

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

God to Himself, and as a crown, that He was permitted to taste death for men. Are there not grace and honour both in serving such a Master? "To Him who loves us and loosed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God, to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever!" Thus by the power of His heart Christ holds upon His way from where His royalty is derided to where it is rejoiced in with singing.

W. M. MACGREGOR.

LINES OF DEFENCE OF THE BIBLICAL REVELATION.

IV. THE ARGUMENT FROM SILENCE.

THE argument from silence represents the following series of syllogisms. Had B existed in the time of an author A, A must have known of B. Had A known of B, he must have mentioned or cited B. But A neither mentions nor cites B. Therefore B did not exist in A's time.

It is clear that this argument involves two assumptions which are not always capable of demonstration. Human action is characterized by fitfulness, whence it is not absolutely certain that a man will perform an act which he may be well expected to perform. Hence, while knowing of B, he may for some unknown reason fail to mention B. Or, though the chance of his having failed to hear of B may be exceedingly small, it is often difficult to deny the admissibility of such a chance.

The most powerful argument from silence known to me is that urged against the genuineness of the document called the Cairene Ecclesiasticus, a copy of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew of the eleventh century. Rashi, who lived in the eleventh century, and whose work on the Talmud embodies the whole of the Jewish learning of the time,

expressly excludes Ecclesiasticus from the category of "written books"; there seems, therefore, no chance that the Hebrew could have been preserved among the Jews and Rashi never have heard of it. In the same century dictionaries were written of both Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew; and the lexicographers, who did their utmost to illustrate their vocabularies from the sources at their disposal, take no notice of the supposed original of Ben-Sira. In the tenth century a Mohammedan of Baghdad got a learned Christian and a learned Jew to give him lists of their literature for his bibliography; and Ecclesiasticus figures in the Christian list of books translated into Arabic, but not in the Jewish list. If, then, there be an argument from silence, we have here a case of one. A sufficient number of persons are involved to eliminate the element of personal caprice; some of them must have known of the book had it existed; and most of them would have had an interest in citing it. Since they do not cite it, we may justly infer that the book did not exist.

The argument from silence that is used to discredit Daniel is of a very different order. Ben-Sira, writing about 200 B.C., enumerates the famous men of the chosen line. In this list the name of Daniel does not appear. Had Daniel formed part of Ben-Sira's canon, the latter must have known of the work; and had he known of it, he must have mentioned Daniel among the famous men of Israel. This is how the argument runs. But the last premiss is false, since he does not mention Ezra, although he mentions Nehemiah (xlix. 13). And the destruction of one link destroys the whole chain.

But let us question this witness rather more closely. Of Ezekiel, before or after whom Daniel would naturally be mentioned, he says (xlix. 9), "He also mentioned the enemies in rain, and set right those who walk straight."

The Hebrew for "enemies" is scarcely distinguishable from the name *Job*, and our second source for Ben-Sira's verses, the old Syriac translation, here gives *Job* for "enemies." It seems marvellous that any one seeing this should doubt that the Syriac version was made from the original, and here preserved a valuable trace of it; but to German commentators this sort of argument apparently "does not appeal." No one now is likely to doubt that the Hebrew meant "Ezekiel also made mention of Job"; and by the aid of the instruments which we ordinarily employ for the restoration of Ecclesiasticus we elicit verses giving the following sense: "He also mentioned Job, by a hint, and declared happy those who walk straight."¹ Ezekiel mentions Job in chapter xiv. (verses 14 and 20) as one of a trio of perfect men—Noah, *Daniel*, and Job. Ben-Sira is struck by his mention of *Job*, and infers something from it.

But if he was surprised by the mention of Job in this list, he evidently *was not surprised by the mention of Daniel*.² And what surprised him about the mention of Job was the fact of one who was not of the chosen line being given a place in such a trio. Hence he must have been aware that Daniel was an Israelite. Now whatever may have been the case with Ezekiel, it is very certain that the only Israelitish Daniel known to Ben-Sira who could be mentioned in a trio of perfect men must have been the Daniel known to us. Ben-Sira shows no sign whatever of acquaintance with pre-exilic history going beyond our own. But if it seemed to Ben-Sira quite in order that Daniel should be mentioned

1

נִם הַזְּכִיר אֶת-אֵיּוֹב בְּרָמּוֹ

וְאִשֶּׁר אֶת-מִישְׁרֵי דָרְךָ

ברמו is an emendation for *בזרם*. If the latter word be rendered "among strangers," the argument will not be seriously affected; and indeed the word "Job" is all it requires. For *רמו*, cf. B. *Nedarim*, 39b.

² The Author of *Chobath ha-Lebaboth* (11th century: Warsaw, 1875, ii. 158) is struck by the mention of Job here,

in such a way, he must have had our book of Daniel in his canon.

And now let us examine Ben-Sira's inference. A clue to its import is given in a note appended by the LXX. translator to the Book of Job.¹ "And it is written that he, Job, shall rise up again with those whom the Lord raises." From this mention of Job then Ben-Sira infers that those who do good, irrespective of their nationality, shall have a share in the future world. Truly it is interesting to find this question discussed so early as Ben-Sira's time. Rabbi Seadyah in his religious philosophy, and a later Rabbi in his unpublished eschatology,² both incline to the view that the future life is for Israel only. Ben-Sira took the more liberal view, and assigned a share in it to all who walk straight, and this he inferred from the mention of Job in Ezekiel's list.

