

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

was left open for me—I used to feel, late as it was, and often the end of a busy day, an inward refreshment and lifting of heart, which made the starlit heavens seem more familiar and near.

The people of the house where she lodged were Germans—quiet and gentle people. While she was there, a child was born to them, the first after ten years of marriage. It only lived a few hours, and in the night, hearing it was dying, and the parents in deep distress, Miss Greenwell went upstairs and sat by the poor mother, and to her infinite consolation, taking the new-born child in her arms, she administered the rite of baptism. The sacrament was, to her, the seal of divine recognition of the mystery of birth, placing once more in the protecting arms of God the marvellous gift of His love.

AGNES MACDONELL.

ON SOME POINTS IN PROFESSOR ROBERTSON  
SMITH'S LECTURES ON THE OLD  
TESTAMENT.

DR. DRIVER'S forthcoming review of the second edition of Prof. Robertson Smith's well-known work will doubtless make it superfluous for me to show by details the exceeding merit of the book. Strictly speaking, indeed, it is above both eulogy and criticism, in so far as it reproduces those admirable lectures which to so many, even of those who now sit in the professor's chair, have been delightful companions. Yes; not only the higher criticism of the Bible, but this excellent introduction to the study, has proved its life, "like Dante among the shades," by moving what it touches. It is however worth while for some of us to confer with the author, as with an old friend, on some of the new pages of his book.' I shall not speak of the important additional matter in Lectures V. and XI., nor of the new concluding lecture, and only incidentally of the re-written seventh Lecture which has to do with the Book of Psalms. Two of the six appended notes will

form the subject of this short article; it were easy to expatiate upon them at length, but the author at any rate will understand why I confine myself to a brief statement of the impression which he has made upon me. Note A relates to the text of 1 Sam. xvii. Prof. Robertson Smith is no more moved by the arguments of Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Budde, who hold that the omissions of the Septuagint are due to an attempt to remove difficulties, than Cornill, whose valuable *Einleitung* is attaining such a well-deserved popularity. On the other hand, there are some scholars who hold out even against such able writers as Cornill and the author, and to the number of these both Dr. Driver (presumably) and myself (*Aids to the Study of Criticism*, p. 90) belong. The author's exposition of his critical theory is most lucid, and as one reads it one is more than half disposed to agree with him. But when we turn back, and ask if the difficulties pointed out, e.g. by Budde, in such theories as the author's have been removed, we hesitate to reply in the affirmative. I am afraid that if I followed the author, I should be led into an arbitrary, subjective criticism which I could not justify. Look at the form given to the seventeenth chapter of Samuel by Klostermann. The author is bold, rightly bold, but I feel sure he would rather give up the whole problem as insoluble than venture on such a thorough analysis as could alone prove his theory to be correct.

Some of Prof. Robertson Smith's observations are undoubtedly correct; but the roughnesses in the text can be accounted for differently. For instance, there is great awkwardness in verse 12; but the text appears to be not quite in order, and in verse 31 the author and Klostermann are evidently\* right in following Lucian's Septuagint, which appends *καὶ εἰσῆγαγον πρὸς Σαούλ*. He is also I think right, in company with Klostermann and Budde, in the conjecture that verse 12 should begin with the words, "And there was a man, an Ephrathite of Bethlehem-Judah, whose name was Jesse." This view does not however force us to hold that verses 12-31 (I put aside the question of glosses in this portion) come from a different source from xvii. 1-11. I should not have been surprised if the author had also been attracted by another theory of Klostermann, which substitutes Jonathan's armour for that of Saul in verse 38 (cf. *Aids*, p. 105). I cannot at present follow him however in his own view of Israelitish armour-bearers. Prof. Robertson Smith's familiarity

