

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

truth in the critical attitude, and so far as it is true the Anglo-Catholic writers here accept it. Why not? For they also accept the other truth of Christian experience, which is as much a truth (or half-truth) as the truth of 'science.' Dr. SELWYN'S

remarks on this topic are very illuminating and will seem convincing to most minds. There does not seem, in the nature of things, any reason why an Anglo-Catholic should not also be a higher critic.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

II. The Contribution of Great Britain to Old Testament Study.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., REGENT'S PARK COLLEGE,
LONDON AND OXFORD.

1. THE scientific study of the Old Testament means the examination of its elements by the full employment of all the general methods of literary and historical study—linguistic, archæological, geographical, anthropological, comparative, even theological and philosophical, always provided that the literature shall be allowed to speak for itself without conscious correction by any of the vested interests of Church or Creed. The aim of this article is to review the chief contributions made to this study by British scholars, exclusive of those who are still living, and to steer, if possible, between the Scylla of subjectivity and the Charybdis of a mere bibliography. Fuller details, including those relating to other countries, will be conveniently found in *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, by T. K. Cheyne (1893), the Introduction to *The Hexateuch*, by J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby (1900), the article on 'Criticism (Old Testament),' by J. Strachan in vol. iv. of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* (1911), 'The Legacy of Israel' (*Hebrew Studies in the Reformation Period and After*, pp. 353-373, by Canon Box, 1927), *Theologie der Gegenwart in Grossbritannien*, by W. Vollrath, pp. 48-81 (1928).

2. If we leave out of account the great series of translations of the Old Testament into English, our scientific contribution may be said to begin with the London *Polyglot* (1654-57), of which we may justly be proud.¹ An added interest is given to these six great folios when we remember that its editor, Brian Walton, turned to this task after

being ejected from his livings in 1641. The four Old Testament volumes open to show the Hebrew text with half a dozen versions, each with its Latin rendering. To this monumental work, for which the editor justly claimed the *aere perennius*, there was added in 1669 Edmund Castell's sevenfold Lexicon in two companion folios. Naturally the foremost Orientalists of the time were associated with Walton, such as Edward Pococke (1604-91), remembered also for his commentaries on Minor Prophets, and John Lightfoot, best known by his *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* (1658-78). To the same period belong two scholars whose interest lay rather in the Biblical manners and customs than in linguistic study, namely, John Selden, known by his *De dis Syris* (1617), who died in the year of publication of the *Polyglot*, which he had helped to finance, and John Spencer, whose pioneer work in the comparative study of Hebrew institutions was published in 1685 (*De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus*). To the next generation belongs the textual work of Humphrey Hody (1704), and to a still later period that of Benjamin Kennicott (1776-80), and (on the LXX) of Holmes and Parsons (1798-1827). The outstanding name of the eighteenth century in regard to subject-matter is that of Robert Lowth, whose *Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* (1753) gives the pioneer and classical treatment of Hebrew poetic parallelism. He also illustrated his insight into the poetic form of Hebrew prophecy by his annotated translation of Isaiah (1778).

3. The literary or 'higher' criticism of the Old Testament began in Great Britain with Alexander Geddes (1737-1802), who followed up the pioneer work of Astruc (1753) and Eichhorn (1780) on

¹ Its international significance may be illustrated by the fact that my own copy of it was catalogued in the library of the Bare-footed Carmelites at Riom in 1711.

the Continent by more or less independent work of his own. They made what seems likely to be a permanent contribution to the subject by analysis of the Pentateuch into two principal documents. The theory of Geddes was that it was a collection of very varied material (though including the journals of Moses) first compiled in the time of Solomon (*The Holy Bible*, 1792, 1797; *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures*, 1800). This theory has been defeated by the developments of Eichhorn's, but it won attention and support on the Continent, and Geddes deserves to be remembered as the pioneer of Old Testament criticism in this country. He was the first to see that the problem is Hexateuchal and not simply Pentateuchal, and that the compilation of the sources must be placed considerably later than the Mosaic age. The distinction of Geddes is the more apparent because he found no British successor for more than half a century; only then was the mantle of the Scottish Romanist priest inherited and shared by an Irish Congregationalist tutor and an English Anglican bishop—a good example of the catholicity of the search for truth. The name of Samuel Davidson (1806–99) is commemorated by a recently founded Professorial Chair of Old Testament Studies in the University of London, with the significant proviso that 'there shall be no restrictive conditions as to the religious or theological beliefs, convictions, or denomination of any candidate'—significant because Davidson had to resign his tutorial post in the Lancashire Independent College on account of his work on Old Testament Introduction published in 1856. The case of Bishop Colenso is much better known; he was excommunicated (though afterwards legally restored) in 1863, on account of his Pentateuchal criticism.¹ But neither Davidson

nor Colenso made any independent contribution to the subject.

