

In modern Judaism there are three great parties. There is first the orthodox party, which abides by the old, abides with a great tenacity, because the "traitor" is now again, as in the days of Saul of Tarsus, within their own community. To this party, to which of course the vast bulk of modern Jews belong, all that has hitherto been held sacred regarding the laws and institutions of Moses is sacred and binding still.

Then there is the party that holds by what is called the "Breslau Judaism." It is indeed, as Mr. Abrahams says, "a curious product of compromise." "It would examine Jewish tradition, piece it out into its component parts, show how it developed, date it, but still go on loyally observing all that it enjoined as though Jewish science had never applied the crucible." In other words, it is a party (called into being and led by the late Professor H. Graetz), which accepts the results of the most advanced criticism *in theory*, but in practice ignores it altogether; denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, yet continues to hold the Passover and the Day of Atonement, and to observe the Sabbath, as if it were never questioned that all had come from the hand of God by Moses.

Lastly, there is the radical party, chiefly represented in England and America, not many in

number, but full of ability and enthusiasm. To them the "Breslau Judaism" is a miserable compromise. They accept the results of criticism with a sweep which takes a Christian's breath away, and they accept them in the sphere of ritual, of present religious life, no less than of literature and history. "In religious matters," says one of its ablest representatives in England, "Graetz was fond of talking of the *juste milieu*, and for the Judaism of to-day extremes are no doubt dangerous. But to some of us it seemed as though Graetz, while equally condemning unbending conservatism and extravagant liberalism, found his *juste milieu* forsooth in *both extremes*, binding his conduct to the one and abandoning his thought to the other. There was originality, no doubt, in this species of compromise, but it need hardly be added that it had no elements of permanency. It served its purpose of reconciling the old with the new for nearly half a century. But new phases of spiritual vacillation need ever new varieties of compromise, and these saving waters will be drawn by future generations of Jews from the deep unfailling well of truth that Graetz dug out, *though it may be necessary to first remove the stone with which he himself covered its mouth.*" Whereunto will all this tend? It is a question of deep interest to us.

Canon Cheyne's Hampton Lectures.¹

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR A. R. S. KENNEDY, M.A., B.D., ABERDEEN.

The general position of the newer school of critics with regard to the literary history of the Old Testament has never been more happily expressed than by the ultimate founder of the school, the late Eduard Reuss. As far back as the summer of 1834, so he assures us in the preface to his *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament* (1881), he taught that "the Prophets are to be regarded as older than the Law, and the Psalms

¹ *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions*, with an Introduction and Appendices, by Thomas K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D. 1891.

as younger than either." In this country we are now tolerably familiar with the former part of the Professor's thesis, the mutual relation of the Law and the Prophets; we are not so familiar with the latter part, the relation to both occupied by the Psalter. It will not be the fault of Professor Cheyne, if, in the future, the attention of British scholars is not drawn in an increasing measure to the many and complex problems, literary, historical and theological, presented by the "book of the praises of Israel."

Canon Cheyne's book consists of eight lectures, with a most ample array of notes, references, and

