

# 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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE VI.

CHEYNE ON THE PSALTER.<sup>1</sup>

BY PRESIDENT S. C. BARTLETT, D. D., LL. D., HANOVER, N. H.

IN this volume we have the Bampton Lectures delivered at Oxford in 1889, modified, enlarged, supplied with copious notes, and published in an octavo volume of 517 pages. It is the work of one who has long been engaged in the study and exposition of the Old Testament Scriptures, and has published several previous volumes. It is brimful of quotations, and references, and multifarious learning. The writer is familiar with the older and the more recent expositors, and to some extent with rabbinic writers, and shows a good acquaintance with classical and English literature. His work abounds in Scripture references,—some fifteen hundred of them to other parts of the Old Testament, and a much greater number to expressions in the Psalms. He has freedom and versatility of style, although chargeable with diffuseness, indirectness, and not seldom indistinctness. He has a system of his own, not at first apprehensible by the reader. It requires a good deal of reading fully to grasp his principles and method of argument, or to recognize the full results and bearings of his discussion, scattered as they are through the volume, and some of them rather assumed or implied than directly announced.

<sup>1</sup> *The Psalter: Its Origin and Religious Contents, in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions. With an Introduction and Appendices. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1889, on the foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A., Canon of Salisbury. By Thomas Kelly Cheyne, M. A., D. D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, and Canon of Rochester. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. 1891.*

This last-mentioned fact, together with the size of the volume, and the great number of points, principal and subordinate, involved in his treatise, creates a difficulty in criticising it in a brief essay. To answer it thoroughly would require a volume of equal size. The writer himself alludes to so many changes of opinion (pp. 128, 130, 164, etc.), as to awaken an expectation that in some particulars he may yet answer himself. Indeed, to deal with the manifold details of the book might simply result in diverting attention to its fundamental qualities, and method of procedure. As a clear statement of facts is often found the best argument, so in this case a clear disentangling of the principles and method of the volume may be the best criticism. We proceed at once to the statement, with little attempt at formal reply.

The aim of this large and learned volume is to show that none of the Psalms was written by David or his cotemporaries; that the eighteenth is "the only possible pre-Exile psalm" (p. 258), the "earliest possible date" of that being the last days of Josiah or perhaps the Exile (p. 206); and that the larger part of them belong to Maccabean times, coming down as late as not only the time of Judas, but (p. 24) that of Simon Maccabeus, 142 B. C.

In maintaining this position, it is noteworthy, and marks a slight turn of the tide in Old Testament criticism, that the author does not rely primarily nor strongly upon alleged linguistic peculiarities. This was long the stronghold of the advocates of the late origin of the Old Testament books, but the reader of Kuenen, and especially of Wellhausen, will perceive it dropping more and more into the rear. Dr. Cheyne follows in the same line, and more frankly. For he says (p. 16), "I should not lay any great stress on the linguistic criteria" of the alleged Maccabean psalms. When he adduces such as he can offer in an Appendix, it is with the preliminary statement (p. 461), "I do not myself

think that in case of the psalms the linguistic argument can be often more than a subsidiary one." He goes farther and says in his Introduction (p. xxi), "The linguistic argument is unfortunately not of primary importance in Old Testament criticism." We accept the omen. And we venture to express the belief that before the lapse of another generation some of the arguments that are deemed "of primary importance" will cease to be even "subsidiary," before the positive results of the archæologist.

What, then, are the arguments and the method of this elaborate treatise?

The order of procedure is somewhat peculiar. The author deals first with the fourth and fifth books, as they are called, and having shown, as he would claim, their late origin, he proceeds to the second and third, and closes with book first, and indeed psalm first,—literally advancing backwards.

The one underlying assumption of this entire discussion, the indispensable substratum of the whole argument, is this: The necessity of finding an historical development of evolution,—the certainty that such and such thoughts and sentiments could not have appeared at such and such periods, such early periods in the history of the Jewish nation. To this settled and fast assumption the date and origin of the Psalms must be subjected; before it every counter-indication is doomed to give way, and everything supposed to be settled is to be unsettled. This assumption is, of course, but another form of the denial of the supernatural, the revealed, the miraculous, which has figured so largely as the fundamental assumption of much recent continental criticism.

