

A few days later Mr. Stephan called saying that he would bring a man to examine the scrolls who would definitely know their antiquity, a man who was an expert in such things. Being himself a Jew and a specialist in antiquities he would certainly be able to pass accurate judgment on the scrolls, said Stephan. At the appointed time Mr. Stephan and his specialist (whose name I do not remember) arrived. They examined the scrolls carefully. Then the specialist pointed to the little table on which the scrolls were lying and said, 'If that table were a box and you filled it full of pound notes you couldn't even then measure the value of these scrolls if they are 2000 years old as you say.' Needless to say I felt discouraged but somehow I still felt they were wrong."

T. Wechsler has admitted in the *Haolom* that he was the expert in antiquities that accompanied Mr. Stephan whose name the Archbishop failed to remember. There is a discrepancy as to the time when Stephan and Wechsler visited the Archbishop. According to Wechsler the visit occurred in the summer of 1947 while the Archbishop states that they visited him after the 26th of September, but in substance both articles are in accord. The Jewish expert (Wechsler) expressed his opinion that the scrolls, particularly the Scroll of the *Haftarot*, did not belong to antiquity but had probably been taken from a Geniza of a synagogue nearby. This not only discouraged the Archbishop but was the cause of the withdrawal from the market of the Scroll of the *Haftarot*.

I repeat: For the sake of scholarship the Scroll of the *Haftarot* should be produced. This must be done to aid us in determining the antiquity of the findings. Further, I believe that in publishing the scrolls, particularly the Commentary on the Book of Habakkuk and the so-called Sectarian Scroll, a full photostat of the scrolls should be made because every word and letter is vital in determining the authenticity and the antiquity of the scrolls.

THE DATE OF PSALM 80.

I.

THE disagreement as to the date of Psalm 80 is not due, as in so many cases, to the absence of evidence, but rather to many indications not only confusing but incompatible with one another. Some scholars propound theories on what they consider irrefutable arguments which are entirely ignored by the sponsors of other views, founded, in turn, on allegedly conclusive evidence. Many important points, however, of great significance are either passed over in silence, or met in entirely inadequate ways. A review of various theories is necessary before we can discuss the question of the date of the Psalm itself.

While the theory of the Maccabean origin of the Psalm has been discarded unanimously by recent scholars, they, broadly, divide into two camps: those² who consider the Psalm a prayer for the restoration of Israel as a whole, which necessitates its being of exilic or post-exilic date; and, those² who regard this a "Northern" Psalm, a prayer for the restoration or salvation of the Northern Kingdom only, the dates suggested ranging from shortly before 721 B. C. E. to some time after the destruction of the Northern Kingdom.³ Some do not definitely commit themselves to either view.⁴

¹ C. A. Briggs, *The International Critical Commentary*, "The Book of Psalms," Edinburgh 1907, vol. 2., p. 203 f.

M. Bittenwieser, *The Psalms*, Chicago 1938, p. 232 f.,

A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Cambridge Bible*, "The Psalms," Books II and III, Cambridge 1898, p. 484 f.

² T. Witton Davies, *The Century Bible*, "The Psalms" (LXXIII-CL), Edinburgh 1908, p. 83 f. (Suggested date: reign of Menahem). E. Koenig, *Die Psalmen*, Guetersloh 1927, p. 356 f., takes the Psalm to refer to the Assyrian invasion of the Northern Kingdom under Phul (2 K 15.19); he seems to suggest, though rather vaguely, a Judaean authorship, since "the misfortune of the Northern tribes was, of course, a cause for distress and intercession to the patriots of Judah, too."

³ H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*, Goettingen 1926. (Some considerable time after 722 B.C.E.).

W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms*, London 1939, vol. 2, p. 366 f.

⁴ W. E. Barnes, *Westminster Commentaries*, "The Psalms," London 1931.

D. R. Kittel, *Die Psalmen*, Leipzig 1914, p. 296 f.

II.