with Arabic historians gives to him no doubt a special authority on Semitic military matters. But must an armour-bearer necessarily have been inexpert in the use of arms? This seems to me (I speak under correction) a gratuitous assumption. I agree however with the author that the whole story of Goliath implies that David was only a stripling. He was, in fact, a shepherd boy according to this narrative; Prof. Robertson Smith adds, and also Saul's armour-bearer, and (like Klostermann) explains the sword in verse 51 as David's (which is plausible). I cannot however as yet venture to follow him. If it is a bold hypothesis that the words "who is with the sheep" (xvi. 19) are interpolated, I am not sure that it is not justifiable under the circumstances (see Budde, p. 211). The author is hardly less bold in another way when he asserts that the words of Saul's servant in xvi. 18 may be taken proleptically. To me they rather suggest that it was an honour even for a brave and dexterous warrior to act upon some occasions<sup>1</sup> as the king's armour-bearer. If I may not hold this view, I see no choice but to fall back upon the difficult theory (suggested but rejected by the author) that xvi. 14-23 is itself of composite structure.<sup>2</sup> At any rate, the author and I both agree with Ewald, that this fine story was "told and retold with infinite delight and frequency"; hence the chief difficulties of the text.

I now pass to the note on Maccabæan psalms in Books I.-III. of the Psalter. I have already ventured to express the opinion (EXPOSITOR, March, 1892, p. 231) that Prof. W. R. Smith's article on the Psalms in the *Encycl. Britannica* is still the best general introduction to the subject, and I am heartily glad that the substance of it is republished in the present volume. There is so much in it with which I agree, so much which needs to be emphasized as practically certain, however much it may be disputed, that if I thought the criticisms which I am about to offer would strike the reader as hostile, I would suppress them. They are in fact rather questions than criticisms, and will at least testify to

<sup>1</sup> For I suppose that Saul, as well as Joab (2 Sam. xviii. 15), may have had several armour-bearers.

<sup>2</sup> I do not understand the remark that xvi. 14-23 may conceivably present traces of a narrative which introduced David to Saul as a full-grown warrior, "especially in view of 2 Sam. xxi. 19." Is Elhanan regarded as another name of David (Böttcher's and Prof. Sayce's view)?

the interest with which I have read this note. That references to a king in psalms which appear to be post-Exilic are surprising, is admitted on all hands. Prof. Robertson Smith thinks that Psalms lxi. 7-9, and lxxiii. 12 are liturgical additions. I suppose he means that these psalms were originally the songs of an individual, and adapted for the use of the Jewish Church by these closing verses. But who in this case was meant by the king? Does the author suppose the Messianic king to be meant? This seems to me more difficult to realize, and less supported by external evidence, than my own theory (which may, of course, be united to the individualistic interpretation of the rest of these psalms). And this reminds me that on the next page the author explains Psalm lxxii. 1 thus: "Entrust thy judgments to a king, and thy righteousness to a king's son," which "may very well be a prayer for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty under a Messianic king according to prophecy." I do not forget the simple  $\text{מֶלֶךְ}$  in Isaiah xxxii. 1, xxxiii. 17, and I know that many difficult things have to be admitted, but I cannot as yet take in this theory. Nor can I, without some entirely fresh considerations being offered, admit that Psalm xlv. is most easily understood as pre-Exilic, and I am surprised that Prof. Whitehouse (*Critical Review*, January, 1892, p. 10) should be attracted more by the theory of Psalm lxxii. offered in my *Lectures* than by that of Psalm xlv. Special stress is once more laid by the author on his theory (which is closely allied to Ewald's former theory) of Psalms xlv., lxxiv., lxxix., and lxxxiii. It will be a great satisfaction to me, should I be able to follow him, more especially as regards Psalms lxxiv. and lxxix. For I cannot help believing that the critics of the Book of Isaiah will have sooner or later to admit that Isaiah lxiii. 7-16. 24 belongs to the terrible times of Artaxerxes Ochus.<sup>1</sup> Now if it may be accepted as probable that the temple was burned and Jerusalem laid waste by the Persians, irritated at the part taken by the Jews in the Syrian and Egyptian revolt, we can place Psalms lxxiv. 7 and lxxix. 1 by the side of Isaiah lxiv. 10, 11 (Heb. 9, 10). At present I see difficulties. It is very bold to transform the story of Bagôses so completely, nor should we altogether neglect the statement in Solinus, that not Jerusalem but Jericho was "subdued"

<sup>1</sup> *Jewish Quarterly Review*, October, 1891, pp. 104-111, where Prof. Robertson Smith's article "Psalms" is duly referred to. On the Syrian and Egyptian campaigns of Ochus, see also Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien* (1892).