This radical objection to any supernatural elevation or illumination, and insistence on mere natural historical growth, is more constantly implied than openly asserted, but occasionally appears in somewhat bald statement. Thus in his Introduction (p. xxxi), while recognizing in Ps. xvi. a

hope of immortality, he consigns the psalm to the period after the Exile, in the following manner: "If this be pre-Exilic, nay, even if it be an early post-Exile work, it is impossible to find in it intimations of Christianity, except indeed on the hypothesis of a heaven-descended theology." "Pre-Jeremian such highly spiritual psalms [as lxi. and lxiii.] cannot be" (p. 99). "Such ripe fruits of spiritual religion could not, methinks, have been produced in the miseries and anxieties of that period," namely of Jehoiachin, and therefore "the earliest possible date" of Ps. xxii., xxxv., and lxix. is "the period which preceded Nehemiah's first journey to Jerusalem" (p. 230). "Davidic it [Ps. xix.] cannot be; fancy the worldly-minded, even though religious, David inditing a hymn in praise of a rich and varied handbook of spiritual religion. Must one spend precious moments in dispelling this illusion?" (P. 237.) Again (p. 193), "From the point of the history of art not less than from that of the history of religion, the supposition that we have Davidic psalms presents insuperable difficulties." As a proper pendant to this dictum on the one side, take this on the other: "Even if no psalms, probably Maccabean, had been preserved, we should be compelled to assume that they had existed" (p. 15). How could the path of an investigator be made plainer and easier than by an impossibility behind him and a drawing of compulsion before him?

When our author comes to the details of his discussion, he lays down certain criteria to determine a Maccabean psalm, briefly stated by him on p. 95 thus: "(1) The presence of some fairly definite historical allusions; (2) an uniquely strong church feeling; (3) a special intensity of monotheistic faith; (4) an ardor of gratitude for a wondrous deliverance."

Now it is obvious at a glance that the last three so-called criteria, however weighted with rhetorical terms,— "uniquely strong," "special intensity," "ardor," and "wondrous,"—have no force or bearing to show specifically the

times of the Maccabees, as distinguished, for instance, from the time of David. Unless we are ready to set at defiance, through and through, the narrative of the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, David had more than one "wondrous deliverance," and had and exhibited "an ardor of gratitude" therefor. And if the man who had not only purposed, but prepared, to build a magnificent temple of worship, contributing thereto personally three thousand talents of gold and seven thousand talents of silver, calling forth a still greater contribution from all the chief men of the "tribes of Israel," accumulating a great store of materials, and even prescribing to his son the "pattern" of the whole building and its furnishings, had not "a uniquely strong church feeling,"—not to mention the spirit of those psalms which history has ascribed to him,—where are the tokens of that feeling, in early times, to be found? And as to the "monotheistic faith"—let the reader turn to David's recorded utterances in chaps. xxviii., xxix., of First Chronicles, containing not only the constant reiteration of "my God," "our God," "Jehovah God," but such a specific address as this: "Thine, O Jehovah, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Jehovah, and thou art exalted as head over all. Both riches and honor come of thee, and thou rulest over all; and in thine hand is power and might; and in thine hand it is to make great and to give strength unto all." Let him turn to the prayer in 2 Sam. vii., where in eleven verses he calls as many times on Jehovah and Jehovah God, saying, "Thou art great, O Jehovah God; for there is none like thee, neither is there any God beside thee;" let him but glance at David's brief recorded and casual words to Saul, Goliath, Abishai, Abigail, and others, his charge to Solomon, both as given in 1 Kings ii.; 1 Chronicles xxviii., all containing similar direct appeals to his God, and if he can find a more "special

intensity of monotheistic faith" in the Old Testament Scriptures, he will make an interesting discovery. In truth, it is difficult to see in these last three "criteria" anything more than a numerical show, to give apparent strength to the real weakness of the first.

Let us then look for a few moments at the first "criterion," "the presence of some fairly definite historical allusions." We will take as a specimen his first, and apparently choice, instance, Ps. cxviii., where he says, "the historic background is singularly definite," so that he refers it to Maccabean times, about 165 B. C. As a matter of fact, it may be said in passing, the historical background has been found so far from "definite," that Dr. Cheyne appears to be somewhat solitary in his reference, other scholars, quite as eminent and sagacious, having fixed respectively on four different periods: Ewald (followed by Plumtre) on the first celebration of the Feast of the Tabernacles in the first year of the return from the Captivity, Hengstenberg on the laying of the foundation of the second temple, Delitzsch on the completion of the temple in the seventh year of Darius, Stier and Perowne on the extraordinary Feast of the Tabernacles after the completion of the second temple,—all of them more than three hundred years earlier.