But how does the mention of Job by the side of Noah and Daniel prove this? The method of reasoning is an exceedingly familiar one in the Talmud, and resembles the "identical category."³ In a list of terms whatever applies to one applies to all. If, therefore, in the list Noah, Daniel, Job, we can find that *one* will be raised to life we are justified in inferring that all will enjoy the same privilege.

That one is Daniel, who is promised the future life in the last verse of the book that bears his name.⁴ "Thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." No one could be promised resurrection more distinctly than thus. Since Job is mentioned side by side with Daniel, he too will have a share in the future life. Since he has it in

¹ Compare also Justin, *Dialogue*, § 45, where the same passage of Ezekiel (with the proper names seriously corrupted) is utilized by the Jew for the same purpose.

² *Megillath ha-megalleh* (Bodleian MS.).

³ *Gezerah Shawah*.

⁴ The verse is used for this same purpose in B. *Sanhedrin*, 92a.

virtue of his good conduct, therefore the same will apply to others, be they Israelites or not. A "beatitude" then as early as this means a promise of the future life.

If we examine the argument thus far, it will be seen that the provision made against doubts concerning the Divine revelation is worthy of attention. Had Ben-Sira's grandson translated the word *Job* correctly, it might have been condemned as an interpolation; the fact that he rendered it wrongly proves its genuineness beyond any question. Had Ben-Sira referred to an early chapter of Daniel, we should have been told that no argument could be drawn therefrom for the authenticity of the latter half; as it is, Ben-Sira refers to the *last verse*, a verse which implies all that has preceded. Had the LXX. translator of Job not gone out of his way to account for the introduction of Job into the canon, we should not have been able to evolve Ben-Sira's argument with certainty; that little supplement guides us with precision.

But if Daniel formed part of Ben-Sira's canon, he ought to borrow phrases from Daniel as he borrows them from other parts of the Bible. And so he does. In xxxvi. 7 he asks the question, "Why, when the light of all the days of the year is from the sun, is one day superior to another?" And he answers, "By the sentence of God they were separated, and *He changed times and feasts.*"¹ Here, as so often, the error of the Greek translator enables us to restore the original with certainty: he should have rendered the words, "He changed times and seasons."² These words are a quotation of Daniel ii. 21, "He changeth the times and seasons";³ and, indeed, it may be doubted whether Ben-Sira would have assigned this act to God without some

¹ וְשֵׁנָה עֲתִים וּמוֹעֲדִים.

² ἐορτή = מוֹעֵד. The Syriac has this right.

³ LXX. and Th. ἀλλοιοῖ καιροὺς καὶ χρόνους. Compare also Daniel xii. 7 with vii. 25, showing that יַעַר = מוֹעֵד.

warrant from Holy writ, such as this text of Daniel gives. In the same chapter of Daniel (ii. 9) occurs the similar phrase "until the time be changed";¹ the meaning is not very clear: the wise men are charged by Nebuchadnezzar with having conspired to put the king off with some fabrication until the time changed, probably meaning "until some fresh interest diverted the king's attention." The phrase is in any case identical with that used by Ben-Sira xviii. 25, "from morning to evening *time changes*,"² which seems to signify "the weather changes." He supposed then that the king used the phrase metaphorically of his own state of mind, as might be done colloquially in our own language.³

Is this sufficient to prove Daniel genuine? Probably not, but it is quite sufficient to wreck the theories that are at present dominant. Those theories require Daniel to be Maccabean; and it has now been shown that a pre-Maccabean writer bases a theological argument on the *last* verse of Daniel, and borrows phrases from the earlier part of the book. Hence the attack on Daniel has been for the moment repulsed, and any hypothesis which regards it as spurious will be confronted with the fact that Ben-Sira identified the Daniel mentioned by Ezekiel with the Daniel of the book that bears his name.

Let us now try to use the argument from silence on our own account. In the Biblical revelation an important place is occupied by the *Psalms*. The Arabs use for a collection of poems the term *divan*, and it is so useful that we shall borrow it. Divans are of several sorts. Sometimes the poetry of a tribe is collected into a divan; such a book contains the works of all the poets whom the tribe

¹ See also vii. 25.

² מִבֶּקֶר עַד עֶרֶב שְׁנוֹהָ עֵת. The Syriac מִשְׁנָה is intransitive.

³ The phrase "He that liveth for ever," as a name for God (Ecclus. xviii. 1) also comes from Daniel xii. 7. The metre requires the form עֹלָם.

produced. Only one such seems to have been handed down to us ; but we can trace the existence of others, and in one case can almost name the year in which it perished.¹ More often the divan contains the works of a single poet ; and where the same author wrote on a variety of subjects, his verses on each subject constitute a separate divan. There are also cases in which the poetry produced by the members of one family is put together. In such a case the work of one gifted member is likely to occupy a prominent position in the divan, whereas the others only follow in his train. What sort of divan is represented by the Psalter ?

