

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

lated a suggestion which I have pondered over for years, and to leave it to others to mature or to abandon. I think at least my readers will agree with me in holding that it would be an inestimable boon if the uncritical and unlearned hearer could listen to the words he has learnt to love and revere with more intelligent understanding through the removal of "plain and clear errors," whether of reading or of translation, as well as of serious obscurities, without losing his sense of familiarity with the wording and idioms of our old translation, so pure in its diction, so grand in its flowing periods, so priceless in its influence upon all our literature, so faithful in its simplicity, and so dear to thousands and tens of thousands of Christian souls.

W. WALSHAM WAKEFIELD.

*CANON CHEYNE ON KING DAVID AND THE
PSALTER.*¹

To all who are aware of the lines on which theological discussions in England have recently been running the title of this book tells its own tale. The Bampton Lectures on the Psalter by the same author furnished a striking example of what the criticism of the Old Testament is doing, and not a few persons, unprepared for the results therein set forth, believed that an assault was being made on "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." The controversy which has ensued has done something towards dispelling this illusion, but the author of a work round which so fierce a fight has raged not unnaturally desires to show both by example and by precept the manner in which he holds that criticism and reverence can travel hand in hand. Nor is it a mere task of self-defence to

¹ *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism.* By the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

which he is bound. The motive which in many minds underlies the suspicion with which the newer criticism is regarded is worthy of the utmost respect. Men to whom religion is dearer and the central statements of theology more certain than aught beside have a right to demand that the fresh views propounded for their acceptance shall be proved to be, at the least, not subversive of the foundations on which they have built their all. There are teachers of religion also who have not forgotten that if they would continue to teach, they must never cease to learn, to some of whom it has become clear that the more advanced Biblical students have not spoken without a cause, but to whom it is not yet clear how they may utilize critical results without injuring the less instructed. Confidence can only be established by the thorough critic proving successful as a devout teacher. In fairness to the critic, however, the hearer and reader must be careful to dismiss prejudice.

Canon Cheyne's conviction that none of our psalms were composed by David pre-supposes a thorough examination of the narratives in which this king figures in order to ascertain what sort of man he was. Hence the first part of the volume before us, entitled "The David Narratives." The Books of Samuel, in which the majority of these accounts are contained, are made up of documents which differ from each other in origin, date, and value. The list and clear description of these documents which is given in the first essay will prove very useful: a beginner in criticism, or a student who might wish to criticise the critics, would find that its guidance enabled him to see the facts with his own eyes. Having indicated the groups to which the various accounts severally belong, our author is free to reconstruct the character of the hero and tell us what sort of life he really lived. The traditional sweet singer of Israel has disappeared and there remains a man distinguished for patriotism and public spirit, respect for national laws and

institutions, punctuality in the administration of justice, regard for human life, and magnanimity; a man who is neither an Old Testament saint nor a New Testament Christian, yet loves his God, works in harmony with the chief religious authorities of his time, bears affliction with the resignation born of penitential humility and trust. "Nature in him has been touched (as we say) by grace; . . . with all his illusions, he had what is called in Heb. xi. 'faith.'" "Is this all," the onlooker may cry, "all that is left of the complex but fascinating personality which has always contributed so largely to the charm of the Bible?" Not quite. But even if we had lost everything save this, there might perchance be gain in our loss. It is exceedingly desirable that we should have brought home to us the worth of the non-theological virtues. The qualities enumerated above are not sufficient to make us Christians, but the lack of any of them leaves us imperfect Christians. It is an apostle who says, "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." None are in greater need of the injunction than those whose chief interest lies in theology. And let it be added that if the second king of Israel occupies a lower position in religious knowledge than later leaders of Hebrew thought, the study which discloses this exhibits him as standing considerably above his predecessors and the mass of his contemporaries. The river of God's grace waxes broader and fuller with the flow of time. The Bible is not a Chinese picture which has no perspective.