This being his selected case, he shall be allowed to state it in his own words, and even at inconvenient length. Our brief comments, indicated by figures in his text, will follow. After a preliminary page and a half setting forth that there are so "strong reasons for expecting to find Maccabean psalms," that "if no psalms probably Maccabean had been preserved, we should be compelled to presume that they once had existed," he proceeds as follows:—

"I know that several great events in the history of the Jewish church have been thought of—e. g., the erection of the altar of burnt-offering at the Feast of the Tabernacles in B. C. 536, or the foundation of the second temple in B. C. 535, or the dedication of the same temple when finished in B. C. 515. But neither of the two former can be the occasion, if only because the temple

is spoken of as completed;<sup>1</sup> nor is the exuberant spirit of independence and martial ardor in the psalm in harmony with the third.<sup>2</sup> But the purification and reconsecration of the temple by Judas Maccabeus in B. C. 165 is fully adequate to explain alike the tone and the expressions of this festal song. Read it in the light of this event, and especially verses 10-12, 15-16, 21-22, and 26. Need I show how that thrice repeated refrain, 'In Jehovah's name will I mow them down' (Bruston, '*je les massacre*') suits the character of the terrible Judas?<sup>3</sup> The rendering 'will I mow them down' supposes an allusion to the 'grass which is cut down and withered.'<sup>4</sup> If, however, with strict adherence to usage, we were to render 'will I circumcise them,' we should have a very striking paranomasia, closely akin to St. Paul's *βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν* (Phil. iii. 2).<sup>5</sup> It is no doubt too painful to be that intended by the editor, but the original writer<sup>6</sup> may, in oriental style, have two meanings in his mind, one for the moment, the other to be brought forth in quieter times.<sup>7</sup> Or need I comment at length on that second triple burden, 'The right hand of Jehovah doeth valiantly, is exalted, doeth valiantly?'<sup>8</sup>—or do more than refer to the prayer of Judas (1 Macc. iv. 30-33), when he saw the Græco-Syrian army at Beth-zur, before that great victory which opened to him the way to Jerusalem?<sup>9</sup> But I must pause a moment at verse 22. Does the 'stone' mean Israel which had, to the surprise of all men, again become conspicuous in the organization of the peoples? Or—for this large application of the figure of the building implies too much reflection<sup>10</sup>—may it not have a more special reference to the Asmonæan family, once lightly esteemed, but now to become recognized more and more as the chief cornerstone?<sup>11</sup> Nor can I leave verse 27 unexplained; every line of it is significant, 'Jehovah (not Zeus) is God;<sup>12</sup> light hath he given us.' May not this allude to the illumination which gave rise to the second name of the Dedication Festival ('the Lights') a name which Josephus regards as a symbol of unexpected deliverance (Ant. xii. 7. 7)?<sup>13</sup> 'Bind the procession<sup>14</sup> with branches,' the verse, if I understand the obscure words aright, continues, '(step on)<sup>15</sup> to the altar horns.' True, we cannot tell how the ancient people celebrated its autumn festival; but we do know that solemn processional circuits of the altar were made in the later periods, the priests repeating meanwhile the twenty-fifth verse of our psalm. Can we doubt that the same rite was practised in earlier times, and that, as in other cases, the meagre rules of Leviticus should be read by the light of later custom?<sup>16</sup>

These, then, constitute the "singularly definite historical background." On which we offer a few brief notes, referring respectively to the passages indicated by our inserted superior figures.

1. If the second temple was completed when the psalm was written, there was a range of three hundred and fifty years during which the psalm could have been used be-



fore coming down to the time of Judas. This therefore is not "singularly definite." And though we should (with Perowne) concede the probability of the temple being completed, verses 19-22 are not sufficiently conclusive to justify the positive statement that "neither of the two former *can be* the occasion."

2. This again is destitute of all definiteness. "Martial ardor" prevailed at many periods of the Jewish history. "Exuberant spirit of independence" is a phrase of the author's. The actual independence of Judæa was not achieved by Judas nor Jonathan, but by Simon. Perowne finds, on the other hand, and with more show of reason, in verses 8-10, allusions to the hostility of the Samaritans and the Persian satraps during the building of the temple, to the uncertainty of a trust on the princes Cyrus, Cambyses, and pseudo-Smerdis, and to the continual harassment of the returning exiles by the surrounding tribes.

