

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 3—July, 1905.

I.

THE NINETEENTH PSALM IN THE CRITICISM OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

IN the first part of the nineteenth Psalm, comprising verses 2-7, or 1-6 as numbered in the English versions, the Psalmist sings of the glory of God as displayed in the heavens:

- 2 The heavens declare the glory of God,
And the firmament showeth his handiwork.
3 Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night showeth knowledge.
4 There is no speech nor language,
Their voice is unheard.
5 Their line is gone out through all the earth,
And their words to the end of the world.

In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun,
6 Which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber,
And rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course.
7 His going forth is from the end of the heavens,
And his circuit unto the ends of it;
And there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.

In the second part the glory of Jehovah's law is first extolled:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 8 The law of Jehovah is perfect, | restoring the soul: |
| The testimony of Jehovah is sure, | making wise the simple. |
| 9 The precepts of Jehovah are right, | rejoicing the heart: |
| The commandment of Jehovah is pure, | enlightening the eyes. |
| 10 The fear of Jehovah is clean, | enduring forever: |
| The ordinances of Jehovah are true, | and righteous altogether. |
| 11 More to be desired are they than gold, | yea, than much fine gold; |
| Sweeter also than honey | and the droppings of the honey comb. |

And then the poet, viewing his own life in relation to this law, prays for pardon, deliverance, and acceptance:

12 Moreover by them is thy servant warned: in keeping them is great reward.

13 Who can discern his errors? Clear thou me from hidden faults.

14 Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins, let them not have dominion over me:

Then shall I be upright, and I shall be clear from great transgression.

15 Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart

Be acceptable in thy sight, O Jehovah, my rock and my redeemer.

From the apparent lack of coherence between these two parts and from their dissimilarity in word and matter, Rosenmüller, in 1798, concluded that the nineteenth Psalm is composed either of two distinct hymns which by accident or design became joined together, or else, in view especially of the abrupt ending of the first part, of fragments of two hymns (*Scholia in V. T.*, Partis 4 Vol. 1, pp. 530, 536). This conjecture he withdrew in the second edition of the *Scholia*, which was published in 1831, as being unnecessary; since "nothing is more common among the ancient poets of both the Hebrews and the Arabians than suddenly to pass from one theme to another in the same song." But although Rosenmüller abandoned his entire theory and unreservedly accepted the unity of the Psalm, the doctrine of the composite origin of this exquisite ode was not allowed to lapse. De Wette had in the meantime revised Rosenmüller's argument. Like Rosenmüller in his retraction, and on substantially the same grounds, de Wette denied significance to the alleged lack of coherence between the two parts of the psalm; since abrupt transition, says he, is characteristic of lyric poetry, and is exemplified in the first half of this very poem in the sudden introduction of the sun. But though de Wette rejected this argument, based on the abruptness of the change from one subject to another, yet on other grounds he asserted the original independence of the two parts. The argument which Rosenmüller derived from the dissimilarity of language and material de Wette modified, partly into diverseness of style; but he discerned the chief marks of double authorship in the difference of tone, presentation, and character of parallelism in the two sections, particularly in the greater length of the verse-members or lines, and in the less sprightly rhythm, of the latter part of the poem. To this evidence he added an argument wholly his own, though at the same time it is a further specialization of Rosenmüller's general reference to dissimilarity in word and matter. He discovered in the latter part "probably the fragment of a penitential Psalm"; and "the poet,

who begins with that exalted contemplation of nature, could hardly have concluded with the sentiments of the contrite heart." He might, indeed, have been led by a contemplation of the heavens to an humble frame of mind, as in Psalm viii; but had he "carried such trouble in his heart as is expressed in verses 13 and 14," he "could scarcely have brought himself into harmony with the rejoicings of creation" which are voiced in the first part (de Wette, *Commentar ü. d. Psalmen*, 3e Aufl, 1829). But over against de Wette's view it is significant that the nineteenth Psalm has never been reckoned among the seven penitential Psalms (Ps. vi, xxv, xxxii, xxxviii, li, cxxx, cxliii). It needs only to be compared with the fifty-first, for example, to exhibit the difference between its sentiments and a cry of penitence wrung from a broken and contrite heart. The Psalmist is not conscious of actual transgressions. He refers to sins of inadvertence; asks to be acquitted of the sins that are hidden from his eyes, and to be kept from the commission of wickedness. As Hengstenberg says, "There is no trace of a bruised heart; the mind rises in the face of human weakness, easily and without a struggle, to the blessed hope of divine forgiveness and sustaining grace." The prayer is quite compatible with a spirit that is in attune with nature's choir in its praise of God. It is not surprising, therefore, that this argument of de Wette's at once sank out of sight, and has never been put forth again. His abiding contribution to the discussion consists in his exhibition of the difference in style between the two parts of the Psalm. Of this, more anon.