To realize how delicately and reverently the investigation on which these conclusions depend has been conducted, the book itself must be read.¹ Our space will only admit of a

¹ Contrast Renan's tone in all the chapters of his *Histoire* which deal with

reference to two instances in which real help is afforded to lovers of Holy Scripture. Discoursing on the assertion that David was a man after God's heart, Canon Cheyne says: "Let us look at the context. The words which follow our text should remove all doubt as to the writer's meaning. He continues thus, 'And Jehovah hath commanded him to be captain over his people.' A 'man after God's mind' (for 'heart,' as often elsewhere, means 'mind' or 'purpose') is one in whom the God of Israel has found the qualities of a captain or leader, just as 'shepherd according to my heart' (Jer. iii. 15) signifies 'rulers who shall answer the purpose for which I send them.' It is equivalent to 'Jehovah's anointed,' which means one who, whether with or without the sacramental oil, has received the anointing of the Spirit, has had his natural faculty of leadership supernaturally heightened." This piece of straightforward exegesis is more effectual than all apologetic shifts, not only in banishing the unbeliever's "shallow sneer," but also in removing the uneasiness which the strong language of the text has caused to devout souls. An almost equally grave difficulty is disposed of, and this time by means of pure criticism, in the second example which we have selected. Neither "a man after God's own heart" nor even "a verrey perfight gentil knight" does he seem who dies "with the words of blood and perfidy on his lips," charging Solomon to put Joab and Shimei to death. No one will accuse Wellhausen or Stade of holding a brief for the old king. But Canon Cheyne has their support when he decides, on critical grounds, that the speech in question is not authentic, originating rather from a narrator "who sought to relieve the pious builder of the temple from the respon-

David. The Frenchman's repugnance has caused him to be unfair and irreverent. The English writer is under no temptation, either to extenuate or to set down aught in malice; he knows too well that good of one kind or another must ensue from the coming face to face with any well-ascertained truth.

sibility of some doubtful acts by ascribing them to the influence of David.”¹

A hearty agreement with the results obtained by these studies of the great king's life, taken as a whole, does not involve the acceptance of every detail. On the one hand David's treatment of Mephibosheth may admit of a more favourable construction. “Thou and Ziba divide the land” scarcely deserves to be characterized as “the iniquitous sentence.” True, “either Mephibosheth was a traitor or not.” But some allowance must be made for the difficulty of arriving at a sure decision amidst the excitement, confusion, and weariness of such a return? And if, as even Renan believes, there were grounds for suspecting the fidelity of the accused man, the sentence, so far from being iniquitous, leaned to the side of mercy. On the other hand, it is a little unsafe to use the statement that his were “wars of Jehovah” as a proof that he did not fight merely for glory. The inscriptions of the Assyrian kings, with their repeated assertions that this and the other campaign were undertaken by the direction of Asshur, and the declarations of Mesha, such as “Chemosh said to me, ‘Go down, fight against Horonaim,’” compel us to recognise that at that period and amongst those peoples all wars were thought of as under the patronage of the national god. And when Canon Cheyne supports his view in a footnote with the words: “The prophet Amos recognises a religious significance in David's conquests (Amos ix. 12, where read ‘which *were* called’),” we cannot help doubting whether there is any justification for this special reference of the prophet's words to victories won so long before his own day.

If the kernel of the David-narratives has been reached by separating the genuinely historical notices from the legen-

¹ It may be remarked, in passing, that the same instrument, criticism, has made it possible to perform a like act of justice to Saul. See pp. 61, 62.

dary, it may be feared that the latter will be thrown aside as worthless. But this is by no means the case. The story of David's encounter with Goliath (1 Sam. xvii.) is ascribed to the prophet Hosea's time, later, that is, than the other account (1 Sam. xvi. 14-23) of the young man's introduction to Saul, which belongs to a document of the tenth or ninth century B.C. Its later origin makes it less likely to be historically true. Moreover its substance is contradicted by 2 Sam. xxi. 19,¹ which tells us that Goliath was slain by Elhanan the Bethlehemite. Tradition has credited its favourite, David, with another man's achievement. But the form in which that tradition has been preserved bears the impress of the divine Spirit, who converted what would otherwise have been mere folk-tales into vehicles of religious instruction for all ages. So, at least, Canon Cheyne believes. He is never weary of insisting that there is a truth of poetry as well as a truth of history. And is he not right? Bald records of events, however correct, fail to convey a just idea of the actors in those events. The poet and the romance-writer bring us into living contact with men of like passions with ourselves. The imaginative insight which goes to the heart of things human and divine, seconded by the plastic skill which embodies ideas in suitable shapes, is one of the best gifts of God. Let the parables of our Lord bear witness! And the exquisite romance which depicts the stripling slaying the giant is too full of "the truth which is the germ of gospel truth, that 'God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble,'" to allow of our doubting for a moment that the Spirit of wisdom guided the writer's mind. The "use of edifying," to which it may be put by a sympathetic student and teacher could not be better exemplified than by the closing pages of the first part of this book: "Like David we must put off all fancied superiorities:

¹ From the same document as 1 Samuel xvi. 14-23.