3. And suits equally well the character of any other valiant warrior or "hero." Entirely indefinite.

4. How "closely akin"?

5. Here (1) "mow down" is not the rendering of Gesenius, Fuerst, or De Wette; the first two rendering "cut off," quite literally, the third less closely, "destroy." (2) How purely arbitrary to find in that one expression concerning the destruction of enemies an "allusion" to the providential transitoriness of human life in Ps. xc. 6—which, by a similar process, our author would force down to the time of Ezra! (3) And when this last pressure has been applied we are still about three hundred years before the time of Judas. "Singularly definite."

6. The radical meaning of the Hebrew  $\text{כָּטַף}$  is recognized by the lexicons as simply "to cut," or "cut off." "Circumcise" seems to be secondary, although in Kal and Niphal it uniformly bears that application. But in Piel and Hithpael it has not that meaning, but "cut off." *This form is neither of*

the two, but Hiphil. To "circumcise" cannot be claimed absolutely as the "strict" adherence to usage, while here the context makes it ridiculous.

7. Observe the superior discernment which distinguishes the intent of the "editor" and the "original writer," and the facility of ascribing two incompatible meanings to the "writer"—although it is as difficult to see the gain of the second to his argument as to see the point of the reference to Phil. iii. 2.

8. What bearing has this "triple burden" on the Maccabean date?

9. The reader who shall "refer" to this passage in 1 Macc. will recognize, perhaps, one of the fallacies of reference; for he will find there but an earnest prayer of Judas for the overthrow of his enemies, without so much as the similarity of a phrase to this passage of the psalm.

10. It seems needless to do more than call attention to the assumption contained in the remark, and its futility.

11. On the one hand, according to the only account we have of the family, it does not appear to have been lightly esteemed, but quite the contrary, from the outset (1 Macc. ii. 17, 42-43, 66). And further, the Asmonæan family did not achieve its pre-eminence in the time of Judas; for both he and Jonathan were slain, and the triumph was achieved only under Solomon. On the other hand, our Lord (Matt. xxi. 42) and the apostle Peter (Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7), if not Paul (Eph. ii. 20), find, either directly or typically, a much nobler object for the application in the Lord Jesus himself. The author does not deem it necessary to allude to these passages, although they would seem to be worthy of some attention.

12. "Not Zeus." We are unable to discover any significance in this parenthesis, unless it be to show the indirectness of the author's mental processes, and the irrelevancy of his allusions.

13. A suggestion trebly and quadruply groundless. (1) How unwarranted it is to refer the origin of an idea and phrase ("shine upon," "give light to," "enlighten," with the meaning, "gladden") running through the Old Testament to this one late fact! If there were a connection, why not the second from the first, and not the first from the last? But (2) the name "Lights" for the Festival of the Dedication appears first in Josephus, and is not found in 1 Macc. iv. 56, 59, nor in 2 Macc. x. 5 (nor, it is said, in the Mishna). (3) Josephus does not say that the "Illumination gave rise to the name Lights." He says, "I suppose the reason [of the name] was because this liberty beyond our hopes appeared to us"—a purely emotional origin. (4) There is nothing to discredit the view that this name was much later than the time of the Maccabees, and the illumination later still, and suggested by the name.

14. "Procession," an unauthorized translation. The word (though derived from a verb originally meaning, as it is understood, to dance or move in a circle) is actually found in but two (general) significations, viz., a festival, and a festival sacrifice, as here.

15. The bold insertion of these two words is alike unjustified by the text and context, and unsustained, so far as we are aware, by any other scholar. The apparent object of this insertion and of the previous unwarranted rendering, is to give some shadow of support to the subsequent inference or hypothesis.

16. Here, "we *cannot tell*"—but, "*can we doubt*" how it was? And supposing the practice of the "later periods" to be like that of "earlier times," how does it help to show that this psalm had its origin in Maccabean times, and particularly in the time of Judas Maccabeus?

We have thus followed Dr. Cheyne, we confess at wearisome length, through his strongest effort on his best case, in order to exhibit beyond all cavil or complaint his method,

and to show him at his best. If he has fulfilled his promise to present a definite historical background proving this psalm to belong to the time designated, we confess we do not understand what is proof or sound argument. A more baseless and at the same time pretentious logical fabric we do not remember to have encountered. We do not undertake to settle the date of this psalm,—which we believe must be done but conjecturally and very doubtfully,—but simply to show the fallacious method by which the author would *positively* determine uncertain things and overturn things somewhat well settled. The specimen we have given must suffice, although the temptation to follow him through other like discussions is hard to resist.