In 1835, six years after the third edition of de Wette's work appeared, Ewald issued his commentary on the Psalms. He paid no heed to Rosenmüller's abandonment of his whole argument, nor to de Wette's demurrer to a part of it; but he returned to Rosenmüller's original reasoning in so far as it was based on lack of connection and on difference of content. "There is no transition from the first to the second part either in thought or language," he says, whereas the subject changes abruptly and entirely. The difference of theme calls for explanation. In the first and second editions of his commentary, he made no use of the argument derived from the difference of measure and rhythm, upon which, together with the difference in tone, de Wette had placed his chief reliance. His indifference to the claim which was put forth for diverse authorship on the ground of this rhythmical dissimilarity was doubtless influenced by the suggestion, which de Wette reports a friend to have made, that the change of style might be accounted for by the radical difference of theme. Ewald did, however, discern

a feebler speech in the second part, and a stylistic coloring, as he calls it. He adduced this rhetorical inferiority as evidence of a later age when force and vigor were waning; and in his third edition he supplemented this argument for a late date by an appeal to the art of the verse (*kunst des verses*); for, he says, that while in this [second] part also there are two strophes of four verses each, yet the "long-membered" verse prevails. And further, with respect to the time of composition, he saw in the Psalmist's profound appreciation for God's law and apprehension of its spirituality, and also in the Psalmist's prayer for deliverance from the arrogant (verse 14), marks of a date not earlier than the eighth century (first edition), or seventh and sixth centuries (third edition). Ewald had found four features in the second part of the Psalm which, in his judgment, indicated lateness of composition, namely, a decline in the poetic vigor, a longer verse, a spiritual appreciation of the law, and a prayer for deliverance from the arrogant. Accordingly, Ewald concluded that the present composite nineteenth Psalm consists of an earlier and a later poem. The earlier one he regarded as Davidic. Ewald, moreover, pointed out, on the one hand, that the hymn with which the Psalm begins is without an application, without a hint as to how man must praise God or receive the praise uttered by the heavens; and, on the other hand, that the second portion lacks a satisfactory beginning, since no prayer would begin "in so chilly a manner." Hence the only possible inference is that "a later poet attached this conclusion to that ancient [Davidic] piece, in order to place the revelation in nature and that in Scripture on equal footing (*gleich zu stellen*); he either found the ancient piece without its original ending or, what is more probable, the old ending no longer sufficed him, since at his time the written revelation had attained to high importance, and it seemed to him fitting to touch upon this latter also."

There were thus two distinct arguments before the public, as early as 1835, for the composite structure of the nineteenth Psalm, namely, diversity of theme and difference of rhythm; and before the century was half over three arguments, and soon thereafter four arguments, for the later date of the second part, namely, a decline of poetic vigor, a spiritual appreciation for the law, a prayer for deliverance from the arrogant, and the art of the verse. Eventually two more arguments for the late origin of one or both parts of the Psalm were advanced. In the study of this Psalm, therefore, eight matters require investigation. Two concern the unity of the poem, and six relate to the date of its composition.

And, first, the unity of the Psalm.

DIVERSITY OF THEME.

In 1835, a few months later than Ewald, Hitzig reviewed the previous discussions, and accepted the unity of the Psalm. "Possession—the fact that the parts are united—is," he says, "much easier to justify than to contend against." The argument based on the sudden transition from one theme to the other had been shown by Rosenmüller and de Wette to lack cogency. The mere abruptness of the change might be a sign that the Psalm has been pieced together out of other poems, or it might not. In itself it proves nothing. The closely related argument drawn from the difference of content was nullified by Hitzig, in that he advanced proof of an internal connection in thought between the two parts of the Psalm. Remarking that "the Psalm sings [or voices] the praise of God [that rises] from nature and from revelation," he pointed out that "the Hebrew was especially apt to join these two thoughts. He never made a distinction between the common God of the world and his own particular God, the Lawgiver." Nowack and Reuss, indeed, object that "verses 8–15 are not the praise of God from revelation, but are the praise of the law"; and Hengstenberg regards this two-fold division of the Psalm as a misapprehension of the poet's design. These exceptions, however, concern the husk only; they do not touch the kernel of the argument. It is not the law, but the law as Jehovah's enactment that is praised. And phrase the matter as one will, the fact remains that, as Riehm put Hitzig's argument, "the identity of the Creator of the universe and the Giver of the law is a fundamental thought of the Hebrew theocracy." It is embodied in the theocratic constitution, being implied in the monotheism of the first commandment, in which Israel's God and Lawgiver forbids His people to have any other gods before Him; and it is expressed in the fourth commandment, in the words "in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." It is voiced by the prophets; as by Jeremiah in chapter x. 10–16. This argument has justly made a deep impression on criticism. In the general principle that an inner connection was felt, Hitzig has been followed by Hengstenberg, Alexander, Delitzsch, Schultz. Even most of those critics who deny the unity of the Psalm frankly admit that the collector who united the two fragments was governed by some such unifying principle. So Hupfeld, as already de Wette, Ewald and Böttcher; Nowack also; and Kirkpatrick, citing Amos iv. 13, v. 7, 8; and Baethgen. As Cheyne expresses it: "By an afterthought the two parts of the Psalm were brought into relation" (*The Book of the Psalms*, first edition, p. 221).