other learned matter, arranged in two practically independent courses, as indicated by the full title given below. The first course of five lectures is devoted to the problem of "the origin," the second course of three, to the "religious contents of the Psalter," and some older readers, the author suggests, "would do well to read the second part (beginning at Lecture VI.) before the first." Taking the lectures, however, in the order of their delivery, we find that the distinguished lecturer fixes on the colophon or subscription of Psalm 72 (*v.* 20), as the starting-point of his inquiry into the origin of the Psalter. Here we learn that our present Psalter "was preceded by one or more minor Psalters." One of these originally consisted of our present Books IV.-V. (Ps. 90-150), now bisected at the end of Psalm 102, and from certain general features of the collection, it is inferred that it must be a product of that period of Jewish history which begins, with the foundation of Alexandria in B.C. 331 and ends with the death of Simon Maccabæus in 135 B.C. The latter, according to Cheyne's hypothesis, "devoted himself to the reconstitution of the temple psalmody," which embraced the editing of the psalms in question, and their incorporation in the now completed Psalter. The second part of Lecture I. is devoted to an analysis of "these two books, with a view to determining the date of the groups of psalms which they contain." At the threshold of his inquiry, the lecturer has to face the well-known *crux* of psalm-criticism, are there Maccabean psalms in our present psalm-book? Canon Cheyne has no difficulty in answering the question in the affirmative, and twenty-seven psalms in all are, with more or less confidence, assigned to the period of the Maccabean struggle. These—if we may anticipate the results of succeeding lectures—are distributed among the various books as follows: in Bk. I., Ps. 20, 21, 33; Bk. II. 44, 60, 61, 63; Bk. III. 74, 79, 83; Bk. IV. 101; Bk. V. 108, 110, 115-118, 135-138, 145-147 (?), 148-150. The Psalms in the last two books not belonging to this age have their appropriate historical background assigned to them either in the pre-Maccabean Greek period, or in the second (*i.e.* after Ezra and Nehemiah) and first centuries of the Persian dominion. The investigation thus far is contained in the first two lectures; the next two are devoted to a similar analysis of Books II. and III. (Ps. 42-89), which are composed of a number of

originally distinct psalters distinguished by their preference for the divine name Elohim. The contents of these two books are distributed over the same three periods as those in the books we have just discussed, with the important reservation that "it is not unnatural" to suppose that Psalm 60 may contain pre-Exilic or even Davidic elements. The psalms in the first book, finally, are similarly disposed of, no psalm, even here, showing unequivocal proof of being of pre-Exilic date, with the possible exception of Psalm 18, which, though more probably of the early Persian period, *may* be as old as the reign of Josiah. The thesis of the larger half of Canon Cheyne's book, therefore, may be thus formulated: the Hebrew Psalter was not edited merely, or edited and in part composed, but (with one doubtful exception) wholly composed and edited in the post-Exilic period of Jewish history.

Now it is quite unnecessary to inform readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES what to expect in these five lectures, with the relative notes and appendices. All that the finest scholarship, long familiarity with the methods and results of modern criticism, a rich endowment of the faculty of "historical divination,"¹ and true spiritual sympathy with the sacred poets can do has been done to establish this thesis of the post-Exilic origin of the Psalter. Yet I, for one, do not hesitate to return our Scotch verdict of "*Not proven.*" It is quite impossible in a magazine article to enter fully into the reasons which have led to such a verdict. Even at the risk of seeming to do Canon Cheyne and his book an injustice in passing by its more positive and permanent results, I feel compelled, however, to set down here, in the briefest possible outline, a few of the considerations which, on historical and literary grounds, seem to block the way to a general acceptance of the Professor's thesis.

(1) While hypothesis has a recognised place in scientific investigation, and "the torch of conjecture" may legitimately, nay, must be employed on occasion by Old Testament critics, higher and lower, still we are entitled to reject an hypothesis which seems opposed to the facts of history. Now, neither of our two authorities for the history of the Asmonean dynasty, the author of I. Maccabees and Josephus, says a single word regarding an

¹ "Without exercising this faculty to some extent, it is impossible fully to enjoy the Psalms." Cheyne's article, "Psalms," in *Chambers's Encyclopedia*, vol. viii.

incident of such national interest as the final editing of the temple hymn-book by Simon Maccabæus. The argument *e silentio* is, of course, not conclusive in itself, but it gains in positive value as evidence the more difficult it is to account for the historian's silence. Now we find the first-named author expressly stating that Simon "made glorious the sanctuary and multiplied the vessels of the temple" (1 Macc. 14, 15). Why, then, is no mention made of his assumed "reconstitution of the temple psalmody?"