The chief argument for the former view is that a limitation of the Psalm to a catastrophe suffered by the Northern Kingdom is "precluded by the third strophe" — vv. 9 ff. — for these lines show, that "the fortune of the entire Israel is spoken of under the figure of the vine." From vv. 15 ff. it is equally clear, "that the whole nation, Judah as well as Israel, has been destroyed and that the Psalmist prays for their common restoration" (Buttenwieser).

The grave objection to this view is, of course, that neither Judah nor Jerusalem is mentioned, while extreme prominence is given to the northern tribes; indeed, the whole people are called "Joseph" in v. 2; this is quite inexplicable when the Psalm is assumed to have been written in the Babylonian Exile, since then, to all intents and purposes, "Judah" had become Israel, although, to be sure, some remnants of the northern tribes may have been fused with it. It is no answer to this objection to suggest that the author of the Psalm was himself connected with one of the northern tribes (Kirkpatrick), for even so he could hardly have imagined a restoration of Israel under the leadership of the Joseph tribes. Kittel's suggestion that Judah should be imagined as speaking in our Psalm has already been refuted by Gunkel, who pertinently observes that if the author himself had belonged to Judah and spoken on its behalf, it would be even more difficult to understand the undue emphasis placed upon the northern tribes.

SEE IN Hebrew
is a ~~not~~
symbolic
meaning
in the
combination
of these
tribes

SEE a
who brings in
הבית

ANOTHER
demonstrates
involvement
in the south
after 722 and

III.

The other view, according to which the Psalm appertains to the Northern Kingdom only, naturally bases itself chiefly on the absence of any reference to Judah. One of the objections to it, as Buttenwieser and others have pointed out, is the obvious concern of the Psalm with the fortune of the entire nation. One cannot admit that a Psalmist of the Northern Kingdom would so entirely disregard the continued existence of Judah as to consider the end of the Northern Kingdom equivalent to the complete destruction of the "vine brought forth from Egypt" — an objection not met at all by the protagonists of this view.

An additional difficulty is presented by the inclusion of Benjamin in v. 3, among the northern tribes, in flat contradiction to I Kings

destruction need not be complete.

12.21 and elsewhere, where it is reckoned as loyal to Rehobeam. Briggs, for this reason, proposes to eliminate יבנין as a gloss, although, as Gunkel and others rightly point out, it is "protected" by the play upon it in the words ימיך ימין of v. 18. Kirkpatrick seeks to prove elaborately that Benjamin did, in fact, belong to the Northern Kingdom; while Gunkel and Oesterley ignore the difficulty altogether by simply taking that for granted

A further stumbling-block lies in the reference, in v. 2, to "Him who sitteth on the Cherubim," which is usually associated with Zion. Oesterley's remark "that we do not know that Cherubim were absent from all the Northern sanctuaries" is surely rather far-fetched. We shall, however, return to this point later.

Thus, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that neither of the common views really does justice to all of the evidence available in the Psalm itself, and that both, in fact, face great difficulties in accounting for some of its outstanding and essential features.⁵

IV.

Before offering a theory of our own, attention may be drawn to a number of further points, left out of account or explained unsatisfactorily by either or both of the above theories.

As Davies has already pointed out, vv. 12 ff. suggest that "the evils lamented in this Psalm are experienced in Palestine, and not in any foreign land." This is consistent with his own view that the Psalm was written prior to the destruction of the Northern Kingdom, but with none of the other theories. The verses in question certainly do not give the impression of an exile bewailing the fate of his homeland, but that of a native seeing his country ravaged before his eyes. With this links up (Barnes) view that the Psalm, in its opening verses and refrain, "implies that Israel is going out to war" — a view shared by Kittel. The former mentions the phrase "sitting on the Cherubim" "as a further indication that war is in prospect; for this expression