4. Meanwhile attention was being paid to other sides of Biblical study. The science of Assyriology, obviously so important for Old Testament science, began with excavations by the Englishman, C. J. Rich, in 1811 and 1820, and found notable representatives in A. H. Layard (1845) and George Smith (1873). Edward Hincks was in 1846 a pioneer in the decipherment of Babylonian. Thomas Young was in 1817 a pioneer in the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphics, and contributed materially to the success of Champollion in 1822. W. M. Thomson's classical work, *The Land and the Book*, showed what could be done by a faithful observer of the manners and customs of 1857, now beyond recall. The invaluable investigations of the Palestine Exploration Fund are well known. Doughty's great work, *Arabia Deserta* (1888), was based on his travels of 1875–78. At first sight such a book may seem to fall beyond our present subject; yet, in fact, there is no book which can so re-create for us the atmosphere and incident of much of the Old Testament life. The tradition of Walton's *Polyglot* was continued in this period, on a smaller scale, in the patient scholarship underlying Field's *Hexapla* (1875), and the textual work of Holmes and Parsons found its successor in the work done by H. B. Swete and others on the LXX (Manual edition, 1887–94). C. D. Ginsburg devoted much time and energy to the exact study of the Old Testament text (1894). In the years between 1892 and 1906 the great *Concordance to the Septuagint* of Hatch and Redpath was added to the indispensable reference books of the student. The great *Thesaurus Syriacus* of Payne Smith (1818–95) is equally indispensable for the study of the Syriac versions.

5. The teaching work of A. B. Davidson (1831–1902) extended over nearly forty years, and probably most British students of Hebrew in the present generation have been brought up on his *Hebrew Grammar* and *Hebrew Syntax*. His commentaries on 'Job' and 'Ezekiel' in the *Cambridge Bible* and his dictionary articles (e.g. 'God' in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*) show that deep religious interest in the Bible which has usually been characteristic of British scholarship. It is unfortunate for Davidson's literary reputation that his posthumous *Theology of the Old Testament* was ever published, since it is a conglomerate of lecture notes representing different stages of his slow development on critical questions. The posthumous book, *Old Testament Prophecy*, is more of a

¹The Episcopal bench tried to get a resignation from Colenso, and Archbishop Longley is said to have communicated their desire to him as follows:

My dear Colenso,—With regret,
Your brethren all, in conclave met,
Request you—most disturbing writer—
To give up your Colonial mitre.
This course I beg to urge most strongly,
And am, yours very truly, Longley.

Colenso's reply was:

My dear Archbishop,—To resign
This Zulu diocese of mine,
And own myself a heathen dark,
Because I've doubts about the Ark,
And think it right to tell all men so,
Is not the game for yours, Colenso.

unity. But the great work of Davidson was the practical one of training and inspiring students of the Old Testament through a long and critical period, rather than in any marked contribution to the literature of the subject, at least commensurate with his solid scholarship.

The most distinguished British representative of Old Testament studies during the nineteenth century was undoubtedly W. Robertson Smith. His brilliant articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* began in 1875; the monograph on *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* appeared in 1885; the three Old Testament books of that decade are still indispensable to the student, viz. *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1881), *The Prophets of Israel* (1882), *The Religion of the Semites* (1889), the last, in particular, having become an international classic. The originality of Robertson Smith's comparative work, to which his Arabic studies specially contributed, is fully recognized by continental scholars.¹ His work illustrates the characteristic British interest in anthropology and folklore. The ecclesiastical battle for the rights of scholarship which he fought in 1878 was of great moment, and did much to popularize Old Testament science. It is significant of our British attitude that we are never content with the pre-war German divorce between university and pastoral teaching. We rightly feel that truth does not allow of this compartmental treatment. Even the protests of obscurantism and literalism reveal the true instinct, that the conclusions of scholarship are vital to religion.² Robertson Smith's strong religious interests have been shared by most British Old Testament scholars.

Cheyne's contributions during his earlier (pre-Jerahmeelite) period were of very high quality. His original mind, fine scholarship, and attractive English style enabled him to do work that stands the test of the passing years better than that of most. His little commentaries on 'Micah' (1882) and 'Hosea' (1884) in the *Cambridge Bible* are still of real value, even for scholars; his *Isaiah* (1880) was the best of its time; his *Job and Solomon* (1887) first revealed to many the fascination of

the Wisdom literature; the first edition of his *Book of Psalms* (1888) is still the best commentary for the English reader, whilst the fine study of *Jeremiah* in the same year revealed his spiritual sympathy with the most fascinating of the Old Testament prophets; his *Origin of the Psalter* (1891) cannot be neglected.³ The lectures on *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile* (1898) reviewed (less successfully) the period with which he had been chiefly concerned. Much of his work in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* and elsewhere was marred by excessive emendation of the text, but this should not obscure the fact that Cheyne ranks as one of our best commentators, one who combined critical scholarship and spiritual sympathy to a very high degree.