It is clear that the divan before us exhibits selection. It does not contain all David's poems ; for out of four which his biography preserves, the Psalter contains only one. Since three of these poems are dirges, we infer that the dirge, a most important style, is not admitted. Thence we may infer that the Psalter is confined to one style, the religious ode, or hymn, for the absence of the dirge gives us an *a fortiori* argument. If songs of that solemn and semi-religious character are not admitted ; still less can the encomium find a place. As for the epithalamium, it would seem to have no place in the Semitic divan. It would probably be regarded as a personal insult.²

Secondly, the divan must be exclusive not only *quâ* subjects, but also *quâ* authors. Hezekiah's thanksgiving after recovery resembles many of the Psalms in style. Since it is excluded, we infer that the productions of remote descendants of David are excluded. The Psalm of Habakkuk exhibits the technique of the Psalms. It is not admitted into the Psalter ; we infer that the hymns of the prophets are not admitted. Jonah's psalm is a cento from the existing Psalter ; therefore, the Psalter was complete before it

¹ *Letters of Abu 'l-Ala*, p. xiii. note 4.

² In *Aghani*, ix. 33, there is an allusion to a poem of the sort.

was composed. If Jonah be historical, this will be before the fall of Nineveh.

The relation of the hymns of Hezekiah and Habakkuk to the Psalter is indeed of a sort which gives occasion for reflection. It is clear that both of them are modelled on the Psalms, so closely modelled that the room left for the author's originality is in parts exceedingly small. This fact is not of itself surprising. In the Arabic divans the subjects introduced, their order in a poem, as well as great numbers of similes and expressions, are "tralaticious," borrowed by one generation from another, in so long a series that it is now impossible to name or locate their originator with approximate correctness. Hence the employment by these authors of whole verses already found in the Psalter is not unintelligible. But whereas the verse which is numbered 34 in Psalm xviii. is exceedingly suitable in the mouth of a "man of war from his youth," in that of a seer its appropriateness is far more doubtful. We should be inclined to explain it in the latter case as we explain the verses in which the Arabic poets of the Abbasid period describe their journeys through the desert, their feats of prowess, their loves and the ruins of the dwellings of their friends—as matter which the laws of the art required to be introduced in a poem, although there was no longer any reality to which any part of it corresponded. In the case of Hezekiah's hymn there is the same peculiarity as in Jonah's, viz., a tendency to apply to actual personal experiences words which in the Psalms seem used rather more vaguely and metaphorically. And there seems in both cases a considerable likelihood that the technical terms of the music of the Psalter are misunderstood by the authors. Hezekiah's hymn is called *Miktab*, "a letter." It at once suggests itself that this word is intended to be the same as the *Mikdam* of the Psalms, and indeed bears to it the same relation as Spenser's *Æglogue* bears to the Vergilian *Eclogue*. In the

latter case it was not apparent what an *Eclogue* had to do with pastoral affairs; a very slight alteration made it quite clear. Similarly the word *Miktam* is decidedly a puzzle; by a very slight alteration a thoroughly familiar word is produced. The words with which Habakkuk's hymn closes seem to bear a similar relation to the title, "By Menasseah," of so many of the Psalms. One who read these hymns and, without prejudice, compared them with the Psalter, would probably conclude that they were not incorporated with the latter, on the same ground which would forbid our incorporating any other late imitation with its model. But the assumption of the spuriousness of all these hymns is somewhat complicated, and, in the case of the hymn of Habakkuk, clearly improbable.

Let us now see whether we can discover any means of dating the Psalter. Since the Psalms sometimes recount at length and frequently make allusions to the national history, they will probably mention (1) all events of primary importance down to their arrangement in the form of a divan; (2) all the prominent individuals who took part in forming the national history down to that time, these persons being considered special objects of the Divine favour.

This canon is based on the analogy of similar works in other languages,¹ and especially on the Praise of the Fathers by Ben-Sira. He brings the history down to its last name—Simon son of Onias, whom he had known as a child. The name of Nehemiah is to him of supreme importance, and also that of Zerubbabel. "How," he asks, "can we adequately praise Zerubbabel? He was like a seal-ring on the right hand."² Then of the Jewish kings he selects those for mention who did right in the sight of the Lord. Besides

¹ *E.g.* Horace, Ode i. 12.

² xlix. 11:

אִיכָה נִגְדַל זְרֻבָבֶל
וְהוּא כְחוֹתֶם עַל יַד יְמִין

these he mentions the great prophets, including those of the northern kingdom.

He does not mention Joseph where he would naturally come, because with the captivity of Ephraim, which was not followed by a return, Joseph *drops out of the chosen line*. Since we are justified in regarding Ben-Sira as an adequate exponent of the theories current between the return and the time of the Maccabees, stress may be laid on this point. The disappearance of Joseph from the list of patriarchs is characteristic of the time of the return; during the divided kingdom he was doubtless the patriarch of the northern nation, while during the united kingdom he was the patriarch of the larger and more important part of it.

Of the events which followed the Exodus, the most notable was the establishment of the monarchy; after that the division of the nation. Hence the number of considerations whereby we can date the Psalter is not small.