Saul's armour will be as useless as Goliath's in the day of battle. . . . Do you ask what the sling of the Christian is? It is the mind renewed in the image of Christ, which like the sun-flower turns constantly to the sun. And his stones from the brook are those short, strong, dart-like prayers, fitly called ejaculations, partly those passages of Scripture which in time of need the Spirit of God blesses to his edification. . . . The forces in society which make against the spiritual life are numerous and powerful. But there is a way, as the psalmist tells us, 'to still the enemy and the avenger,' not to extinguish him, but to still the fury of his assault. In describing it, the psalmist uses a strange but expressive figure. The prayers and praises of believers form, he says, a tower of strength, in which God and His people dwell together, and against which no enemy can prevail:—*with the mouths of babes and sucklings Thou hast established a stronghold.*" How one of the more learned of the old Puritan divines would have delighted in this! How they cherished the power here displayed of reaching an unexpected, beautiful idea by a literal rendering of the Scriptures which they loved so well!

On a considerable portion of the matter contained in the second part of this volume the readers of THE EXPOSITOR may be presumed to have already formed an opinion, seeing that almost all the Psalm-studies have appeared in the pages of this periodical. Those on Psalm li. are indeed the only exception. Fortunately the exception is of such a nature as to furnish an excellent opportunity of considering the principles on which our author everywhere works. We are all familiar with the heading of the poem: "For the chief musician. A Psalm of David, when Nathan the prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bath-Sheba."¹

¹ It should, nevertheless, be observed that in the Hexaplar LXX the title has a shorter form:—Ἐἰς τὸ τέλος ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυίδ, and Aquila gives Τῷ νικοποιῶ μελῳδῆμα τοῦ Δαυίδ. Staerk's article in the current number of Stade's Zeit-

Here a definite historical background is supplied. Close scrutiny of the psalm ought to make it possible to determine whether the fallen, but now penitent, king was the writer and, concurrently, to come to some conclusion as to the value of these titles which have been prefixed to the psalms. In the brief compass of this paper we cannot exhibit the force of the argument by which it is shown that the ideas which lie at the root of the poem are those of Jeremiah and the second Isaiah, so that the "I" who speaks must be understood of the Church-nation which was formed after the return from Babylon.¹ If any one doubts whether the community could be regarded as an individual, he has but to read Isaiah xlix. 1-4:² and if he would see how many difficulties are removed, either by this, or, in some cases, by the kindred conception of the "I" as a typical Israelite speaking for others as well as himself, he may be recommended to go through the psalter trying how many psalms will bear its application. Let us turn to one or two of the arguments founded on special expres-

schrift gives a full view of the titles prefixed in the Massoretic Text and the important ancient versions to the psalms which have a heading. The best illustration of the purely subjective considerations which have determined the authors of these headings is furnished by the divergences which are thus made visible. See, for example, how they dealt with Psalm lxxx.

¹ It is to be regretted that there is no translation available for English readers of Smend's essay, *Ueber das Ich der Psalmen*. On some points the paper is open to criticism, but the connected study of the "I" throughout the Psalter is very impressive. For corrections of Smend, see Steckhoven in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1889, Staerk in the same, 1892, and Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 180, 350.

