divided into two, and noting by the way the infelicity of the title *Samuel*, seeing that the prophet just named ceases to be prominent after the middle of the first book; (2) *the Contents*: which deal with a period comprising probably about 100 years,

during which the transition from the tribal to the monarchical form of government was accomplished. The three great figures round which the history is grouped are of course, Samuel, Saul, and David, although to the theocratic view Saul is of minor importance, and the history really belongs to Samuel and David. For practical purposes Professor Smith finds it convenient to arrange the material in three sections (*A*) The Life of Samuel, 1 S 1-15, (*B*) Saul and David, 1 S 16-2 S 1, (*C*) David the king, 2 S 2-24.

(3) *The Composition.*—Here our author notes the well recognized use of duplicate narratives, e.g. in the two accounts of Saul's rejection and perhaps of his appointment, of David's introduction to Saul, etc., and points out how a difference of style and of points of view may likewise be traced in different sections. His analysis of the sources will command general approval. It is as follows:—(*A*) 1 S 1-15 consists really of a Life of Samuel, chaps. 1. 3. 4. 7<sup>3-17</sup> 8. 10<sup>17-25</sup> 12. 15, and a Life of Saul, 9<sup>1-10</sup> 10<sup>16</sup> 11. 13<sup>2-14</sup> 5<sup>2</sup>. For the former Professor Smith employs the symbol *Sm.*, for the latter *Sl.* The section includes other detached passages that belong to neither of these sources, notably 5<sup>1-7</sup> 7<sup>1</sup>. Chap. 2 is itself composite, but our author sees no reason for holding, with many modern critics, that vv. 27-36 are a very late addition made after the virtual completion of our present book. (*B*) 1 S 16-2 S 1 proceeds from two main sources, which may be a continuation of *Sm.* and *Sl.* The first of these, corresponding to *Sl.*, is 16<sup>14-23</sup> 18<sup>6-13</sup> 20-20a 19<sup>11-17</sup> 21<sup>2-10</sup> 22<sup>1. 2. 6-23</sup> 23<sup>1-14</sup> 25. 26. 27. 29. 30. 2 S 1; the second, answering to *Sm.*, is 16<sup>1-13</sup> 17<sup>1-18</sup> (in the LXX text) 18<sup>14-19</sup> 18<sup>30-19</sup> 10. 18-24 21<sup>11-16</sup> 22<sup>3-5</sup> 23<sup>15-24</sup> 26 28. 31. Chap. 20 and 21<sup>1</sup> cannot be fitted into either of these. (*C*) 2 S 2-24, of which chaps. 9-20 are generally admitted to be homogeneous. Perhaps these twelve chapters should be connected with *Sl.*, whereas 5. 7. 8 would go better with *Sm.* Chaps. 2-4, again, may belong to *Sl.*, chap. 6 has affinities with both sources. The Appendix, chaps. 21-24, includes diverse sources. Perhaps 21<sup>1-4</sup> and 24 belong to the same source as 9-20, but could not have been a direct continuation of these chapters, for they interrupt the connexion between 2 S 20 and 1 K 1. Professor Smith has little sympathy with the attempt of Budde and others to trace the Pentateuchal sources J and E in the Books of Samuel. The Deuteronomic touches,

also, he holds to be few, and this is generally admitted.

(4) *The Text and Versions.*—Professor Smith describes very carefully the different versions that have to be taken account of, and lays down the principles that must be observed in availing ourselves of their aid. He deals successfully, for instance, with the objection that the text of the LXX is still too corrupt to be used with any certainty in correcting the Massoretic text.

(5) Passing to speak of the *Religious Ideas* of the Books of Samuel, Professor Smith remarks that these are of a mixed character, varying greatly in different sections. A primitive stage, for instance, is marked by the matter-of-course presence of *teraphim* in David's house (1 S 19), whereas elsewhere (15<sup>22</sup>) the use of these is coupled with idolatry and witchcraft as an abomination to Jahweh. The story of the witch of Endor marks, apparently, a survival of pre-prophetic religion. A limited view of Jahweh, as in the strictest sense the God of Israel alone, appears in 1 S 26<sup>10</sup>, and even although Jahweh is a righteous God, this attribute is exhibited chiefly in vindictive justice.