Who is the last person mentioned in the Psalms? Except David (the notices of whom shall be considered presently), the last is Samuel (xcix. 6). With him the catalogue of saints stops. This is precisely what we should expect if David were the author of the divan. Samuel was to him as Simon son of Onias to Ben-Sira. The difference in their ages was sufficient to give Samuel in David's eyes the rank of an ancient saint.

The name *Joseph* is used as the equivalent of Israel (Ps. lxxxi. 6, lxxx. 2). He is preferred to Judah as the chief patriarch after Jacob (lxxvii. 16). It is only where the fact of the royalty being in Judah has stress laid on it, that Joseph is made less than Jacob, and even the verse in which this occurs points to a united kingdom (lxxviii. 67). To the splitting of the nation there appears to be no allusion. Jerusalem still "a city is securely built together; thither the tribes of God go up, the tribes, they go up thither"

(cxxii. 4). They ceased to go up in the days of Jeroboam, and this decentralization of Jerusalem was commemorated by a fast in the ancient calendar of the synagogue. Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh are mentioned together as equally integral parts of the nation (lxxx. 3). Ephraim is God's pillow, and Judah His staff (cviii. 9). Other tribes are mentioned in the archaic Psalm lxviii. (28). Psalm lxxviii. brings the history down to the choice of David. Psalm cvi. leaps from the judges to the Exile. Psalm cv. stops with the entry into Canaan. Psalm lxxxix. stops with David. Psalm cxxxvi. becomes vague after the conquest of Canaan. Thus the assignation of the bulk of the Psalter to any late period is confronted with the argument from silence. The Psalmists who versify the sacred history must have known of the glories of the Salomonic era and of the splitting of the nation, if they lived after the close of the monarchical period; why then do they become vague after the accession of David, or earlier? If they belong to the period of the divided kingdom, why do we find no trace of the hostility which ordinarily prevailed between the two divisions of Israel, and no aspirations after re-union? Why are Ephraim and Manasseh given an honourable place beside Judah and Benjamin? The later we place the collection the stronger does the argument from silence become. For Ben-Sira's Praise of the Fathers must be our norm for the sense of the concept "sacred history" in the time between the Return and the Maccabees. And we find that with him the names of Nehemiah and Zerubbabel are as honourable as that of Samuel.

Of the theory of the prophets that the miracle of the restoration would outshine the miracle of the Exodus we find no trace. The Exodus is the great marvel which the Psalms seem never wearied of recounting. The "turning of the captivity of Sion," on the other hand, is an event still in the uncertain future (Ps. cxxvi. 4, liii. 7, lxxix. 11,

cvi. 47). Into details concerning the Captivity no Psalm save cxxxvii. enters; but even there the scene is a wholly ideal one. All that we can gather is that the Psalm was composed before the fall of Babylon. For after its fall there would be no occasion for the curse with which it closes.

If the general spirit of the Psalms be considered, it is assuredly that of a fighting community—one in which the hero has the praises of God on his tongue, and a two-edged sword in his hand. The forces of nature are regarded as the warrior's allies; for since his cause is identical with God's, he may reasonably expect that God's weapons, the thunder and hail, will be enlisted on his side. Sanskrit scholars have called attention to the same phenomenon in the Vedas; the primeval ancestors of the mild Hindu could fight as well as sing. The spirit of the Psalms is in this respect similar to that of the Vedas. If it be true that in the Chronicles David, the king and hero, has become a "book-bosomed priest," in the Psalms he by no means appears in that light. The devoutness of the Psalmists does not interfere with their power of striking hard blows. The spirit of Psalm xviii., in which the singer declares that God teaches him to fight, and makes him strong and agile, is also that of Psalm cxliv. The martial instinct is exceedingly strong in Psalms lx. and cx.

Psalm cxliv. is of interest because the author tells us about himself. "God, who gives salvation to kings, teaches his hands to war and his fingers to fight, subdues his people under him, and saves His servant David from the evil sword." It is evident that either David himself is speaking, or that some one else has put the words into David's mouth. If the former is the case, his mentioning his own name may be paralleled from the lyrics of many nations. Imru'ul-Kais, our oldest Arabic poet, in his famous Mu'allakah makes a woman call him by his name.

Horace hopes that a future bride will remember how she sung the verses of the bard Horace. Sa'di in his *Bustan* mentions his own name very frequently. On the other hand, one who chose to personate David would have no difficulty in putting his name in a line. Only what is there in the Psalm that suggests such personation?

In Psalm lxxxix. the author, assuming the character of David, narrates a vision that had been vouchsafed him, and complains that it has not altogether been corroborated by the event. He styles himself the Lord's Anointed (v. 39), and declares that he carries in his bosom the whole of many nations—a phrase something like *l'état, c'est moi*. Some of the verses might indeed be said in the name of Israel generally (39–44); but the author has done his best to render this interpretation impossible, by pleading in verses 48 and 49 that, *his life being of limited duration*,¹ the fulfilment of God's promise would presently be despaired of. If David be personated, the transition from the real David to the figurative is almost unintelligible. If, on the other hand, David himself be speaking, then the gloomy tone of the ode seems the natural counterpart of the cheerful tone of others. To those who study human nature the statements in verses 39–47 offer no difficulty. The lake which seems clear and calm at a distance is all ruffled when seen close by. Newspapers that are famed for common sense have repeatedly within the last ten years declared that the glory of England is departed. Even a slight reverse or disappointment plunges the most confident in gloom. Hence from odes of this sort it is difficult to obtain historical details. We cannot reproduce in thought the state of mind of the composer.