When our author has settled in this manner, to his satisfaction, the date of some one psalm, his next step is to join to it a "group" of psalms, more or less resembling it, but having, by his own admission, no such historical background, and to assign to them unhesitatingly the same date. Thus he carries Ps. cxv.—cxvii. along with Ps. cxviii. This also being his strongest case, we give him the benefit of his own words:—

"Let us approach the other members of the second part of the Hallel, and ask, Have they the same historical background as Ps. cxviii.? It *cannot be said* that either Ps. cxv. or Ps. cxvi. still less the minute 117th psalm, by itself compels an affirmative answer. But all these come to us from the church as members of the same group or subdivision of a group as Ps. cxviii., and it is a canon of criticism that when certain psalms, all of which agree in some leading features, and positively disagree in none, have come down to us from ancient times in one group, we are bound to assign them to the same period, though it is only in one instance that we can from internal evidence speak positively as to date. And who can deny," etc.

So, then, waiving all criticism on the vagueness of the phrase "leading features," the date of these three all hangs on the same slender thread with the first. But the bond of connection is immediately found by the author's own showing to be still more fragile than the other; for he proceeds thus: "Only we may without violating our canon assign them

(pp. 115, 116, 117) to a somewhat *later date* and a *different author*." Thus he cuts his own cord.

Again, the "groups" which figure so conspicuously in the discussion are not merely those psalms which have been grouped by the Jewish churches (as the Hallel) nor always those which stand in numerical order; the author makes his own groups. Ps. cxv. draws with it cxxxv., and cxviii. carries cxxxvi. to Maccabean times (p. 50). He makes a "group" of Ps. cxi., cxii., and cxix., by the following summary process of excision and transposition: "Ps. cxi. and cxii. were *obviously* not written as Hallelujah psalms. They *must* originally have been without the opening Hallelujah, and been followed by Ps. cxix.," which "evidently belongs to the pre-Maccabean portion of the Greek period." He groups and despatches Ps. cxxxii. thus:—

"The only psalm which a modern reader might be tempted (with De Wette, who yet has doubts) to ascribe to Solomon is Ps. cxxxii. Not only are verses 8-10 put into the mouth of Solomon by the chronicler (2 Chron. vi. 41, 42) which of course is but a *literary fiction*, but verses 6 and 8 contain a distinct reference to the ark. This reference, however, is introduced dramatically, nor can the psalm be separated from others of the post-Exile period in which ancient promises are placed in a new setting. . . . But it seems more in accordance with the comparative principle which dictates the groupings of parallel psalms with a view to determine their date, to assign it to a somewhat earlier part of the same period as its twin-brother, Ps. lxxxix., that is to the last century of the Persian rule."

The several expressions in this last quotation as to what "can" not be, what "of course is," what "the comparative principle dictates," and the "literary fiction" of the chronicler, are but specimens of the constant usage of the author, informing us, till it becomes tedious, what must be or cannot be, what we might expect or might not expect, what is or is not possible or conceivable; or meeting us with the triumphant inquiry whether it can be so or we can suppose it to be so. Thus in two successive sentences on page 11 we have at once this accumulation:—

"Wide *must have been* its discrepancy [that of the music of the Maccabean Festival of Purification] from the temple music of Nehemiah's time, just as this too *must have* differed from that of the pre-Exile period, and we may, nay *we must*, conjecture that not many years after the second of these festivals the noble high priest and virtual king, Simon, *devoted himself* to the reconstructing of the temple psalmody. We know [how?] that he did not despise that Greek architecture which had begun to establish itself in Palestine, and *can we suppose* that he would refuse already familiar musical harmonies (Eccles. lxiv. 3) simply because they had some Greek affinities?"

And so this "radical change" of the temple music, thus settled, becomes (p. 9) one of "the strongly marked features which enable us to determine date or dates."

We cannot forbear citing a little more of this process of assumption from the same page:—

"What *more natural* than that Simon should follow the example of David his prototype, as described in the Chronicles, and make fresh regulations for the liturgical services of the sanctuary? . . . *Is it likely* that he benefited the exterior, and took no thought for the greatest of the spiritual glories of the temple, those praises, etc.? . . . No, *there cannot* be another time so suitable for the editing of the two last books of the Psalms as this period of the Maccabean history."