Reuss saw the consequence of such an admission; and proceeding consistently, he pronounced the two parts of the present Psalm to be distinct odes, which should not be joined together, much less be printed as one. And he defended the integrity and completeness of the first poem, notwithstanding that it breaks off with startling suddenness, declaring that the abrupt ending is "a sign of greater antiquity, which expended as yet no great industry on form and finish." Duhm follows Reuss, except that he regards the first poem as a fragment. He follows Ewald in his opinion that the lost conclusion celebrated the moon as the ruler of the night. Reuss is pleased to describe his separation of Psalm xix into two psalms and his numbering of them xviii and xix as a departure from rabbinical tradition. It is a departure from more than rabbinical tradition, for the Psalm was a unit when the Greek version was made. But though consistent, Reuss does not escape the force of the argument. It must be admitted that both parts can, to quote the words of Hupfeld, "be embraced under one common abstract category."* It may therefore be regarded as fairly settled that there is an inner connection of thought between the two parts.

DIFFERENCE IN RHYTHM.

As other evidence of diversity of authorship difference in rhythm has been urged. What is the difference in rhythm? De Wette drew attention to the greater length of the lines and the diminished vivacity of the rhythm in the second half of the poem. But not until 1855 was the difference in tone and rhythm described more specifically. In that year Hupfeld wrote: "The first [part is] in genuine lyric manner, enthusiastic and with simple two-membered or three-membered verses; the second in its didactic portion is calm, sententious, with long periods or verses invariably four-membered," or, as he or his editor afterward stated the matter with nicer discrimination, "two double members, each double member consisting of a stronger and a weaker member [the latter of] which merely adds a predicate . . . as an echo," thus:

The law of the Lord is perfect,	converting the soul.
The testimony of the Lord is sure,	making wise the simple.

In this conception of the verse he follows Delitzsch, who in 1859 noticed the cæsura in the lines of the second part. "In the second part . . . comes the cæsural scheme, which as it were bounds

* Hupfeld raises a question of date which will be considered in its proper place. The question of date, however, does not concern the question of unity.

higher, draws deeper breaths, and surges like the rise and fall of waves."

It was Budde who, as a result of his notable study of the Lamentations of Jeremiah (*Z. A. T. W.*, 1882, 1-52), introduced the designation "lamentation verse" for those features of the second part of the nineteenth Psalm which had been pointed out by Hupfeld and Delitzsch. The lamentation scheme or measure is a long line broken by the cæsura into two unequal parts, of which the first is longer than the second. In the nineteenth Psalm this scheme runs regularly through verses 8-10; it is found in verse 11, where in each line the first member is longer than the second and hence congruent with the scheme, although equal or about equal in the number of words (Budde, *S.* 7, 40); it occurs in verses 12-14*a*, and also in 14*b* by shifting the position of the athnach pause, as was first seen by Delitzsch. Delitzsch finds it in verse 15 also, by shifting the athnach pause:

Acceptable be the words of my mouth	and the meditation of my heart
In thy sight, O Jehovah,	my rock and my redeemer.

But Budde regards this verse as a closing verse formed by the addition of a third member.* Wellhausen considers the verse a liturgical addition to the Psalm. It divides somewhat awkwardly into one double-membered line, according to the lamentation scheme, followed by a short line, thus:

Let the words of my mouth be acceptable, and the meditation of my heart in
thy sight,
Jehovah, my rock and my redeemer.