⁵ Some of these objections would not apply to Koenig's view, that the Psalm, though referring to a disastrous defeat of the Northern Kingdom, was written by a Judaeen author. The following difficulties, however, still remain unsolved: a) the inclusion of Benjamin among the Northern tribes (a point, which Koenig fails to meet satisfactorily) and b) the recognition by an allegedly Judaeen author, of the Israelite king as the "man of Thy right hand etc." in verse 18.

does יבנין
shed light
on this?
perhaps it
means Jerusalem

suggests the ark of the covenant which from time to time was carried out with the armies of Israel." This point is of the greatest significance. *Wherever this phrase occurs elsewhere (Ps. 99.1; 1 S 4.4; 2 S 6.2; 2 K 19.15), it refers to the God dwelling on the actual Cherubim of the Ark; in every case, either the Ark or Zion or the Temple is referred to in the context.* Quite apart, therefore, from the difficulty of associating the Cherubim with the Northern Kingdom, it is obvious, that the Psalmist must have conceived YHWH as still "enthroned above the Ark," and that his choice of this particular appellation must have been motivated by the fact that he was appealing to Him in His martial capacity. We cannot concede that in the Babylonian Exile this ancient title might have been retained with the explanation that it referred "to the cherubic chariot in Ezekiel's theophany" (Briggs); for Ezekiel's daring and novel conception of the Divine Presence as independent of the Ark and as riding over the earth on his unseen Cherubim, can hardly have been sufficiently concrete or popularly accepted so as to become a basis for addressing YHWH as "throned on the Cherubim," when the real, visible Cherubim were, in fact, known to have been destroyed.⁶

Further, it is curious, that an author, writing after the destruction of Israel and, possibly, of Judah, should be content with mere expressions of astonishment at YHWH's indifference to His people. There is no suggestion here of sin or transgression which the people might have committed; from the contemplation of God's care and solicitude at the time of the conquest of Palestine, the Psalmist passes abruptly to the painful disappointment with respect to His present indifference. No mention of any intermediate events, nor of any reasons that might have caused YHWH to turn away from his people, are found in the Psalm; the impression is left that the conquest of

⁶ D. B. Duhm in *Die Psalmen*, Freiburg in B., 1899, p. 208, suggests that this phrase was still used by later authors, at a time when the Ark and the Cherubim had ceased to exist. It is, however, significant, that in both Ps. 99.1 and 2 K 19.15, the only instances quoted by him of the late use of this appellation, the context refers to the Temple or Zion respectively. The latter text, where the phrase occurs in the record of a prayer of Hezekiah, is quite irrelevant to our problem, viz. whether it would still be used, as an archaism, in prayers or Psalms at the time of the author of 2 Kings. Even if one admits such use as possible, the occurrence of this phrase, especially if taken in conjunction with our other evidence, would be more probable in a Psalm of early date.

Canaan was a comparatively recent event. Notwithstanding the assumptions of the "all-Israelitic" interpretation, there is no allusion whatsoever to the re-union of the two kingdoms (Davies).

Finally, v. 18 is generally recognized as an allusion to Benjamin, a "play on words" (Kirkpatrick, Oesterley, Gunkel); but no reason has been suggested why the Psalmist should thus single out Benjamin from among all the tribes mentioned, when the verses in question, according to most views, refer to the people as a whole. The only reason advanced, viz. Gunkel's suggestion that the Psalmist himself belonged to that tribe, is certainly no sufficient explanation.

check
JSE of
PUN'

V.