Psalm cxxxii. repeats part of the same matter as that contained in Psalm lxxxix., but finds no contradiction between promise and fulfilment. A particular act of de-

¹ Cf. Eccelus. xxxvii. 25.

voutness on the part of David is urged as meritorious, somewhat as Nehemiah (v. 19, etc.) urges his merits. Verse 10: "For the sake of David Thy servant refuse not the request of thine Anointed" would certainly seem to imply that the Anointed and David are not the same; but the service mentioned, that of "finding a place for the Lord," would seem to have been superseded by the building of the Temple in the next reign, and it is probable that fewer difficulties attend the assumption of Davidic authorship than any other.

The fact that these Psalms, wherein the name of David occurs, are not placed near the beginning of the collection, but distributed about it, implies that the collector interpreted the "I" of the Psalms as David. Had he cherished any doubts on that subject, surely any Psalm of which the Davidic origin was ostensible would have been put near the beginning. In some other Psalms the phrase "the king" or "king" is used without any further specification (xxi. 2, 8, lxxiii. 12, lxi. 7, lxxii. 1). In some of these the phrase is clearly identical with the personal pronoun "I," and the wish which the Psalm contains is of a sort that could only apply to an individual. These Psalms strike chords which more or less pervade the Psalter, and form the substance of Psalms which contain no reference to David or to a king.

Of personal matters mentioned in the Psalms perhaps the most curious is that the Psalmist *cannot write*. This is asserted in lxxii. 15, "My mouth shall recount Thy righteousness, all day long Thy salvation, for I know not how to write." The phrase there employed is clearly identical with that used by Isaiah xxix. 12, where the context renders the sense certain. In Psalm cxix. 13, "With my lips have I recounted all the judgments of my mouth," the point seems to be the same. And in xlv. 2, "My tongue is the pen of a skilful scribe," the same is implied. The use of writing is still connected with the idea of rendering some-

thing permanent. Constant repetition is with the Psalmist a substitute for it.

Elsewhere the detail is less clear. We have notices of persecution undergone, of fierce battles, of calumny, of treachery and deceit, of disease and recovery, of variations between triumph and despair, confidence and doubt. The author is a fierce enemy, and a zealous worshipper and patriot. His cause is to him absolutely identical with that of God.

Is this series of meditations consonant with the character exhibited by the David of the books of Samuel? Let us try to find another example of a man who at different periods of his life was outlaw and prince, warrior and saint, sinner and penitent, who committed his devotions to verse. Such a character may be found in the author of a volume of as yet unpublished verse¹—the Zaidite prince Abdallah Ibn Hamzah. Like David this personage founded a dynasty, identified his own cause with that of religion and patriotism, and cherished ambitions which went beyond anything he was himself permitted to realize.² When the Caliphate of Baghdad was nearing its close, Abdallah Ibn Hamzah, who was descended from the Alid branch of the Prophet's house, bethought him of raising the Alid banner in South Arabia. It would seem that his first efforts were due to real oppression of the Arabs by the Ghuzz and other "barbarians," whom it is perhaps surprising to find so far south as this poet's home. Against them he defended a fort or two with success; thence he began to be regarded as a champion who might be summoned to lead in cases of emergency. In the field he was frequently successful; but the allegiance sworn to him was repeatedly violated, and he was often driven from home and property. The poems in which he gives vent to

¹ Bodleian MS. (Arab. e. 6).

² The life of him by Safadi is also unpublished.

his feelings cover a period of over sixty years; and during that time he underwent a number of experiences similar to those which David in his day had to endure. Of the eight books of which his divan consists one contains moral reflections which in their tone bear some resemblance to the homiletic Psalms. In those which are more immediately devoted to recounting his own history there are not a few notes which remind the reader of other parts of the Psalter. He fancies God has secret favours towards him, enabling him to see his desire on his enemies. God, he thinks, has commanded him to cleanse the countries from pollution, and wash the soil clean of all evildoers. God bade him do this, and he will command his sons after him to continue the work.

What Jerusalem is to the author of the Psalms such is San'a to Abdallah Ibn Hamzah. "Thou, O San'a, art my greatest care, and Dhamar, when it is mentioned, is my chief desire." The barbarous tribes play with him the rôle of the enemies whom the author of the Psalms promises to circumcise (cxviii. 10). He stood in the breach, what time the lions were grinning round him with their terrible teeth. The sword and spear, the shield and buckler, have for him the same attraction as they had for the old hero. The mail that sparkles like a pond, while elastic as a serpent, and the spear-points that flash like lightning from a cloud, are the objects of his affection. What troubles his mind is not such a disaster as the rout of his army, but the wonder how a nation could be so backsliding and perverse as to betray him after they had invoked his championship. What excuse will they be able to allege when on the day of judgment God confronts them with him? The complaints which appear in several of the poems of being *satirized* and lampooned throw a curious light on such passages as Psalm xxxv. 16. The lampoon was, in Arabian antiquity, a weapon which was not

always distinguished with sufficient precision from material weapons, and which was thought to have a very deadly effect.