The Commentary follows, in its methods, the line now familiar to students of the series. A summary of each paragraph and a general discussion of its meaning is followed by more detailed critical and exegetical notes in small type. After very considerable experience of the employment of this method, as well as of the notation used for scriptural references, not only in these commentaries but in the new *Dictionary of the Bible* and elsewhere, we prefer it to any other with which we are acquainted.

We may note a few of our author's views culled from the pages of the commentary. Professor Smith does not commit himself on the origin or the meaning of 'Belial,' although he has followed, and refers to, the discussions in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by Cheyne, Baudissin, and Jensen (p. 11).—The *nabi*, 'prophet,' was probably originally *the mutterer* (p. 72).—The obscure expression in 1 S 15<sup>32</sup> he renders (but only provisionally) 'Agag came to him trembling, and Agag said, Surely death is bitter.'—As to the story of David's combat with Goliath, he agrees with Robertson Smith in giving the preference to the shorter (LXX) text, but doubts whether Cornill is right in holding that the omitted sections also form a continuous narrative.—He holds that the probabilities are strongly

in favour of David's authorship of the dirge on the death of Saul and Jonathan, building chiefly upon the absence of all religious allusions and of any reference to the strained relations between Saul and David. Such allusions were almost certain to have been introduced by a late imitator. 'The bow' of 2 S 1<sup>18</sup> Professor Smith despairs of explaining.—In dealing with 2 S 12<sup>31</sup> he is disposed to acquit David of the charge of torturing his Ammonite prisoners. The words used may mean that David 'set them to the saws and the picks and the axes, and made them work at the brick-moulds.'—2 S 22 (=Ps 18) 'it is difficult to suppose to be David's own.'—2 S 23<sup>1-7</sup> is 'a comparatively late production.'

These few instances will show the character of the work before us, which, alike in textual criticism, in archæology, in geography, and in exegesis is precisely the kind of commentary to which one turns with confidence.

In the Appendix Professor Smith deals at some length with Löhr's recently published edition of

Thenius' *Samuel*, which appeared only after our author's own commentary was in the printer's hands. We feel certain that there will be general agreement amongst scholars that Professor Smith is right in taking Löhr to task for the strangely reactionary method of textual criticism he pursues (cf. also Bertholet's review of Löhr in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, xxiii. (1898), pp. 529 ff. In the same connexion we may refer also to some remarks on textual criticism by Professor Cheyne in the *Expositor*, April 1899, pp. 253 ff.). Löhr may have improved on the commentary proper, but he has certainly altered for the worse a good deal of Thenius' critical work. Finally, our author's excursus on Lucian and Theodotion well deserves, and will no doubt receive, the attention of experts.

It may be safely predicted that Professor Smith's commentary will be welcomed as an accession of strength to the Anglo-American alliance so brilliantly inaugurated by Professors Driver and Moore.

## Christ's Sympathy in Life's Commonplace.

(HEBREWS II. 16.)

BY THE REV. R. GLAISTER, B.D., KIRKCUDBRIGHT.

GREAT truths are simple truths. Men have strained hard to find the innermost truth of things, and at last have found that it was very simple, lying close to them all the time. God scatters His richest gifts in the greatest profusion. The dewdrop, glancing in the sun, has colours bright as the diamond, and the beauty of things around is better mirrored there. The deepest doctrines of our religion, in exact accordance with God's working elsewhere, are not far-off abstruse thoughts; they come down into the lives of all; they dwell with the simplicities and charities of the universal human heart; they meet the common needs and wants of men. The doctrine of the Incarnation is a high thought, a thought 'pinnacled dim in the intense inane' for the strongest minds to strain after, but the fact of the Incarnation makes religion a dearer and more homely thing. It is a great thing for wise men to

explore all nature and the soul of man, to learn what these can tell of Him from whom they came; it is a great thing for wise men to think of a Power behind all visible things, and to ascribe to that Power all the wisdom and beauty and glory they know, and set Him on the shrine of their adoring homage, their spirits' Lord and King; it is a great and high thought for them to people the far-off heavens with ideals of excellence, which may be guides to virtue and happiness for them and all men. That is a religion which exalts our race, begotten as we are of the dust of the ground. Impulse and inspiration for lofty souls may be gotten thence. But our Christian religion, the special gift of our God, is simpler, homelier, warmer; it comes closer to the heart; it leaves the cold bare heights for the valleys where the crowds of men and women are; for it tells us that we need not with lofty persistence scale the