And though the very next words are, "we have no ancient record of it," he calmly proceeds, in the sentence following,—

"Our *result* is that books iv. and v. of the Psalter received their present form soon after B. C. 142. Egyptian-Jewish pilgrims *must* quickly have carried it home to their brethren. For the synagogue of Alexandria a manual of sacred song was *indispensable*. There may have been an earlier version of the Psalter, but not long after Simon's edition [now a settled fact] reached Egypt it was *probably* put into permanent Greek form. The date of this event cannot be precisely fixed, but it was at any rate before the Christian Era."

In this same style we are told (p. 16), "we expect to find," "we can hardly err in supposing" (p. 24), "we may yet suppose," "who else can be meant but Simon" (p. 25), "we are driven back to the view" (p. 48), "can there be much doubt" (p. 49), "consistency requires us to make," etc. (p. 49), "they can hardly be earlier and may be even later than Ezra and Nehemiah's time" (p. 50), "Ps. cv. and cvi. must have belonged" (p. 51), "they must originally have been without the

opening Hallelujah," "their post-Exile origin needs no proof" (p. 71), "second Isaiah presupposes a circle of hymnists" (p. 53), "its author must have lived in an earlier and happier period" (p. 95), "there must be other psalms" to be joined to those three earlier Maccabean works, "the source of inspiration cannot have suddenly dried up," "will you hesitate to infer" (p. 112), "two periods and two only can be defended for its composition" (p. 114), "must be clear to all" (p. 131), "unimaginable if we did not assume" (p. 132), "can we avoid supposing that lxxxiv. 9, 10, has at least been touched by the author of Ps. lix.," "a frigid accumulation of these divine names is intelligible in Ps. l., but hardly in such deeply felt lyrics as lix., lxxx., lxxxiv." (p. 157), "didactic use of history decisive against pre-Exile date" (p. 167), "we may infer that there was a class of court poets in northern Israel" (p. 191), "the divine fire must have passed from him [David] to others, and from others to him" (p. 192), "as critics we cannot consistently suppose that the religious songs of David (if there were any) were so much above the spiritual capacities of the people" (p. 192), "the most productive and spiritually the richest of the ages of psalmody cannot have been the earliest," David, "using the name symbolically, cannot have been alone, I feel bound to assume the existence of a David subsequently to the poet-king, to account for the character of the book of Amos." This style of writing, with its perpetual assumption piled on assumption, becomes so wearisome that it is positively refreshing to find the author rising occasionally to the height of assertion; as when he says (p. 240), "There are cases in which a dogmatically expressed opinion is inexpedient, but I am sure that the case before us is not one;" and he dogmatically settles it in regard to Ps. i. that "Jeremiah is the source from which a post-Exile psalmist has drawn."

And this brings us to a third feature of this volume, more

noteworthy even than the dogmatic assumption of a development, as against a supernatural influence, and the constant subordinate assumption of certain speculative opinions to determine questions of fact. I mean the author's deliberate method of dealing with historic testimony. Here the dogmatism of denial and of assertion is a constant factor. Historic testimony becomes plastic in his hand. Not only does he depress the date of any psalm, as occasion requires, in order to depress the date of any other, but he avails himself of the same privilege in regard to any other portion of the Old Testament. Of course the higher criticism affords him a ready vantage-ground, as in regard to Deuteronomy, the closing part of Isaiah, and other books. But he is wiser than his teachers. Thus while Driver (Introduction, p. 358) says, "It is not clear that none of the psalms contained in Ewald's list [of Davidic psalms] are not of David's composition," to Dr. Cheyne it is clear.

I will not lay stress upon his entire rejection of the traditions embodied in the titles of the psalms, inasmuch as many of them have been shown to be unfounded. But Dr. Cheyne does not content himself with any such limit. He unhesitatingly rules out the express statement in 2 Sam. xxii. 1, that the 18th psalm was composed at a certain time, by the remark that it "was conjecturally ascribed to the idealized David not long before the Exile" (p. 204), with the further information (p. 70) that "the author of Ps. xviii. thinks himself into the soul of David." He easily settles the question of the date of Ps. cxxxii., as already mentioned, by the passing remark (p. 52) that verses 41, 42 of Solomon's prayer (2 Chron. vi.) "are put into the mouth of Solomon by the chronicler, which is of course a literary fiction." He grapples fearlessly with the history of Josephus and the archæology of Flinders Petrie of the Egypt Exploration Fund, declaring (p. 10) that Josephus's account (Antiq. x. 9. 7) of the deportation of the Jews from Egypt to Babylon by



Nebuchadnezzar, is a "fiction whereby Josephus tries to save the verbal Inspiration of Jeremiah"—that narrative explaining in part the presence of Greek names of musical instruments in Daniel,—and the distinguished explorer Petrie has "much exaggerated the antiquity of these names" (Tanis, pp. 49, 50)—his offence being that his remarkable discoveries at Tel Defenneh or Tahpanhes relieve the strongest objection to the received date of the book of Daniel.