(2) Another difficulty which confronts the historical student in these lectures is the very important part in Jewish history and psalm-composition which Canon Cheyne is obliged to assign to an oppression and captivity of the Jews at the hands of Artaxerxes III., surnamed Ochus.¹ If my calculation is correct a third of the Psalter, more or less, is assigned by Canon Cheyne to the last half-century of the Persian rule. But on how slender grounds this attribution rests. Let us hear the latest and most "critical" historian of Israel, Professor Stade: "Only two completely isolated events are recorded from the century between Nehemiah and Alexander, and even these are no longer quite intelligible as regards either their occurrence or their significance."² Of these one is the defilement of the temple by Bagoses, the Persian governor under Artaxerxes II. *circa* 383 (Josephus, *Antiq.* xi. 7, 1), a story which Graetz, the historian of the Jews, characterises as "extraordinarily suspicious," but which is confidently used in these lectures as the historical background for a number of psalms. The other incident referred to by Stade is what he calls a "supposed" participation of the Jews in a rebellion against Artaxerxes Ochus (258-338 B.C.), which resulted in the deportation of a portion of the community "to Hyrcania, by the Caspian Sea." Now, here again I must appeal to the *argumentum e silentio*. I admit that no stress is to be laid on the absence of all mention of such a calamity by the compiler of our Books of Chronicles, but it is quite otherwise with the silence of Josephus. I do not think with Professor Cheyne³ that "the

¹ See Index I. under Artaxerxes, and compare the fuller statement in Cheyne's article on "Critical Problems of the Second Part of Isaiah" in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1891.

² Stade, *Geschichte Israels*, vol. ii. p. 194.

³ *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1891. The reference is to an article by Professor Graetz in the same magazine (Jan.

omission of any reference in Josephus is satisfactorily explained by Professor Graetz in the article" to which our English scholar refers us. If it was, as the latter maintains, "the third of Israel's great captivities," the silence of the Jewish historian is surely inexplicable. What, then, are the authorities for this third captivity? Chiefly the late Byzantine chronicler, George Syncellus⁴ (*c.* 800 A.D., hardly, therefore, "an *early* chronologist," p. 53), who gives the incident⁵ on the authority of certain unnamed Greek historians. There is no ground for Graetz's suggestion that "the chief of these was probably Diodorus Siculus;" little more may be intended than a reference to his usual authorities,⁶ Panodorus and Annianus, the Alexandrian chroniclers, the latter of whom borrowed from the former. He in his turn was dependent on Eusebius, in whose chronicle the notice in question, though in a somewhat shorter form, must have stood, since it is found in both the Hieronymian and Armenian translations. But it is well known that Eusebius' authorities for the extra-canonical Jewish history were Josephus, who on this occasion is silent, and the lost chronography of Julius Africanus. Regarding the last-named, Gelzer has shown in his monograph⁷ that his authority in matters of Jewish history, regarding which Josephus is silent, was Justus of Tiberias,⁸ the latter's contemporary. We are thus thrown back for our *probable* ultimate source on a man whose reliability is not above suspicion and whose chronicle was described by one who used it as being "very meagre and brief," and as "passing over much that was important and even necessary."⁹ It is now evident, I trust, that the authority of even Graetz and Cheyne is not sufficient to remove one's legitimate scruples with regard to this "third great captivity," and that one cannot be blamed for hesitating to accept the large results in psalm-1891) on the "Zechariah, chap. xiv.," which he would refer to the same period.

⁴ For whom see Karl Krumbacher's *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 1891, pp. 118-120, with Bibliography.

⁵ Syncellus, ed. *Dindorf*, vol. i. p. 486, 10. Extracts from the various writers are given by Graetz, *Geschichte*, ii. pp. 209, 210.

⁶ Krumbacher, *loc. cit.*

⁷ H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie*, Leipzig, 1885.

⁸ For whom see Schürer, *The Jewish People*, etc., Div. I. vol. i. pp. 65-69.

⁹ Photius, *cod.* 33.

criticism which, in the work before us, are made to depend upon its historical reality.