² Canon Cheyne anticipates the objection that ver. 5, "Behold, in iniquity was I brought forth, and in sin did my mother conceive me," must have been the utterance of an individual. Here again the appeal to the second Isaiah comes in:—"Thy first father hath sinned": "Thou wast called 'Rebellious from the womb':": "Jehovah hath called me from the womb. . . . And He said unto me, Thou art My servant; Israel in whom I will be glorified." National unity is easily realized amidst national calamities. And the idea of the individuality of the religious community presented itself more naturally to the Jew returned from the Exile or the Hebrew Christian of Apostolic times than to us whose whole religious life is coloured by the consciousness of "unhappy divisions."

sions here employed. On the words "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, etc.," Canon Cheyne says: "The ordinary reference of this verse to David's confession of his sin . . . involves too great a strain upon our faith . . . 'Against thee, thee only,' could only be said by the Jewish Church which made it its chief concern to carry out the precepts of the Law. . . . But how could a just and generous man, like David, after having fallen into the triple sin of treachery, murder and adultery, permit such bold words to issue from his lips? . . . Cruelly oppressed by the kings of Babylon and Persia, against whom it [the Jewish community] had not sinned, it bethinks itself of one greater than they, against whom it is conscious of having deeply sinned, etc." To the present writer this reasoning is conclusive both on the positive and on the negative side. An attempt has, indeed, been made to evade its force by the assertion that "a 'sin' in the Old Testament is always against God." To make this plausible such passages as Genesis xx. 9, Judges xi. 27, Jeremiah xxxvii. 18 have to be explained away; and the attempted explanations entirely miss the main point, which is simply this, "What is the *usus loquendi* of the Old Testament with regard to the word rendered 'to sin'?" Are men called, *no matter by whom*, "sinners" against their fellow-men?¹ And may it not be added that if an Old Testament writer could not entertain the thought that sin against another man was possible he certainly would not need to declare "against Thee *only* have I sinned." On that hypothesis, "he doth protest too much." A second argument for the late date of the Psalm is furnished by the comparison of "Cast me not away from Thy presence," ver. 11, with 2 Kings xxiv. 20, where the

¹ Canon Driver concedes more than is necessary when he says: "An injury to a neighbour is in the Old Testament a 'sin' against Him." Neither the etymology nor the usage of the word requires this. 1 Kings i. 19 is well worthy of notice.

removal of Israel from the Holy Land is thus described :—
“For through the anger of Jehovah did it come to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, until He had cast them out from His presence.” The language of the historian proves the possibility of the *community* offering the prayer of Psalm liii. The context of this petition bespeaks for it an incomparably deeper and more spiritual meaning than the words bore in the historian’s day. Must not a long interval and much experience have intervened? A word or two remain to be said on the last two verses of the Psalm. Both in the Bampton Lectures and in the *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism* it is maintained that these verses were appended by a somewhat later author. Notwithstanding the deserved authority of such writers as Smend and Driver there is good reason for this view. The former believes vers. 16, 17 to be a denial of the propitiatory power of sacrifice in the time then present and 18, 19 to refer to the acceptableness of the thank-offerings which will be presented in the Messianic future; the two ideas being thus in *contrast*, not in *contradiction*, to each other. The latter sees a *contradiction*, which can only be neutralized by the assumption that the subject is the nation :—“The restoration of Jerusalem would be the sign that God was reconciled to His people (Isa. xl. 2) and would accept the sacrifices in which He had now no pleasure.” It is far more satisfactory to bring the body of the Psalm later down than the indefinite “during the Exile,” to date it immediately before Nehemiah’s time, to look upon 16, 17 as the utterance of one who had pierced through the mere ritual of sacrifice to its inner meaning, and upon 18, 19 as an addendum supplied by one who was deeply interested in Nehemiah’s undertaking and wished to encourage his fellow-toilers. Not that the writer of the bulk of the psalm would have objected to join in the sacrifices to which the author of the addendum looked forward: the early Christians worshipped

in the temple. But there is no "now" in ver. 16; and the contrast—if the word "contradiction" be justly objected to—between the combined negative and positive statements of vers. 16, 17 on the one hand and the sentiment of ver. 19 on the other is too marked to justify our believing in the unity of authorship. One point is clear: whoever penned the closing verses of the psalm wrote when the walls of Jerusalem were laid low.¹