The work of S. R. Driver lacked just that touch of inspiration which marked Cheyne's, but was conspicuous in that quality of balanced judgment which Cheyne's later work lacked. Driver's unremitting toil ('If you want to learn Hebrew, make lists, make lists'), his cautious testing of every theory and patience with its details, his sober judgment and full appreciation of the religious issues involved—all these combined with his outstanding scholarship to give him a place of the highest influence in the Old Testament studies of this country. His *Hebrew Tenses* (1874) developed into an essential handbook for the Hebraist, and the most thorough treatment of its subject in any language, though modern syntactical and comparative study of Hebrew seems inclined to modify the 'logical' theory on which the book is based. His *Deuteronomy* (1895) and *Genesis* (1904) admirably represent (in different ways) that union of devout faith and thorough scholarship which most appeals to us in this country. His *Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, with its important Introduction on Palæography, has educated many a Hebraist and has set a high standard for all work of that kind. It is, however, the *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (1891) which has exercised the widest influence of all the author's books, whilst the differences of the successive editions show the progressive conservatism of his mind. This very quality gave him a greater influence over his contemporaries, and no man has done more than Driver to widen the basis of the scientific knowledge of the Old Testament in this country. His Schweich Lectures on *Modern Research as illustrating the Bible* (1908) show his sane position

¹ A well-known German Professor said to me in 1899 that Robertson Smith was the only really original worker we had in Old Testament studies.

² This may be illustrated by the remark of an old Scotswoman, who was much perturbed by Cheyne's work, as reported in the religious journals of the time. To my suggestion that he was at least a man of fine Christian spirit, she sternly replied, 'He's waur when he comes as an angel o' licht.'

³ The 'Introduction' is of value both autobiographically and as a review of the progress of Biblical criticism in this country.

in the quite artificially created feud between archæology and literary criticism, whilst his book on *Isaiah* shows the breadth of his interests.

6. The triumvirate of Robertson Smith, Cheyne, and Driver stands above all the rest of the names that might properly be remembered here, e.g. Perowne, Ryle, Kirkpatrick, Whitehouse, Bennett, Ball (distinguished also as an Assyriologist), and Addis. The criticism of the Hexateuch is most elaborately represented by the Oxford *Hexateuch*, edited by J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby (1900). But it is fitting that more should be said of the four distinguished Old Testament scholars whom we have lost in the last few years—Buchanan Gray, Burney, Skinner, and Peake.

G. B. Gray (d. 1922) was recognized at home and abroad as one of our leading Old Testament scholars. His monograph on *Hebrew Proper Names* (1896) at once gave him his status, and his subsequent work as a commentator on *Numbers* (1903), *Isaiah i.-xxvii.* (1912), and *Job* (with Driver¹: 1921), is of first-class quality in its thoroughness of technique. His well-balanced judgment is illustrated by his study of *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (1915), as also by his *Critical Introduction to the Old Testament* (1913). The posthumous book on *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (1925) lacks the completeness and co-ordination which the author would have given to it in his own revision, but even so it remains one of the most important books on the subject. Whatever Gray did he did thoroughly, and his standard of thoroughness was a rebuke to most students.

C. F. Burney (d. 1925), who succeeded Cheyne in the Oriel Professorship, was a scholar of massive knowledge and concentrated purpose (who owed a great deal to the teaching and influence of C. J. Ball). Burney has left us two books of first-class quality for the student of the Old Testament, besides other work that lies outside our subject, viz. the *Hebrew Text of Kings* (1903), modelled on Driver's *Samuel* and a worthy companion to it, and the elaborate Commentary of *Judges* (1918), which contains important contributions to the early history and religion of Israel.

J. Skinner (d. 1925), another first-class Hebraist, has left two books of outstanding distinction—the commentary on 'Genesis' (1910), worthy to rank with the best of its rather varied companions in the *International Critical Commentary*, and *Prophecy*

and *Religion* (1922). These studies (in Jeremiah) form one of the best modern examples of the marriage of deep spiritual insight with the acute criticism of the scholar. His 'Kings' in the *Century Bible* is an admirable example of more elementary work (note the 'Introduction').

A. S. Peake (d. 1929) was a scholar more interested in the theological subject-matter of the Old Testament than in its linguistic or archæological sides, and his attention was partly given to New Testament studies. His *Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament* (1904) and the small commentaries on 'Job' and 'Jeremiah' in the *Century Bible* are excellent in their way; how far his long-expected Commentary on *Isaiah xl.-lxvi.* had advanced remains to be seen. He was an ideal editor, and did more than any one of the present generation to disseminate and defend Old Testament science, through the one-volume Commentary that bears his name and through a number of popular publications. He had an unusually wide knowledge of the literature, and an eminently sane judgment in his use of it.

