



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia, untersucht von LIC. H. HACKMANN, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1893. Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt von DR. B. DUHM. Same publishers. 1892. (Second Notice.)

It is perhaps not too soon to congratulate ourselves that the waiting-time of Hebrew prophecy is at an end. Slowly indeed has criticism made for itself a home in the English-speaking countries, and so far as Isaiah is concerned it may be doubted whether it is even now fully established. When in 1881, I began, timidly enough, to state my more mature critical conclusions respecting Isaiah xl.-lxvi., I found none to listen to me, and Dean Stanley himself, in introducing me to an eminent Scottish divine, could find no more appropriate words than that I "had some strange new theory about the composition of Isaiah." Even now things are only beginning to improve. For instance to the leading writer on Old Testament subjects in that truly cultured paper, the *Guardian*, it is still "intolerable and not to be endured," that any one should disintegrate the second part of Isaiah, which to him, as it would seem, stands on quite a different footing from the Hexateuch. But in Germany, happily, one can count at least half-a-dozen writers who recognise the problems of both halves of the Book of Isaiah, and a foremost place among them is due to the authors of the two books now to be noticed. The readers of this REVIEW are aware that for years past I have been busy on the problem of Isaiah, and if I seem to speak dogmatically, they will understand that I have reasons behind my apparent dogmatism, and that, as Kuenen says, certain things may be disputed but are not therefore uncertain. I must first of all speak of Hackmann, whose name is new outside Göttingen, but whose small book of 174 pages is one of the best productions of recent criticism. He has adopted the excellent plan (so difficult to carry out in England, where there are so few good students' books) of putting forth only that which is more or less his own property, thus avoiding the tediousness of repetition. He knows himself to be a link in the great succession of critics, each leading member of which has contributed something to the correction of his predecessors. In a word, he takes up the study of Isaiah at the point to which it has been carried by the acute researches of others.

The peculiarity of the present stage of free criticism is that

critical and exegetical results are forming themselves by degrees into a consistent and intelligible whole. Hitherto the course of religious thought and belief in Israel has seemed somewhat like a zigzag, and we have only been able to account for this by laying excessive stress on the rich variety of the gifts of a succession of religious leaders. Isaiah in particular, though not so Protean as he appeared in the old conservative times, has been thought to be, both from a psychological and from a literary point of view, among the most richly endowed of the human race. His moods seemed to be ever changing, and with them his literary style and his circle of ideas, and on the whole we were content to admire him as some one too great to be understood. Ewald indeed persuaded himself that he understood Isaiah, but that sympathetic interpreter was deficient in the sense of historical development, and as by degrees his successors looked closer, they began to see that the Isaiah problem was a more complicated one than Ewald had supposed. The first thing to be done was to settle the order of Isaiah's real or supposed prophecies more satisfactorily, a task in which the cuneiform inscriptions were naturally much appealed to. But these renewed investigations disclosed an extraordinary degree of variation in Isaiah's prophetic statements. Hence special studies had to be made of Isaiah's forms of teaching, and in particular of his pictures of the national future. Guthe's *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia* (1885), Giesebrecht's *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik* (1890), pp. 76-106, contain the first detailed critical treatment of the latter subject, and Duhm in his recent commentary (1892), with which Smend's chapter on Isaiah in his *A. T. Religionsgeschichte* (1893) may be compared, has carried the investigation still further, as from his single-eyed devotion to the study of the prophetic religion (see his early work, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, 1875) was to be expected. And though the new Göttingen critic may have seen more clearly in some points than Duhm, this does not conceal or diminish our great obligations to the latter. For those critical problems which Duhm has brought so much nearer to a solution are closely connected with the history of Israelitish religion, and upon our solution of them depends in large measure our comprehension of Isaiah himself.

To understand this great prophet aright, we must obviously obtain as clear an insight as we can into the growth of that part of the Book of Isaiah which can, on critical grounds, be connected with his name, viz., chaps. i.-xxxiii. A preliminary analysis of this body of literature leads Hackmann to the conclusion that some prophecies of special importance were noted down by Isaiah himself; others by the prophet's disciples, and that, with regard to the groups or collec-