Falsus in uno falsus in omnibus would be too harsh a disparagement of the titles which stand at the head of many of these poems. A candid examination of Psalm li. does, however, justify us in declining to be bound by them. It remains, therefore, to investigate the origin and date of each psalm in the light of the evidence which itself provides. Obviously this requires a delicate linguistic tact, a fine literary taste, a large acquaintance with the history of Israel and the nations with which it came into contact, a mind saturated with Biblical thoughts, and fully made up on the general question as to the order in which those thoughts were given to Israel and, last not least, a deep sympathy with the writers. Cowper's enumeration of essentials² is still worth remembering but it needs many

¹ In the June Number of *The Expository Times* Dr. Almond says:—"The 'restoration' of Jerusalem is never mentioned in the Psalms. What is referred to is the building of Solomon's temple and Solomon's walls." But Dr. Almond knows that where we should employ the compound verb "to rebuild" the Old Testament uses the simple form "to build." And it is not very likely that the Psalmist would have contented himself with such an expression as "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: Build Thou the walls of Jerusalem" if he had been thinking of Solomon's temple and Solomon's walls. It is the city, much more directly than the temple, to which this language points.

² "A critic on the sacred book should be
Candid and learn'd, dispassionate and free;
Free from the wayward bias bigots feel;
From fancy's influence, and intemperate zeal;
But, above all (or let the wretch refrain,
Nor touch the page he cannot but profane)
Free from the domineering power of lust;
A lewd interpreter is never just."

additions in our day. Few of us combine all these qualifications. We must, therefore, examine, candidly, but reverently, the results which experts obtain. It is already well known that the author of the work before us entertains no doubt that with the probable exception of Psalm xviii. and a portion of Psalm lx. the Psalter which we now possess was composed after the Exile. The writer of this notice is free to avow his persuasion that Old Testament scholars will gradually approximate to some such conclusion, and that the Christian public will not find it difficult to learn that no injury whatever is thus done to their "most holy faith." There will not be unanimity as to the groups, Persian, early Greek, Maccabean, to which individual poems belong. But there will be a growing consensus of opinion that the Psalms originated in phases of religious life other than those which prevailed prior to the exile. God's people were led slowly forward. They did not, in the person of such a man as David, reach that almost evangelical sense of the evil of sin which is evinced in the fifty-first Psalm and then fall back into the naturalism which marked centuries of the succeeding history. The imperfect morality and religion of the early kingdom passed by many stages into the spirituality which was only possible after Israel had been torn up by the roots from the holy land, and made, perforce, independent of temple and altar. They were "battered with the shocks of doom, To shape and use." There will be other disagreements. On the precise circumstances out of which individual psalms arose, there is room for much divergence of opinion, and in some cases there can be no such thing as finality. The sixty-eighth, *e.g.*, which the Bampton Lectures date about 198 B.C., has been explained within the last few years in what at first sight seems a bewildering number of ways: the beginning of the war against Syria and Ammon in David's reign; the close of that war; the campaign of Jehoshaphat

and Joram against Moab; Hezekiah's return from a campaign East of the Jordan; events in Zedekiah's reign; hopes of return cherished by the Babylonian exiles; the impression produced by the Battle of Issus; the dedication of the second temple; a festal procession between 220 and 170 B.C.; the rededication of the temple by Judas Maccabeus. Yet the duty of deciding is not so formidable as it looks. The general principles which the student has previously adopted will exclude some or other of these groups. Special considerations, such as an excessive number of textual alterations or an evident doing violence to the natural meaning of words will determine the rejection of others. Meanwhile the reader will, at all events, have been gathering many beautiful illustrations of the psalm he has studied. Canon Cheyne lays great, not unduly great, stress on the duty of endeavouring to get at the history behind the psalm. His psalm-studies sufficiently testify to the profit thus obtained. The complementary duty is that of avoiding dogmatism. In his brilliant attempt to account for the sixty-eighth psalm by the impressions which Alexander's great victory at Issus produced, Hilgenfeld says, "The whole Psalm appears to me to allow of no other explanation." This saying expresses the very temper of mind against which we must be on our guard. To prove that a certain set of historical circumstances correspond to this or that section of the Bible is not quite the same thing as proving that the section originated in those circumstances and no others. We are not so fully informed as to the events which happened and the conditions which prevailed during the period from Ezra to the Christian Era to allow of our asserting that nothing, unknown to us, occurred which would still better explain some of the writings with which we have to deal. And we remember that Ernest Havet, in *La Modernité des Prophètes*, so compared the history of the two centuries

before Christ with the prophetic books as to convince himself that the first Isaiah wrote in the days of Simon Maccabeus and Hosea whilst John Hyrcanus ruled; that the second Isaiah veiled the identity of Herod under the name Cyrus; and, in fact, that none of these works are earlier than the second century B.C. It is, of course, true that Havet was no Hebraist. Yet the beacon-light of his errors may serve to warn off really competent linguists and save them from the rocks. A historical background is valuable: our belief that we have found one must not preclude further inquiry.