(3) Mounting the stream of history, I come to a much more serious difficulty, one, in fact, which goes to the very root of Cheyne's position. I refer to his low estimate of the religious development of the faithful Israelites before and during the Exile. In his article on the Psalms, above referred to (which may be recommended as an excellent introduction to the study of his Bampton Lectures), he says: "Though it would be absurd to say that there were no psalms before the Exile, the writings of Isaiah and Jeremiah prove that the *nation as a whole*¹ was as yet far from having assimilated the pure and spiritual prophetic religion, and that the priests in particular were unprogressive. How, then, should there have been *temple-songs*, like those of our Psalter, before that spiritual regeneration of which the *second Isaiah* was presumably the chief instrument?" Now in these two sentences there are three points to which exception may fairly be taken by a moderate critic. The first is the tendency among extreme critics to overestimate the isolation and influence of the second Isaiah, while reducing to an alarming extent the literary monuments of his activity.² Then there is the tacit assumption, that *all* our psalms were from the outset "*temple-songs*," which again depends on the theory that it is "*the nation as a whole*," or, at least, "*the typical or representative Israelite*," that speaks to us in them. Canon Cheyne has already, in the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. ii. p. 251), admitted that it is "difficult to take in the nationalistic interpretation of the psalms," and yet he has come so completely under the spell of this theory—without, however, going to the same extreme as Professor Smend,³ see his Lectures, pp. 319, 320, and elsewhere—that he finds himself compelled by it to throw the whole Psalter into the post-Exilic period, in which the Church-nation came into existence. Now Canon Cheyne never ceases to advocate "*a psychological exegesis*," but I confess my inability to rightly grasp the psychological phenomenon of a poet who, in a single poem, writes by turns as an individual, as a typical Israelite, and in the name of the Church-nation.

¹ The italics are mine.

² See Cheyne, "Critical Problems of the Second Part of Isaiah," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, July, Oct. 1891.

³ *Zeitschrift f. altest. Wissenschaft*, 1888.

Such a theory fails to account for the characteristic spontaneity of all but the latest psalms. I grant willingly that before the Exile "*the nation as a whole*" could not have sung so tender a lyric as "*The Lord's my Shepherd*," or appropriated the penitent's cry in Psalm 51; but it is surely an inadequate view of pre-Exilic prophecy and its results that refuses to see in the earlier psalms, at least, the devotion of individual souls. For, as a learned and liberal-minded Jewish scholar⁴ has said, "*a large proportion of the Psalms are the fresh and free expression of the writer's own feelings at the moment of composition. There are no lyrical poems more instinct with spontaneity than the majority of the psalms. They were not written to instruct others, but because the soul was full and overflowed in words.*"

(4) From these remarks on Cheyne's attitude to the hymns of our Psalter generally, I pass now to an examination of his treatment of certain well-marked groups of psalms, beginning with the so-called "*Elyōn Psalms*," those, that is, in which the divine name Elyōn (Most High) occurs.⁵ Now on p. 84 Canon Cheyne mentions the undoubted fact that the pre-Exilic prophets and narratives avoid this name, adding, "*Num. 24, 16, and Deut. 32, 8, are the only undoubtedly pre-Exilic passages in which Elyōn occurs (Gen. 14, 18-24, being post-Exilic), and these are poetical.*" But the words I have put in italics contain the whole point of the argument. Granting that before the Exile Elyōn is poetical, and only came to be used by prose writers after the Exile (although Gen. 14 will perhaps ultimately prove to be not late Babylonian but early Canaanite), surely the presence of Elyōn in a *psalm* ought not in fairness to be adduced as a presumption, and more than a presumption, in favour of a post-Exilic date, as is done throughout these lectures (pp. 196, 206, *et passim*).

Take, again, the group of "*Royal Psalms*," more particularly Psalms 20, 21, 61, 63.⁶ How many of his readers, I wonder, will Professor Cheyne convince that the epithet "*king*" in these psalms is applied to the early Maccabean princes, contrary to the express testimony of history and numismatics. Fewer still, probably, will agree with

⁴ Mr. C. Montefiore, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1889, p. 145.