by Artaxerxes.<sup>1</sup> The commercial importance of Jericho may well have enabled it to overshadow Jerusalem; we know the importance of this city under Herod. As Hitzig remarks, Jews and Syrians probably dwelt together at Jericho, and shared the lot of captivity which Jerusalem, immersed in religion, may have escaped. Nor am I sure that the revolt of the Jews (or of a part of the Jews) can have had a theocratic character to such an extent as to explain Psalm xlv., and neither the expression "our hosts" (v. 9) nor the Psalmist's consciousness of Israel's innocence (contrast Isaiah lxiv. 5-7, and see Josephus) seems to me quite intelligible on Prof. Smith's theory. And the author is, I think, unjust to the Persian kings. It is perhaps a more satisfactory estimate of them which is given by Prof. Gardner, when he says that they "were usually very tolerant of the religions of those they conquered."<sup>2</sup> And if there was any country where the Persians were unlikely to commit acts of sacrilege, it was the land of the Jews; what was there in the temple to irritate Mazda-worshippers? Nor must we rely on the citation from Pseudo-Hecataeus, which does not in the least prove that the Jewish religion was persecuted by the Persians. And lastly, Gutschmid's theory respecting the Holophernes of the Book of Judith is no doubt possible, but is not at present widely received among scholars.

As to Psalm lxxxiii., Prof. Robertson Smith's date (after B.C. 350) comes very near my own. Still, with Isaiah lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12 in my mind, I can hardly believe it to be correct, and 1 Macc. v. seems to me to throw a bright light on the psalm. The statement of Pseudo-Scylax which gives Ascalon to Tyre (cf. Gutschmid's art. "Phœnicia" in the *E. B.*) is strange; and is Ascalon equivalent to Philistia? I wonder that the author does not add a reference to Isaiah xxv. 10-12 (Moab), for Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii. is probably of the second Persian century. Psalm lxviii. is also stated to be of the close of the Persian age. But in this case I cannot understand why Israel should pray for a "rebuke" to Egypt, which was battling so manfully for its independence against the tyrant Ochus. But to all my doubts and questionings there is one sufficient answer if Books I.-III. *must* have been com-

<sup>1</sup> "Judæa caput fuit Hierosolyma, sed excisa est. Successit Hierichus: et hæc desivit, Artaxerxis bello subacta." Solinus, § 35, 4 (Mommson).

<sup>2</sup> *New Chapters in Greek History*, p. 246.

pleted before the Maccabee period. It is too true that we have but the most fragmentary and second-hand accounts of the fateful years which preceded the catastrophe of Persia. If the psalms in question *must* be Persian, then we may reconstruct a history to suit them. But I am not sure that they must, and I have reverence even for the echoes of historical events in Diodorus and Solinus.

Of course, it is gratifying to me to know that this prince of English critics is entirely on my side on the point to which I attach the highest importance, viz. that the Book of Psalms is not a record of many different ages, to be laboriously puzzled out by the critic, but upon the whole a monument of the Church of the Second Temple, so that he who would study Jewish religion—not the religion of a few exceptional men, but that of the Church—must work hard at the psalms. I have looked on with astonishment at the failure of English reviewers to take in this idea, and I am pleased to have on my side one who, for his acuteness, learning, and devout spirit, ought to be respected by them all.<sup>1</sup>

T. K. CHEYNE.

<sup>1</sup> I subjoin two little notes. (1) On p. 212 the author states that the point of Psalm cxxxiii. is missed in all the commentaries that he has examined. I have not the *E.B.* at hand to see if this sentence is but reprinted, but surely all those commentators who regard this as a pilgrim psalm hold just the same view as that which is here so well expressed. What *is* the property of the author is the beautiful interpretation of verses 2 and 3 which follows. (2) It is not perhaps wise to reject the situation proposed by me (after Hitzig) for Psalms xlii., xliii., because it is "fanciful" (p. 439). Unvividified by the imagination, the facts of exegesis tend to be insipid. Milton has taught us that there is a true fancy and a false (*Paradise Lost*, Book V.), and the author himself is, happily, well furnished with imaginative power. (3) My present view of Psalm lxviii. 31 (A.V. 30) is to be found in *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism*, p. 341. The verse, as I now interpret it, suggests placing the psalms at a time when Egyptian mercenaries were dangerous to Syria (see *Jos., Ant.* xii. 3, 3).