Amongst the fresh matter with which this volume is enriched the essay on "The Inspiration of the Psalmists" holds an important place. Not that it provides a new definition of Inspiration. "I have myself no theory of inspiration to offer," is the author's frank confession. But theologians of a much more dogmatic type have felt the same necessity of modesty. "The real question," Archdeacon Lee said,¹ "with which our inquiry is concerned is the result of this divine influence, as presented to us in the pages of Scripture, *not* the manner according to which it has pleased God that this result should be obtained." Would that this feeling of reverent caution had been consistently cherished by the framers of systems of theology! *Est etiam nesciendi quædam ars*. No theory of the mode of communication between the Inspiring and the inspired is verifiable. It is enough if we are presented with "some sufficient reasons for holding the Psalms to be 'inspired.'" Criticism has been supposed to be subversive of this belief. Not unnaturally, therefore, the first reason adduced in the essay is a critical one. Assuming it to be demonstrated that the psalmists lived after the Return from the Exile, they must have written as representatives of the Spirit-bearing community which then came into existence, and the very heart

¹ *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 28.

of their psalms being the prophetic assurance that God had accepted His people's prayers, the men who were the media of these divine assurances must have been inspired. The second argument is that "their words have a greater fulness of meaning than those of other gifted religious poets. . . . The Hebrew poets had in some sense a more direct contact with the inspiring Spirit than any previous or subsequent religious poets." There is a larger proportion of the divine in their works. And, thirdly, "The works of the psalmists have exercised a formative influence over a far greater multitude than any of the 'prophetic masters' of the past or the present." The effects which they have produced, no less than the contents of their songs and the position occupied by the singers, are evidence that "a special creative impulse" has been at work. This is a brief and therefore an inadequate summary of the reasons advanced. But however inadequate for other purposes, it warrants the conclusion that henceforward no one will be entitled to assert that the critic is a disbeliever in Inspiration. His is a real belief in a real Inspiration, although he may not ascribe to it the peculiarity, the absolute uniqueness, with which some readers credit the writers of the Bible. Let such, however, remember in fairness that it is Inspiration, not Revelation,¹ which is being discussed, and that the occasion of the discussion is the Book of Psalms, not the first chapter of S. John's Gospel. Canon Cheyne, however, will not purchase adherents by disguising his convictions. To him Zarathustra, Vasishtha, Pindar, Dante and Browning are inspired. This may be deemed a lowering of the gift, a putting it into

¹ On the distinction between the two see Lee, *The Inspiration*, etc., p. 27. It is, of course, doubtful whether the Oriel professor would speak of Revelation in terms satisfactory to a theologian of the stricter school. His view of the gradual evolution of the doctrine of the Messiah, for example, is removed by a long interval from that which sees in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah a direct prophecy of the sufferings of Jesus. But the time has surely come for an unstinted and hearty recognition of the fact that in the one view as in the other the truth in question is seen to come from God.

the same category as genius. But he is thinking of the extraordinary insight of these men into *moral* and *religious* truth, and the extraordinary force with which they declared this. Nor does he put them on the same line with the psalmists, as the noteworthy words quoted above from his second argument conclusively show. We shall all admit the essence of what he contends for, viz., that every intuition of spiritual truth is given by the Spirit of all truth and goodness. On this, as on many points, there would be less disagreement if we could discontinue for a time the use of technical terms, substituting in place of them descriptive phrases. And whether we find it possible to agree on this or not we may all be profited by the thought which makes itself felt throughout this chapter: "Only through inspiration can we adequately understand the writings of inspired men. Inspiration is an inward state, not only of the writer or writers of a Scripture, but also in their various degrees of its qualified interpreters and readers." The fact of greatest importance to the religious life is the nearness of God to ourselves, with all the possibilities which this involves. A hearty belief in the fact and the possibilities gives reality to the prayer that He may "cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit," and the yet more remarkable Whitsunday collect, which is not careful to discriminate sharply between the light by which the hearts of the faithful were taught at the Pentecost and that by which we may have "a right judgment in all things." Whatever dulls this belief is *pro tanto* atheistic.