⁵ See list in Appendix I., note on Ps. 7, with which compare the special note on this group, pp. 83, 84.

⁶ Cf. Driver's *Introduction*, p. 347.

him that the "king" of Psalms 45 and 72 is Ptolemy Philadelphus. I have already given my reasons for regarding such an attribution as untenable.¹ No, unless more imperative reasons can be adduced to the contrary, the Royal Psalms must, I do not say exclusively but chiefly, be assigned a home before the fall of the Hebrew monarchy.

A last group of psalms, which should be carefully studied in the light of Cheyne's post-Exilic theory, is composed of those which assume an attitude to sacrifice and sacrificial worship directly at variance with all that authoritative history tells us of the tone of post-Exilic Judaism (see list, p. 274). Take, for instance, the three which he names "Puritan Psalms," viz. 40, 2-12, 50, 51, 3-19. Would any one not in bondage to a preconceived theory dream of assigning these to a post-Exilic date, and not rather to the period of the pre-Exilic prophets? If these psalms were written "by the true sons of Jeremiah" (p. 366), why should we not ascribe them to the circle of his disciples? Enough has now been said, I trust, to justify one "uncommitted to definite critical views"² in returning the verdict of "not proven" to the main contention of these Bampton Lectures that the Psalter is the product of post-Exilic Judaism.

We have still before us the second course or group of lectures (vi.-viii.) dealing with the religious contents of the Psalter, but I have space on this occasion for only a brief reference to a topic of the first importance which is discussed in the second part of the closing lecture. I mean the rise and development among the Jews of the doctrines of the higher personal immortality and a resurrection to judgment. Readers of this magazine are already familiar with the lecturer's position with respect to these doctrines. In opposition to the generally accepted views of historical students of the Jewish religion, who hold that the only trace of these doctrines in the canonical Scriptures is in the late Book of Daniel, he finds more or less explicit reference to them in a considerable number of passages, the majority of which are found in the Psalter.³ The idea of immortality there expressed, he further argues, "is no mere evolution out of the old Semitic belief in Sheol; the fostering influence

of a more advanced system of thought was needed for its development" (p. 362). This fostering influence, I need hardly add, is supplied by the religion of Zoroaster. We have thus two distinct questions to answer here: (1) Is the higher immortality to be found in the Psalter, and (2) if so, whence is it?

Now, a repeated and unprejudiced study of the passages in question,—more particularly the four marked (d)-(g) in this magazine (ii. pp. 248-251),—in the light of all that Canon Cheyne has written recently on the subject, has failed to convince me of the truth of his, in itself, by no means improbable contention. The close of a short article like the present is not the place for detailed argument on either side. I would merely note down the following three simple matters of fact, which seem in my opinion to militate against the Professor's position.

(1) The first of these facts is the admitted obscurity of the supposed references. Of the nine psalm-passages discussed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Canon Cheyne himself admits that the majority "are so vague and poetical, and so little defined by the context, that it is only in the light of the [other] passages, and of the contemporary [?] Zoroastrian belief, that they acquire a subsidiary importance." Only less "vague and poetical" are the other four psalm-passages above referred to. Now, why should this be? The teaching of the Gathas on the future life is explicit enough; whence, then, such fatal obscurity in their Jewish admirers? Is it not a more likely supposition that we have here the cry of a few of God's children for the light which they were not yet able to bear? (John xvi. 12). Or it may be that the light they sighed for was indeed vouchsafed to some by the "adorable Spirit," but, in its passage through those imperfect media, it has been so broken and obscured as to be no longer recognisable to us.

(2) But even if we grant that these passages do show fore-gleams of the "beatific vision," it does not by any means follow that, even on the hypothesis that they all date from the period of Persian ascendancy in Palestine, this result is due to "Zoroastrian influences." For I question if these influences were then as strong as Professor Cheyne would have us believe. One very material fact is carefully kept in the background in these discussions, namely, that during the period in question, the Zoroastrianism of the Avesta was not the religion of the Achæmenian kings nor

¹ *The Thinker*, February 1892.