While the author cheerfully recognizes "the mythic substratum of narratives and phrases in the Old Testament" (Introd. p. xviii), and concedes that the book of Jonah "is not a mere romance, but an edifying story adapted to the writer's times, and founded, like some of those in Gen. i. 11, on Semitic mythology," he does not hesitate to "admit that the First Book of Maccabees is veracious," although, as he has additional history of his own to suggest, he carefully adds, "but not that it is complete" (p. 144); and he thinks "there is no sufficient reason for rejecting the statements of Aristeas [designated by him, p. 487, as "pseudo-Aristeas"], where they are credible," adding that the particular statement which he wishes to build upon, "is in high degree credible." While summarily rejecting the statements of "the chronicler" as his occasion may require, in nearly if not quite as many instances, as occasion may require, he appeals to him for support. We have marked quite a number of such instances, which we will not cite.

In depressing at pleasure the dates of various parts of the Old Testament, and finding references to those parts which shall depress certain others, as well as in re-editing the "editor," Dr. Cheyne shows a facility in advance of the ordinary flights of the higher criticism. He is not only *excelsior*, but *excelsissimus*. Thus the 102d psalm is not earlier than the close of the Exile (p. 72), because of its allusions not only to the book of Job, but to the "second Isaiah," which are assigned to the close of the Exile. The

late date ascribed to Deuteronomy makes the book of Ruth still later, "because it presupposes the need of an explanation of the word *levirate*." "Ps. ii. is based upon 2 Sam. vi., which cannot be pre-Hezekian and was probably written in the last happy days of Josiah." The song of Hannah, "a very late interpolation, is certainly post-Deuteronomic, and an early post-Exile work." "The psalm of Jonah, a greatly inferior work, was not improbably written about the same time as the *הַבְּנֵי* in the appendix to Ecclesiasticus" (p. 127). "It may have been inserted in Jonah subsequently to B. C. 198" Daniel iv. 31-35 is "a fine confession imaginatively ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar." In Ps. xci. and xcii. the names Elyon and Shaddai "are marks of a late date, and more especially the latter, which is in a high degree characteristic of the book of Job."

This last instance suggests another device whereby the author makes his method more effective and satisfactory,—namely the facility with which he disposes of inconvenient names of God when found in any of the psalms. Thus (p. 90), "The Elohist phraseology is not always due to the author of the psalms, but sometimes (indeed in my opinion often) due to an editor." And so we learn that in Ps. xlvi. 10 (p. 177) "probably the editor has substituted Elohim for Jahveh;" and (p. 148) Ps. lxxx. "is a beautiful specimen of parallelism, tampered with by the Elohist Editor."

Not content with depressing the date of the 90th psalm ("of Moses the servant of God") to the time of Ezra, on account of its resemblance in phraseology to Deuteronomy and "second Isaiah," our author feels privileged to speak of "its ill-connected thoughts, sometimes both right in themselves and grandly expressed, sometimes only half right or even awkwardly put" (p. 74), and, in verses 7-12, "from a Christian standpoint sorely in need of correction" (p. 354). The "expressions of religious zeal" in Ps. cxviii. are "too violent" for him (p. 19), and he regrets that the author of

Ps. lxxxix. had not drawn "a right inference" (in ver. 9). Dr. Cheyne has no difficulty in assigning a Maccabean origin to the 110th psalm, made so exceptionally prominent in the New Testament; and in regard to the Saviour's assumption that "David in spirit calleth him Lord," calmly inquires, after the modern style, "Did the subject of the authorship of the 110th psalm fall within the range of Christ's teaching?" Certainly. Not only does the general and permanent validity of his answer, as Perowne well says, depend on its being an utterance of David, but, as Dr. Cave asserts, its validity to the Pharisees themselves; it was but for some learned rabbi in that keen and watchful crowd to inform the carpenter's son that David never said that thing, and he, not they, would have been instantly silenced.