It was hardly to be expected that the volume would close without a reference to the grave disputes which have been waged concerning our Lord's use of the cxth psalm. The contribution here made is in the form of a suggested compromise: "While the liberals grant the bare possibility that divine oracles like those in Psalm cx. 1, 4 may have been delivered by Gad or Nathan to David, the conservatives on

their side" are to "admit that the poetical setting of such oracles must have been considerably modified between the times of David and of Simon the Maccabee." The weak point which vitiates such compromises is that each side is uneasily doubtful of its own sincerity and at the same time suspicious of the other's. We fear there is nothing for it but to leave the hostile forces to fight out their battle. It is unhappily too late in the day to urge the late Bishop of Carlisle's plea¹ against the dragging the holy name of Jesus into a literary controversy, but there must be still no inconsiderable number of persons who will exercise their judgment without any reference to this. Their reverence for the incarnate Son of God makes them careful not to invoke His authority in such wise as to imperil it. They will claim the right to investigate the date of a psalm by weighing the evidence appropriate to such an inquiry. They will accept any natural, unstrained explanation of the use to which the Christ put the psalm. And if no such explanation presented itself—which is not the case here—they would not even endeavour to overcome their repugnance to all attempts at probing the intellect of Jesus beyond the point to which He has laid His holy mind open to us.

¹ "I think we have no such knowledge of the limitations, to which the Son of God submitted Himself in His assumption of human flesh, as would justify us in anticipating the attitude which would be assumed by Him with relation to human knowledge of various kinds. No one has a right to say, for instance, that in His humanity all past history was open to the mind of the Lord Christ. . . . If our Lord speaks of a certain document as the work of Moses, or of another as the work of David, according to the current language of His time, I think that His words ought not to be quoted as deciding a modern controversy as to authorship. We have no right to argue that in virtue of His divine nature He *must* have known the truth, and that He *could* not have said anything which was opposed to the truth. Reasoning of this kind appears to some persons incontrovertible; to me it appears delusive and dangerous. Delusive, because it implies that we know the nature of the limitations imposed upon Himself by the Son of God, when He condescended to become man; dangerous, because we imperil a doctrine of supreme importance by submitting it to a test to which there is no proof that it ought ever to have been subjected."—From Dr. Goodwin's last Visitation Charge. *Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit!*

In the June issue of an ably conducted paper we are referred to an article "from which you may learn once for all what the Higher Criticism really is." May we venture to appropriate this language and apply it to the *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism*? It is a book in which may certainly be seen the Higher Criticism in its best aspect—bold, keen, constructive, reverent, deeply religious. Every page testifies that the use of a strong light need not damage the eyes through which we see the beauty of holiness, that the habit of investigation need not deaden the feelings of humility and love. Can criticism be devout? This book is the answer to the question.

JOHN TAYLOR.

SOME CASES OF POSSESSION.

1. *THE DEMONIAK IN THE SYNAGOGUE.*
(MARK i. 23-27; LUKE iv. 33-36.)
2. *THE WOMAN WITH A SPIRIT OF INFIRMITY.*
(LUKE xiii. 10-17.)
3. *THE MAN WITH A DEAF AND DUMB SPIRIT.*
(MATT. ix. 32-34.)

WE have now reached the most disputed phenomenon in all the Gospel story, and to many reverent minds the most perplexing. It will be convenient to treat, along with the first example of demoniacal affliction, two very minor ones, and after examining the narratives, to consider the abstract question of what is called possession. In doing this it will be wise to observe closely what expressions are used in Scripture.

The first narrative is that which St. Mark has placed foremost of all the miracles in his Gospel. He tells us that the early teaching of Jesus impressed men above all else by its authority, strangely contrasting with the servile dependence of their scribes, not only on the written law, but on the