tions of prophecies, only a very few of the smaller groups can be referred even to Isaiah's disciples. Duhm, on the other hand, does not distinguish between the written prophecies immediately, and those only mediately due to Isaiah, and thinks that the groups of prophecies comprising chapters vi.-viii. 18, and in the main xxviii. 1-xxx. 17, may have come from the prophet himself, though the other small groups can only proceed from his disciples and their successors, who were the spiritual ancestors of the later Sopherim. The larger groups, as both agree, are, of course, of much later origin. The difference, therefore, between the critics is not great. They coincide on these two important points, viz., 1st, that Isaiah was not a writer by profession, and took no pains to preserve his *Flugschriften*; and, 2nd, that prophecies which now stand together in the same group cannot be therefore presumed to have been written in the same period. Hackmann's remarks on the first point well deserve attention. They remind one of a criticism addressed to Kuenen by Dr. A. Pierson, who finds the notion of a prophet writing down his own inspired prophecy difficult in itself and morally startling (*Een Studie over de Geschriften van Israëls Propheten*, 1877, page 80)—a criticism which would be ineffective against Hackmann's theory. Let us now consider some points of detail. Our two critics disagree as to the date of the little oracle at the head of ii. 6-iv. Duhm, as we have seen (*JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, January, 1893, page 297), refers the passage to the old age of Isaiah. Hackmann, I am glad to find, dissents from this view. Certainly so early an origin is difficult to maintain, and though the brevity of the passage prevents us making the proof as "cogent" as conservative scholars require, I cannot endorse the somewhat hesitating language of Wellhausen and Smend. Our critics disagree again on the origin of three other great idealistic pictures of the future in chaps. i.-xxxiii., viz., ix. 1-6; xi. 1-8 (9), and xxxii. 1-5, which Duhm (rejecting, on principle, the authority of the collector of the prophecies) refers to the old age of Isaiah, combining them therefore with ii. 2-4. All these passages are regarded by Hackmann as late insertions. His arguments are derived partly from the subject-matter, partly from the phraseology. They are not, however, in my opinion, conclusive, except as regards xxxii. 1-5 (or rather 8), the late origin of which was already clear to most advanced critics. In particular, the phraseological argument for the late date of xi. 1-8, seems to me open to criticism. Nor can I admit that because xi. 1 presupposes the fall of the Davidic dynasty, it is therefore late, or that vv. 6-8 are more intelligible in the post-Exilic period than in that of Isaiah (see Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*). The idea at the root of Hos. ii. 20 (A.V. 18) might per-

fectly well have received further development, and the notion that green herbs were once the food of all animals might well have been current in Isaiah's age.

Another important section of idealistic promises is xxx. 18-26, with which xxix. 16-24 must be connected. These passages stand midway in the great prophetic book which comprises chaps. xxviii.-xxxiii. Their difficulty has, I think, only lately been recognised. They belong to a series of passages which occur at pretty regular intervals throughout the book (see Hackmann's Analysis, pp. 29-31), and which make the collection, as a whole, a hopeless tangle of inconsistencies. The tangle had, no doubt, been somewhat reduced before Duhm's book appeared; certain late elements had been indicated by previous critics (see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1892, p. 569). But it was reserved for the Basel professor to show that those two fine but, in their present context, most unlooked-for pieces of rhetoric, were due to the supplementing hand of a post-Exilic editor. The case is as clear as one could desire; the ideas and the phraseology alike are those of an age long subsequent to Isaiah. I hope that I have done something to make the argument more "cogent," but all that is essential will be found in Duhm and Hackmann. The gain is enormous both to our comprehension of Isaiah (one of Dr. Pierson's shafts is hereby rendered pointless) and to our knowledge of the literary prophecy of the post-Exilic period. Hackmann has also, I think, carried the criticism of chaps. xxix. 1-8, and xxxi., begun by Duhm, to its legitimate end, and, what is more important still, has made the non-Isaianic origin of that noble passage, xxx. 27-33, in a high degree probable.

And what effect have these and similar results on our conception of Isaiah's view of the national future? The necessity for complicated theories like those of Guthe and Giesebrecht disappears. On pp. 156-163, Hackmann shows the weakness of these theories. I wish it could have been otherwise, for to the former theory I was for a time addicted. I do not, however, feel able to admit that Isaiah's picture of the future was one of such unrelieved blackness as Hackmann represents. He did, I think, escape now and then into an ideal world, in which the "remnant" had become a great and happy people. ix. 1-6, and xi. 1-8 (but not xxxii. 1-5, or 1-8) I recognise as Isaiah's. And though I agree that the three closing words of chap. vi. must be a late addition (see LXX.), yet I cannot accept Hackmann's very bold theory respecting the date and import of the prophecy. To put it briefly, he thinks that Isaiah received an inward call to announce a destructive judgment on the *Northern* kingdom, and at the same time committed his revelation to writing. Now this view would