But our author can make as well as unmake history. He not only knows that "Augustine's view of the predictive character of Ps. xxii. is of course impossible" (p. 274), but that it is no utterance of an "individual Israelite" but of "the Genius of Israel." Besides numerous other cases of the kind, some of them already mentioned, he is aware that the songs of the Ascents were "probably a portion of a larger collection of spiritual songs which the pilgrims sung" (p. 51), and of "lost psalms of pre-Exile Hebrew poetry" (p. 268), and that David "was not an isolated student poet, and cannot have had an absolutely unique talent of song" (p. 191). His creative faculty appears at its best when he deals with the 72d psalm, where he first affirms that the high priests Hyrcanus I. and Hyrcanus II. "might both be called kings and kings' sons"—although they were not, and were not so called—and then proceeds to make the "gracious monarch," Ptolemy Philadelphus, the subject of that splendid Messianic eulogium. He comforts himself by the supposition of the utterance having been made "when time could not have revealed the darker aspects of his character"

(p. 170), e. g., his "having violated the highest ideal of marriage more conspicuously than some of the oriental monarchs" (p. 168), "the murder of Nicocles, and the execution of the nephew of Antigonus" (p. 184), which last two affairs Dr. Cheyne thinks the psalmist "would have severely reprehended had he written a little later." It is a pity that he was in such haste, and that the pious men of the Jewish people should have been equally precipitate in admitting his youthful indiscretion into their sacred canon.

We can take space for but one other point among many pressing ones, the superabundant use to which our author puts the "saints" of our version, his "pious ones," the **דַּיְקָנִים** of the Hebrew, the *οἱ ὅσιοι* of the Septuagint. He does not hesitate to make that magnificent psalm, the 148th, and that exultant one, the 149th, calling on all creation and upon God's saints or pious ones to praise Jehovah, apply, not even to so great a joy as at the restoration from the Captivity, but to the rejoicing over the victory of Judas Maccabeus; and he facilitates the application by making the "pious ones" to be the name given to those who "joined the volunteer church army" (p. 48), although he admits that, "judged by a modern standard, they [these pious ones] might be found wanting," inasmuch as Dean Stanley complains that "their obstinate foolhardiness vexed the great soul, and their narrow selfishness cost the life, of Judas." The "pious ones" are a hard-worked people in these lectures. They are identified by him (and others) with the Asidæans, which may be correct—although the Greek word which contains two of the Hebrew consonants, omits the strong guttural altogether, and the Septuagint rendering, *οἱ ὅσιοι*, does not appear in connection with the name. But our author requests us (p. 49) to "notice the definition of the *Khasidine* in 1 Macc. ii. 43, every one that freely devoted himself for the law." Let the reader turn to the place cited, and he will find no such "definition," but

this simple statement: "Then came unto him (or them) a company of Jews, mighty men of Israel, every one who freely devoted himself to the law." Such is the reading of the Greek text, in both the edition of Van Ess and that of Tischendorf. But Dr. Cheyne avails himself of a varied reading, which Tischendorf rejects to the margin (the one which was followed by King James's version in its day), which gives Asidæans instead of Jews, in order to get a "definition," which even then is not there. The statement defines or describes no class of men as such, but states that these men who came were "mighty men and devoted to the law." And this leads us to observe how plastic and convenient these "pious ones" becomes in the hands of our author. They are now "the Asidæans" (p. 48), now "mainly at least of the Asidæan party" (p. 56), and (p. 129) it is "not yet used as a party name," now (p. 117) it is "those who responded to God's covenant love by observing his commands at all cost and believing the promises of his Torah;" they were (p. 27) "the strict legalists," again (p. 119) "the strict Jehovists," and once more, in Ps. 1., the term (p. 150) "designates the entire body of nominal Israelites, good and bad alike, who are to assemble from the lands of the Dispersion that Jehovah may set before them his claims, and sever the good though imperfectly instructed Israelites from their unworthy fellows." It does not appear that on page 141 he would actually put "Rameses, Nebuchadnezzar, and the early Ptolemies" into this class—they not being Jews—although, after speaking of the "high hopes" entertained of them, he proceeds thus: "The names in the ancient sense of the word, of these righteous kings may have passed away, but their souls are in the hands of God, and may be their hopes are fulfilled in "the land of the silver sky."

But we must pause with these specimens of the author's free-and-easy way of making a case. We give him credit

for great and varied learning, however misapplied, and much skill of a certain kind in his reasonings, however invalid. The strength of the book consists largely in the art of obscuring the weakness of the argument by the multiplicity and multifariousness of the details which envelop it. We can conceive of young men not accustomed to scrutinize and weigh evidence, being taken with admiration of the discussion, and being drawn blindly to its conclusions, which are virtually its premises. But to others it may become a *reductio ad absurdum* of this style of argument.