The divan of Abdallah Ibn Hamzah is very far removed from the excellence of the Psalter, but its author believed in himself sufficiently to write repeatedly to the Caliph at Baghdad, demanding abdication in his favour, and to aspire to universal empire; he also addresses his enemies with extravagant confidence in his ultimate success. The part of Arabia where his career was passed has rarely been subjected to foreign influence: its civilization in Abdallah Ibn Hamzah's time was not unlike that of Canaan in the time of David. David has to be pictured as far more earnest, far more conscious of his mission, and far more devout. The life of Abdallah Ibn Hamzah is probably nowhere described so minutely and impartially as that of David in the books of Samuel. But the parallel will, perhaps, serve to remove the incongruity that might be felt in ascribing a devotional book to a man who lived the same sort of life. The ode is to such persons a faithful friend to which they can commit their emotions; the interest which attaches to their persons induces some one or other in their immediate neighbourhood to claim to participate in the solace of these effusions. So they come to be perpetuated. Moreover, in the ode, as we shall presently see, music is in certain cases of great importance. And though men compose poetry for themselves, music is for an audience.

A portion of the divan of Abdallah Ibn Hamzah, which some day will interest students of the Oriental character, is a series of odes addressed by him to his wife, or rather his chief wife, since the man was evidently a polygamist. That delicacy, and even chivalry, should exist amid the domestic institutions of primitive times is strange; but these odes bear witness to it.

From the analogy of the *divan* we have just left and others we should expect that "I" everywhere meant a definite individual, and, indeed, the author of the poem in which it occurs. Whole *divans* are devoted to the penitential or ascetic style, of which the *Psalter* exhibits so many specimens. That of Abu 'l-Atahiyah, a poet of the eighth century,¹ contains some hundreds of odes in which the author confesses and preaches. The first personal pronoun is common enough therein, but there is never any doubt concerning its meaning. "I am tried with a world whose cares never end; and I see nothing for it but faith and patience. When the day's business is over, and I fancy myself secure from mischief, night brings something fresh. How many an offence I have committed, of how many a crime have I been guilty! How many a friend has given me warning, but I would have none of it! Tempting passions called me to worldly things, so I let go my religion and went after them." "I have tried to give up the world, but still hanker hereafter. My hankering is blended with asceticism. And I find it hard to free my soul from habits that it fosters." These are all personal experiences, the value of which, indeed, lies in the fact that they are the confessions of an individual; the "I" is the poet Abu 'l-Atahiyah, who thinks it worth while versifying his experiences for the benefit of his fellows. We open another ascetic *divan*, about a couple of centuries later. "My afternoon," says the poet, "is come, and soon my sun will be setting. I have been on no pilgrimage, but many a calamity goes on pilgrimage to me." The poet's biographers infer from this verse that he actually never went on pilgrimage, and, doubtless, their inference is correct. Indeed it would be a safe generalization that whatever may be the case with "Thou" and "He," by "I" the speaker himself is invariably intended.

¹ Published at Beirut.

We may now consider the evidence of the headings. These may be illustrated from Arabic literature in a double manner. On the one hand the fact strikes us that some of the Psalms have headings, whereas others have none. Some of them are tolerably precise, *e.g.* xxxiv. "by David, when he feigned madness before Abimelech, who drove him out, so that he went." *Abimelech* is an error for *Achish*; whence it follows that this heading was not made by a compiler, who would have got the right name from 1 Samuel, but must have been a traditional title attached to the poem. The same inference is to be drawn from the title of Psalm vii., "sung by David to the Lord concerning Cush the Benjamite." Cush, the Benjamite, is otherwise unknown, whence the heading must follow a tradition that has perished; for this name could not be inferred from the content of the Psalm. Therefore, if we examine the headings without unreasonable credulity or scepticism, we should infer that the compiler stated the occasion of the Psalm where there was any tradition on which he could rely; that this tradition was independent of the existing Bible; and that there was no intentional deception practised. For in a life so fully told as that of David any one who amused himself by discovering occasions for the Psalms would have no difficulty. One who intended to deceive would therefore either assign occasions to all the Psalms, or, if he found the game tedious, would assign them, say, to the first third. But the rarity of the specific occasions, combined with the fact that, few as they are, they embody some matter not otherwise known to us, would appear to be a striking proof of good faith.

Most of the Arabic divans, whether published or still in MS., exhibit the same phenomenon. In writing the life of Abu 'l-Ala, of Ma'arras, I found the headings of his poems preserve several traditions which the very full biographies of him that we possess had overlooked. And

yet in the case of many of his poems there is no heading. The collection we possess seems to have been edited by a pupil, who probably asked the poet for some information about the occasions of all the poems; in some cases this could be given fully, in others it had either been forgotten or was intentionally concealed. The biography in his case also preserves some verses which the divans do not contain, while illustrating his life from the divans. A principle of arrangement is not always to be looked for in these divans. Where it is alphabetical, the poems arranged under each rhyming letter are put together haphazard. Chronological arrangement is occasionally found, but is not very common. There is often a tendency to group together poems that bear on the same subject, but it is an error to regard as a principle what is merely a tendency.