Or following the Septuagint, which bears witness to the presence of the word "continually" in this verse in the manuscript used by the Greek translators, Baethgen, Duhm, and Cheyne (in the revised edition of *The Book of Psalms*) emend the present Hebrew text. With this emendation the closing line, as defined by the two critics last named, shows the familiar meter 3-2 once more. Verse 15 then reads:

Let the words of my mouth be acceptable	and the meditation of my heart
Before thee continually, O Jehovah,	my rock and my redeemer.

The scheme of the lament thus runs from verse 8 into or through verse 14, and even into or through verse 15.

It was assumed by de Wette—and the argument has been taken

* So likewise Nowack.

up by Hupfeld, Ewald in the third edition, Reuss and others since—that the difference in rhythm or poetical scheme indicates diversity of authorship. But analogy does not bear out this assumption. Other Psalms, of which the unity is unquestioned, show this poetical form in a part only, just as in Psalm xix, and not throughout. In Ps. lxxv, the verses 6–9 are a unit in thought and form a complete division in the treatment of the theme; these verses, but not the rest of the poem, follow this scheme (Delitzsch, Budde). Ps. lxxxiv consists of two parts: the blessedness of intimate communion with God (verses 2–8, English 1–7) and a prayer by the Psalmist that he may share in this communion (verses 9–13). The former part runs in the lamentation measure, except its last verse, according to Budde (striking out “where she may lay her young,” v. 4, *Z. A. T. W.*, 1882, p. 40). Truly, then, the fact that a portion of a Psalm, even when forming a unit of thought, is distinguished from the rest of the poem by running in this measure is not in itself an evidence of diverse authorship.

Furthermore, Hupfeld, or his editor, even after he had Delitzsch’s commentary in his hands, was able to detect the scheme in Ps. xix in verses 8–11 only. Riehm discovered in verses 12–15 not the lamentation measure, but the recurrence of the structure which prevails in the first part of the Psalm; and Grätz, so late as 1882, declares that “the last three verses of the prayer neglect the [lamentation] form entirely.” Delitzsch and Budde, and others in their train, are right in comprehending all or practically all of the second part of the Psalm under one structural scheme of verse; yet at the same time Hupfeld, Riehm and Grätz are clearly right in their perception of a difference between verses 8–11 and verses 12–15. Ewald had also felt something of this difference. The structure of the verse still follows the lamentation scheme, but the rhythm has perceptibly changed. The change is perceptible even to readers of the English version. While all can be embraced under the scheme of the lament, yet the praise of Jehovah’s law has its own measure. This allotment of a distinct measure to each theme is significant. It recalls the suggestion of de Wette’s friend that the change in style between the first and second parts of the Psalm might be due to the radical change of subject. Moreover, the change of measure with theme does not mark this portion of the Psalm only, but characterizes the whole poem, and recurs constantly throughout. Each minor theme has its own measure, probably without conscious effort on the poet’s part; each change of thought is invariably accompanied by change in the form of the

verse; and the keynote of the characteristic scheme of the second part of the Psalm is struck in the first part, in verses 4 and 5. Notice that even the slight change from verses 8-10 to the summarizing statement in verse 11 is subtly inarked, while yet the lamentation scheme is retained.

Eight ordinary lines or members of the verse.	{	Verse 2	4	{	The heavens as a whole by day and night proclaim God's glory.
			4		
		3	4		
			4		
		4	4	{	The proclamation described: inarticulate and inaudible, yet world-wide.
			3		
5	4				
	3				
Six ordinary lines or members.	{		4	{	The sun's tabernacle and exuberant strength.
		6	4		
			4		
		7	3	{	The sun's dominion.
			3 or 2		
			3		
Eight long lines broken by the cæsure.	{		8 3-2	{	Jehovah's law enthusiastically described.
			3-2		
			9 3-2		
			3-2		
		10	3-2	{	Summarizing statement.
			3-2		
11	2-2*				
	2-2†				
Six long lines broken by the cæsure.	{		12 4-3	{	The psalmist in relation to Jehovah's law and to Jehovah his Redeemer.
			13 3-2		
			14 4-3		
			3-2		
		15†	4-2		
			2-2		

Further, if the fifteenth verse be included as an integral part of the Psalm, as is generally done—and even though it be a liturgical formula, the author himself could employ it as a fitting conclusion to his own poem (Olshausen)—then each division of the first

* The part before the cæsura is much longer than the part after it. But as the text is conjecturally restored by D. H. Müller (*Strophenbau*, p. 60), the meter is still 3-2, 3-2, thus:

The statutes of Jehovah are desirable	beyond gold and fine gold,
His words are sweeter than honey	and the droppings of the comb.