7. A good many items would have to be added to the foregoing, if the important work of living scholars were included. But even with this in mind, we must freely admit the limitations and dependence on German scholarship of the British contribution to Old Testament science. Whilst the scholarship of the seventeenth century had nothing of which to be ashamed, the contribution of the eighteenth century was small, and that of the nineteenth lagged far behind the rapidly advancing German work. Our scientific exegesis has been largely, though by no means wholly, dependent on German leadership, as Vollrath rightly points out in his interesting review of our contribution. On the other hand, we can claim certain qualities in what we have done which have been markedly absent in a good deal of the German work. There has been with us throughout a strong religious interest. If this has sometimes been a drag on the wheels of progress, the steadying influence has also been salutary. Science must have its full freedom to be science at all; but there are values which lie beyond and above the horizon of science—in this case, the highest values of human life. After all, the enormous amount of patient skill which has been lavished on the Old Testament, in contrast with the relatively scanty measure dealt out to most Oriental books, is due to the fact that *this* book holds a unique place, and that it is integrally bound up with the fortunes, and indeed with the truth, of Christianity

¹ The philological basis of all Gray's work is as sound as Driver's: the pupil passes beyond the teacher in the use of data drawn from the comparative study of religion.

itself. It is not too much to say that Christianity stands or falls with the ultimate truth of the prophetic consciousness of Israel; the special interest of British scholars in the phenomena of prophecy is in this respect significant. This religious interest is the true explanation of much that would seem to be merely obscurantism or entrenched conservatism in the history of the science in Great Britain. If we have been slow to follow where others led, it is partly because we realized, better than they, the magnitude of the issues involved. We shall never be satisfied to leave the Old Testament to the scholar pure and simple.¹ We ask for more in a commentary than would appeal to him, and we ask for less of what is of merely academic interest, such as the majority of the textual emendations of some commentaries of to-day. There are numerous signs that post-war Germany is growingly conscious of the truth

¹ There seems to be nothing in German to correspond with our *Century* and *Cambridge Bibles*.

of this religious emphasis; recent German work is more human and less purely technical in its treatment of the Old Testament. The ideals of scholarship which have animated our best workers, no less than those of the Continent, must not be relaxed. There is still plenty of work to be done on this side—notably a Hebrew syntax written on the basis of comparative study of the Semitic languages. But there are other directions in which there is less demand for philological technique—a competent handbook of archæology, a commentary on the Psalms more on the lines of Kittel than of Gunkel, a history of Israel which shall deal adequately with the documents, and relate the facts to the whole setting of world-history, and a whole series of special studies in Old Testament theology, showing the genetic relation to New Testament doctrine. Much of this work is peculiarly related to our national interests and capacities, but all of it requires a higher standard of thoroughness than most of us have yet attained.

Literature.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

PROFESSOR JOHN BAILLIE, M.A., D.Litt., of Toronto, has followed his 'Interpretation of Religion' by *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net), a book which has been received with a chorus of praise from all sides. It is certainly a very able book, and will bring reassurance to doubting minds. It is difficult to resist the charm of a mind which is perfectly sincere, intensely in earnest, and at the same time fresh and original. All these qualities are to be found here. Dr. Baillie starts from the foundation and expounds what he regards as the Christian message, a message of love in man to man and in God to man, a love that is redemptive, self-sacrificing, and triumphant.

From this he passes to consider the place of Christ in the Christian scheme. His discussion ranges round the two focal ideas of Incarnation and Atonement, and he boldly faces the question: What do we mean by them? It seems evident that what he means to get at is the essential spiritual reality behind such terms. And there can be no question about his success in this task.

That is the value of his book, a great value. But whether he does not leave something behind in his progress is another question. The indwelling Christ, the indwelling Spirit, and the indwelling God may not mean the same thing, but they point to the same experience; that is the burden of much that he says, and he does not go further. Does his view of the Incarnation differ in any vital aspect from a spiritual unitarianism? It hardly seems so. 'Here, then,' he says, 'the necessary clarification seems to have been made. Jesus Christ is not another name for God, but the name of a Man in whom God was and through whom God came to meet us.' Or this: 'We wonder, again, whether we are prepared to say that God's presence in Christ was so wholly different in principle from His presence in other human hearts as this clear-cut distinction between the persons of the Son and the Spirit seems to make it.' These are perhaps examples of an effort to make the Christian message real and acceptable to modern minds. But do they conserve what the Catholic doctrine of Incarnation asserts?

It would be ungrateful to dwell on this aspect of Professor Baillie's book. It is a book for which