An illustration of the nature of the headings in an ordinary divan may be taken by opening one of them at random, and the resemblance to the headings of the Psalms will be found sufficiently striking. We will glance at a series in the divan of the Sherif Al-Radi, a poet of the end of the tenth century. First a dirge on a man who died in 387 A.H., name and date being given. Next poem one of consolation to the Caliph on the loss of a son in the year 377, name and month being given. The next an ode describing the deposition of the Caliph in the year 381. The next a lament over the ex-Caliph's death in 393. The next a lament over a famous vizier in 385, names and dates being accurately recorded. The next a lament over an eminent lady about whom some details are given, of the year 399. The next "a lament over one of his friends." Then come eight poems with no details in the headings. Then one of the year 383, "when the author was twenty-three years of age, and saw some white hairs appearing among the black." If we compare this series, which could

be paralleled from most of the divans known to me, with a series of Psalms, the chief difference will be found to consist in the greater rarity with which the headings of the Psalms give details and dates. It seems almost impossible to lay too great stress on the fact that in the great majority of cases the compiler of the Psalter says nothing of the occasion; for this compels us to attach importance to the cases wherein he breaks silence on this subject.

But the headings apparently ascribe Psalms not only to David, but to a variety of persons, and sometimes to several at once. Psalm lxxxix. contains, as we have seen, information which can only have come from David himself; but it bears the title *Maschil*, by Ethan the Ezrachite. Psalm lxxxviii. has the title "Song for the lyre, by the sons of Korach. By Menasseach to 'Commencing to sing.' *Maschil* by Heman the Ezrachite." (Menasseach is evidently from this passage a proper name, meaning "Victor," like Zafir; the "chief musician" may therefore be deposed.) How can the same poem be by the Sons of Korach, Heman the Ezrachite, and Menasseach? No Arabic scholar would be puzzled by these headings for many minutes; the analogy of the titles in the *Kitab Al-Aghani* is too striking. What we learn from that work is that a poem might be the joint property of many persons; for the air to which it was sung was at least as important as the words of which it consisted. Hence we have only to read a few titles in the *Kitab Al-Aghani* to recognise, if not the exact equivalent, at any rate the precise analogy of *Maschil*, *Miktam*, Menasseach, etc. One or two specimens out of hundreds will suffice. "The poem is by Ja'far the Harithite; the air by Ma'bad; Amr Ibn Banah states that Ibn Suraij performed it to another tune; Hammad states that the Hudhalite performed it to another." "The poem is by Mansur Al-Namiri; the air (*ramal*) by Abdallah Ibn Tahir; also another (*ramal*) by Al-Raff; also another (*thakil*, no. i.)

which Habash also ascribes to Al-Raff." "The poem is by Al-Akhtal, the air by Amr al-wadi (*hazaj* with the first finger); also another (*ramal*) said to be by Ibn Jami'; also another (*khafif ramal* with the middle finger); also another (*khafif thakil* no. i. with the middle finger) by Ibrahim." We need have no further difficulty about the words *Maschil*, *Miktam*, etc., or the names Asaf, Menasseach, Heman the Ezrachite, etc. To the compiler of the Psalm book, as to the compiler of the *Kitab Al-Aghani*, the air is the important matter; for that, he probably had as imperfect a notation as the author of the *Kitab Al-Aghani* has. *Maschil* and *Miktam*, which are so unintelligible to us now, had some definite meaning in the old musical science of the Hebrews—a science which very likely had the name *Kesheth*, "the bow," since in 2 Samuel i. David's dirge has prefixed to it the notice that David ordered the children of Judah to be taught *Kesheth*. To David's poems airs had in some cases been attached by himself, in other cases by famous musicians; hence the tradition of the airs is what is preserved in the headings, and there is nothing surprising in the same poem having been set to music by a number of persons. And since the Psalms are unmetrical, the analogy which should be before us is that of the modern anthem rather than that of the hymn; in the former case it is clear that the name of the musician is far more important than that of the writer of the words, since the *artistic* part is the musician's. As we have already seen, "the word of the Lord is tried" by the fact that owing to its power and profundity metre would only fetter it needlessly; but when the Psalms were composed, the Hebrews doubtless thought of the poem as the words belonging to a tune, rather than of the tune as belonging to the words.

The antiquity of the Psalms may therefore be gauged by the following facts: when the Chronicles were composed,

the meaning of the headings had been forgotten, and *Menas-seach* already regarded as a participle; of the persons who are mentioned as setting them to music Solomon appears to be the latest; for from 1 Kings v. 11 we learn that Ethan the Ezrachite was earlier than he. Whether in the case of Psalm xc. we are to suppose the air (*Tefillah*) ascribed to Moses, and the words to David, or conversely, is not clear; nor is the matter of much importance.