Our contention is that the evidence points unmistakably in one direction: that the Psalm belongs to a much earlier period, preceding the division of the kingdom and, even more precisely, before the rise of Judah to predominance. Only thus can we understand why there is no mention of Judah, why "Joseph" is used as a synonym for Israel and why special place is accorded to Benjamin. The Psalm must have been composed in the time of Saul. Thus it becomes obvious why the author should think that the salvation of Israel depends on Benjamin, or rather on the *איש ימיני* — a phrase actually applied to Saul in I S 9.1 and 21.7

The situation of a country "wholly overrun by enemies" (Kirkpatrick) is entirely in accord with conditions at the time of Saul, prior to his victory over the Philistines. Israel, at the moment reflected in the Psalm, is indeed going to war, and calls upon its God to lead it to victory, as He had done so often before. The memory of the Ark and its miraculous powers was still fresh. The Ark may even have actually gone out with Saul's army, though this is not mentioned in the biblical account, in which, sight of the Ark is lost from the time of its return from the Philistines till the time of its installation in Zion by David.

Now there is no difficulty in the fact that the author passes straight from the description of the conquest to the present situation; nor

⁷ The *איש* and *בן אדם* of verses 16 and 18 seem to us to refer, not to the nation as a whole, but to "the person chosen at this time to be ruler in Israel" (Barnes; similarly Koenig, who takes v. 18a to refer to "the king of the state").

is there any reason for wonder that he does not think of the possibility of God's having forsaken Israel because of sins. This thought would have been unavoidable in the time of the later prophets, but is hardly to be expected in the period of the Early Kingdom.

Surprising though our suggestion regarding the date of the Psalm may appear, we cannot see any serious objections to it. It is generally agreed today that some Psalms may date from the period in question. Butterwieser, for example, goes so far as to "identify positively" 26 Psalms as pre-exilic, some of which he dates as early as the period of the Judges, and even of Joshua. (The Psalms, p. 1 f.)

As far as the language of the Psalm is concerned, there is nothing to suggest a later date. On the contrary, Briggs calls the style of our Psalm "classic," while Barnes points out the presence of what he calls "archaisms," especially in verses 1 and 2. On our theory, of course, these would be specimens of genuinely archaic phraseology.

The assumption of the early date suggested here obviates all difficulties and clears up a number of matters, such as the reference to Benjamin as the "man of thy right hand" through whom salvation is expected to come, which otherwise would remain without meaning.

Jerusalem

H. HEINEMANN

INTRODUCTION TO THE APOCRYPHA

IN THE dedication of his latest book to his uncle, Professor Pfeiffer quotes his motto: 'Giving good value; getting good value.' It may be said at once that he has himself lived up to the first part of this motto, for at \$4.00 this book is extremely cheap. It falls naturally into two parts, as indicated by its title. The first part sketches the political, religious and literary history of Palestinian Judaism from 200 B. C. E. to 200 C. E., and then after a magnificent chapter on Hellenism proceeds to give an account of the Jews of the Diaspora and of Alexandrian-Jewish literature. The second part contains chapters on each of the books of the Apocrypha. Its treatment is fuller than that of any other handbook known to the reviewer, and the whole volume is an indispensable tool to every worker on the Hellenistic period.

The author uses the word Apocrypha in its ordinary Protestant sense, and not in the sense proposed by Professor Torrey — who made it include what is ordinarily covered by the clumsy 'Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha' — or in its Roman Catholic sense. It should be noted, however, that in the first part of his work, he gives short notes on the pseudepigrapha and other literature of the period, so that his work is not only more detailed but more inclusive than Torrey's *Apocryphal Literature*, or Oesterley's *Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*.

The great value of the book is in its wide command of the literature. There are, of course, some gaps, but that is inevitable. Surprisingly, however, there is no mention in the Bibliography of E. R. Bevan's *House of Seleucus*, or his *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, or of Bouché-Leclercq's six volumes on *Histoire des Lagides* and *Histoire des Séleucides*. Less surprising, under 1 Esdras no reference is made to the posthumous work of E. Johanneson, *Studier over Esras og Nehemjas Historie*. Doubtless some readers will observe other omissions. The author has read very widely and ably presents not only his own views but gives a clear account of other views put forward. His whole method is thus the antithesis of Torrey's, which was designed to present simply

History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha, by R. H. Pfeiffer, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949, pp. xii+562. Price: \$4.00.