indeed help us to understand how the prophet could still cherish some hopes for Judah during the Syro-Ephraimitish crisis, and it is confirmed, according to Hackmann, by the confidence with which the destruction of Northern Israel is foretold in ix. 7, etc., and xvii. 1-11. But it requires us to make three assumptions, 1. That "this people" in vi. 9 means Northern Israel; 2. That the name "Shear-Yashub" records what may be called the second part of the revelation connected with Isaiah's vision; and 3. That the word רֵשָׁאִי ("remnant") in that name designates Judah. On these three assumptions I have not now time or space to speak; the second is the only one I see my way to accepting.

Duhm's great work is of course of much more importance for the study of Isaiah than Hackmann's. It is much more complete, and it is the work of a master. Gladly would I continue the analysis which I began in this REVIEW, did my time allow. I must, however, at any rate remedy a few omissions. I think that the book has three faults from the point of view of an old disciple of Kuenen. First, it does not give sufficient weight to the probable results of inquiry into the history of the Canon. Just as I am unable to follow Smend in admitting psalms of the time of John Hyrcanus, so I am unable to accept Maccabæan prophecies in the Book of Isaiah without further proofs. In spite of the uncertainty which hovers around the Canon, I think it unsafe to deviate from the common opinion which fixes the closing of the prophetic Canon at about 200 B.C. Secondly the dry tone of many *obiter dicta* is most distasteful to me; nor am I convinced that what Christians call humility and love to God is not, however imperfectly, present in the post-Exilic religious writings (cf. Lectures VI.-VIII. in my *Origin of the Psalter*). Thirdly, the argument from phraseology is not presented fully and in a connected form. I willingly admit that the author's limits made this almost unavoidable; but could it have been otherwise, the main results of the book would have gained considerably in solidity. Among these "main results" I cannot, I fear, include the homogeneity of chapters lvi.-lxvi.; in other words, the Trito-Isaiah is in my opinion credited with much more than his due.

It would be tempting to conclude with a brief criticism of Duhm's present theory respecting the cycle of passages on the "Servant of Yahvé." I must content myself, however, with referring to an article on Smend's *A.T. Religionsgeschichte* in the forthcoming number of the *New World*. I am still unconvinced that chapters lvi.-lxvi. form a homogeneous work, though I recognise that Duhm has probably found the true, the historical background for an important part of this group. On the text, too, he is very often helpful in the extreme. I

will only mention one very simple correction, which relates to xli. 6, 7 and xl. 20. I had myself pointed out in 1880 that something must have dropped out of the text between xl. 19 and 20. Duhm now makes it clear that the missing passage is xli. 6, 7, which has no natural connection whatever with its present context. This is a great improvement on the suggestions of Oort (*Tijdschr.*, 1886, page 310; 1891, page 463) and Abbott (*Essays*, 1891, page 222), that xli. 6, 7 should come *after* verse 20; the order is now the same as in xliv. 12, etc.—first the metal image, then the wooden one.

Duhm's book is one which gains from further study, and if the author is in some points (seized upon directly by more cautious scholars) strangely wilful, let us be thankful that there is still something to do for future investigators. For the more we study the great writers of antiquity the deeper do they appear, and the larger the problems which they suggest.

T. K. CHEYNE.

The Sacred Books of the Old Testament.

A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, Printed in Colours. With Notes.
The Book of Job. By C. SIEGFRIED. Leipzig and Baltimore.
 1893.

THE publication of Siegfried's reconstruction of the text of Job marks an era in the history of Bible criticism. It is true that the old ideas in regard to the inspiration of the *word* of Scripture have been gradually driven back by the philological criticism which has been applied to the Hebrew text. Few even of the most determined orthodox critics (if such a combination be really possible) will for a moment now assert that the whole of the Old Testament has come down to our day as it left the hands of its authors. We have all become accustomed to see corrections suggested in books and articles; to hear them spoken of from the platform of the lecture-room. We have even seen the critical results of scholars' works embodied in translations of portions of the Bible, as in Addis', Bacon's, or Kautzsch-Socin's renderings of Genesis. But a certain measure of sanctity still adhered to the Hebrew original. Here could be seen the last vestiges of the old ideas in which so many of us were brought up. Suggestions might be *advanced* and changes *proposed*; but to *make* such changes in the actual Hebrew text was little short of ungodliness.