We should misunderstand the effect of music on the Oriental, if we supposed the words of an ode to have anything like the same importance as the air. The great work to which reference has been made is a mine of anecdotes illustrating the power of music. Poetry, when recited, wins admiration, if sufficiently brilliant; but when sung, it maddens. Often we read of the capacity for drinking bearing a definite ratio to the power of the music; "the Caliph drank so many quarts over an air" is a fairly constant formula, by which we can gauge its beauty. Another writer has collected verses, the sound of which, when set to music, caused the hearers to fall down dead;¹ fainting fits are by no means rare effects of verses sung to thrilling airs. At different periods of the Caliphate two singers are able to stop all the traffic between the regions of Baghdad. The art is ordinarily considered unworthy of a gentleman, but nevertheless members of the imperial family were found to cultivate it, and a minister who endeavours to suppress the talent in his son is rebuked. Sometimes the author of the poetry is also the composer of the air; but this was apparently not common. Owing to the imperfect musical notation of the time, the composer of the air had always to sing it himself in the first case; but often he would instruct some professional singer, male or female, who would then be employed to perform it in public, or in the patron's presence. The composer of the

¹ *Al-'Ikd Al-Farid*, iii. 198.

music counts in such cases as the chief author; for often the verses sung are common property, the name of the author having been forgotten.

We should not be justified in identifying the music of the Arabs with that of the Canaanites, and indeed the history of the former is so well recorded that such a proceeding would be impossible. A fairly close resemblance is all that need be assumed. On two occasions in Israeli-tish history we hear of the lyre being employed to rouse and calm ecstasy. We should probably think of the procedure not as of the playing of pieces of instrumental music, but as the performance by a singer of some verses, that he had either composed or learned, with the voice and instrument at once.

That David was a musical expert is a historical certainty, if anything connected with David be certain. He entitles himself "tuner of the airs of Israel,"¹ and that title implies that in his mind also the music was the primary concern. It seems difficult to think of the work of the founder of the Judaic dynasty being either forgotten and neglected during the reign of his successor, or being mixed up haphazard with a whole pile of anonymous performances.

What, moreover, seems clear is that the collection was made before the technical language of the Davidic music had been forgotten, and this had evidently been forgotten not only when the LXX. translation was made, but even when the Chronicles were compiled. The loss of this science must have been occasioned by some break in the national history, and this is most probably the Exile.

The omission from the Psalter of odes which should naturally have been given a place in it, had it been intended to include the works of others besides David, or had it been intended to include poems which were not religious, suggests the inference that the compiler only

¹ 2 Sam. xxiii. i., דַּוִּד = *Nagham* (*Taj al-'arus*, ix. 86).

inserted hymns of which the words were supposed to be by David, though the airs were frequently by others.

The fact that the national history, as it appears in the Psalms, closes with David, makes the Salomonic age the most likely period for the compilation of the book. That some of the references to the Exile are inserted by editors who had no intention of letting them count as the work of David, is obvious; but whether the references which are found in the body of the Psalms are necessarily signs of post-exilic origin cannot be determined till the whole phenomenon of prophecy has been brought within the domain of science.

When the Old Testament revelation was consummated in the New Testament, the Messianic Psalms formed, next after Isaiah, the foundation on which the Messiah's claims were based. David's words were regarded as authoritative; the words of the 16th, the 22nd, the 110th, and other Psalms were given a new and thrilling interpretation. With the events foretold with fateful clearness in the Wisdom of Solomon and the latter part of Isaiah obscure passages of the Psalter harmonized: it was seen that the author of the Psalter was one of those to whom the vision had been granted in which God's purposes and plans were revealed. Such a vision was a privilege accorded to the friends of God; and was not God *compromised* (the word has been repeatedly used in this context) by such a friend as the David of the books of Samuel? Much of the conduct of David that may with justice be impugned is excused on the ground that morality is progressive, and conduct, like scholarship, must be judged according to the standard of its age. But if the worst act of David's life, the painful story of Bathsheba, be considered, the underlying character which David exhibits is much better than that displayed by most men in any age. Max Duncker remarks that the crime which caused David so much peni-

tence and contrition was one of which, probably, no other Oriental monarch would have thought anything, and, if there be any truth in history, it would have occasioned few scruples to most Defenders of the Faith. The second crime ought not to be judged apart from the first, of which it was the natural and inevitable consequence; David had to choose between an honourable death for Uriah and a horrible one for Bathsheba; and he chose the former. He who thinks Bathsheba could have been safe while Uriah lived does not see the whole hand. And when David is rebuked for the crime, he yields the point without argument; he is told that he has done wrong, and he receives the prophet in a prophet's name. When has this been done—before or since? Mary Queen of Scots would declare that she was above the law; Charles I. would have thrown over Bathsheba; James II. would have hired witnesses to swear away her character; Mohammed would have produced a revelation authorizing both crimes; Charles II. would have publicly abrogated the seventh commandment. Who has ever acknowledged an error of any magnitude, if it has been in his power to maintain that he was right? A recent writer has described the course of the ordinary man who falls into the devil's meshes, and that writer probably knows the human heart rather well. Loyalty to the weaker sinner is not a spring that works in the hero of that romance.¹ Cain's plan—that of silencing the accuser, and Adam's plan—that of shifting the responsibility, seem to exhaust the range of human expedients when an error is brought home. He who escaped from both, though *semustulatus*, was a "man after God's own heart."

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

¹ *The Silence of Dean Maitland.*