² See Cheyne's appeal, EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. ii. p. 253.

³ See list in "Bampton Lectures," p. 362, and cf. EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. ii. pp. 225, 226.

presumably of the mass of their Persian subjects. "The ideas and customs," writes M. James Darmesteter, "which are found in the Avesta were already in existence under the Achæmenian kings, but, taken as a whole, they were not the general ideas and customs of the whole of Persia, but only of the sacerdotal caste [the Magi]. There were, therefore, practically two religions in Iran, the one for laymen and the other for priests."¹ It is thus far from being proved that "the truths enunciated or implied in the Gathic hymns" (which *ex hypothesi* the Jews did not read) were "in the air," and were almost unconsciously imbibed by the Babylonian Diaspora to be by them transmitted to their western brethren.

(3) Finally, let us grant again that certain choice spirits in Judaism, during the second century of the Persian supremacy (say, from 430 B.C.), attained to the assured hope of immortality; does it not then become extremely difficult, nay, impossible, to explain the slowness with which such a blessed hope gained acceptance among the mass of the Jewish people? The silence of Ecclesiastes we may explain, but not that of the author of Ecclesiasticus. Jesus ben Sira declares unhesitatingly that "man is not immortal" (17, 30), and he

¹ *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. iv., The Vendidad Introd. pp. xliii. ff.

was no sceptic like Qoheleth. Neither, though Cheyne finds "a strong element of Sadduceanism" (p. 411) in his book, dare we reckon him as a Sadducee in the face of chap. 17, 17 (if his best commentator, Fritzsche, is to be trusted). Yet here is a religious-minded Jew, living in the capital of Judaism, three centuries and a half (c. 180 B.C.) after the commencement of the supposed "Zoroastrian influences," who knows nothing of the higher "life of immortality." Does not this fact also tell strongly against Canon Cheyne's favourite theory?

I would again, in concluding this article, express my sense of the injustice which is done to a great book, for such is the work before us, by the line of treatment here adopted. There is in it very much in the handling of individual psalms to which no exception can be taken, and I have elsewhere expressed my conviction that it is "the most exhaustive and thought-compelling study of the Hebrew Psalter that has ever been given to the Church." In the present case I have been compelled to state frankly a few of the most formidable difficulties in the way of accepting of its results, experienced by one of those younger students, to whom Canon Cheyne appeals, "who are either uncommitted or but half-committed to definite critical views."

St. Paul and the Objective.

BY THE REV. A. B. GROSART, D.D., LL.D.

It seems to be accepted by many who write of St. Paul that his was so peculiarly and absolutely a subjective nature that he took little or no notice of the objective. Incidental remarks of the Rev. George Jackson, B.A., Edinburgh, in his otherwise fine paper in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (October 1891) on Myers' imperishable poem of "St. Paul," may be taken as representative of the ease with which this assumption is made. He thus writes:—"It has been more than once remarked that in all the addresses and writings of the apostle that have come down to us, there is manifested a curious insensibility to the sights and sounds of nature. Probably not a single physical fact with regard to the many countries through which, in his busy life, he passed could be gleaned from his writings."

This is enforced, if not originated, by a quotation from Archdeacon Farrar's *St. Paul*. As I wish to confute the strongest and most dexterously put statement of the case, I willingly give the passage in full about the apostle's birthplace. "With these scenes of beauty and majesty we are less concerned, because they seem to have had no influence over the mind of the youthful Saul. We can well imagine how, in a nature differently constituted, they would have been like a continued inspiration; how they would have melted into the very imagery of his thoughts; how again and again, in crowded cities and foul prisons, they would have

' Flashed upon that inward eye,
Which is the bliss of solitude.'

The scenes in which the whole life of David had been spent were far less majestic, as well as far less