† The part before the cæsura is slightly longer than the part after it.

‡ As traditionally accented, 6-4. Delitzsch, by removing the athnach accent to the preceding word, obtains two lines, 4-2 and 2-2. If the text is emended, the last line may become 3-2.

part bears a numerical relation to the corresponding division of the second part. Fourteen ordinary short lines or verse-members in the first part, just the same number of long cæsural lines in the second part; and each division of fourteen lines is subdivided into two sections, one of eight and the other of six lines. These two phenomena, namely, of a subtle change of rhythm with each subtle change of theme and the numerical relations between the two parts, go far to prove that two fragments were not put together; but that, if the first part is a fragment, the second part was written for it, in view of its structure, to be its conclusion, and was matched to it. These phenomena not only serve reasonably to narrow down the theories in regard to the origin of the Psalm to two, namely, a fragment furnished with a new conclusion or a composition by one author throughout, but they remove all need for the former hypothesis.

And now in regard to the date.

It will be recalled that Ewald assigned the first six verses of the nineteenth Psalm to David, and the remaining eight verses to a poet of a later age. The evidence of lateness he discerned in the decline in poetic vigor, in the Psalmist's appreciation for the law and apprehension of its spirituality; in his anxiety lest he be seduced or driven to sin by the presumptuous, and in the art of the verse: four distinct indications of a date not earlier than the eighth or seventh centuries, or, as Ewald said in his second edition, the seventh century, or, as in his third edition, the seventh or sixth century before Christ.

DECLINE IN POETIC VIGOR.

Ewald's argument from the loss of vigor is characteristic of him. Vigor and sublimity in a Psalm form one of his criteria for Davidic authorship, and lack of them is evidence of the decadent age in Hebrew poetry which he defined as included in the seventh and sixth centuries. There is an element of truth in these criteria in general, but Ewald failed to make out a case in the nineteenth Psalm. Hitzig, whose criticism of the Psalms was governed by the same tests as Ewald's, found no evidence of deterioration in the nineteenth Psalm, and unhesitatingly accepted its unity and Davidic authorship. Maurer and von Lengerke, who agreed with Ewald in dating the second part about the time of the exile, felt no force in Ewald's contention that the second part is inferior to the first in point of vigor; and with Hitzig they held to the unity of the Psalm, and accounted for difference in tone and rhythm by the difference of

theme. Hupfeld, who like Ewald assigned the two parts of the Psalm to different authors and dates, based no argument on the inferiority of one part to the other. Ewald's contention that an essential loss of vigor is observable in the second part of the nineteenth Psalm, a decline in power which is an indication of date, has made no impression upon criticism. It dropped at once out of sight; evidently not because of critical prejudice, but simply because there was nothing in it.

APPRECIATION FOR JEHOVAH'S LAW.

A second indication of lateness Ewald, as already mentioned, found in the high regard for the written law and the apprehension of its spirituality. This argument is important. Probably one does not go too far in asserting that it is the supreme argument, to which all else is subsidiary. It derives its force from the criticism of the Pentateuch. Until the close of the eighteenth century the nineteenth Psalm was commonly regarded as Davidic. It was not universally ascribed to the poet-king; Paulus, for example, suggested Solomon as its author. But the denial of the Psalm to David was an individual matter. It did not divide critics into two camps. Over against believers in the Davidic authorship of the Psalm there was no opposing party standing for a definite poet or for a certain historical period, organized by a tangible principle of opposition, fighting under one standard. But with the dawn of the nineteenth century the unifying principle emerged out of Pentateuchal criticism. In 1805 de Wette was advocating the dating of Genesis in the reign of David, and Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah. Soon afterward Ewald, with firmer grasp of the material, dated large portions of Genesis likewise in the early period of the monarchy, and assigned the Book of Deuteronomy and the completion of the Hexateuch to the second half of Manasseh's reign, or about 660 B.C. This critical position soon reflected itself in the criticism of the Psalms. Ewald ascribed to David the first part of the nineteenth Psalm and the eighth Psalm, which take up the theme of the first chapter of Genesis and sing the glory of the Creator; but the prayer in the second part of the nineteenth Psalm indicates that the written law in all its parts was observed. To what date does this fact point? Now the priestly ritual of Leviticus had, according to Ewald, ardent defenders and eulogists at the beginning of the monarchy; and appreciation for the moral law and the apprehension of its spirituality come to fine expression in the Book of Deuteronomy. The author of Deuteronomy, according to Ewald,

was likewise the final reviser of the entire Pentateuch and Joshua, and wrote about the year 660 before Christ, in the second half of Manasseh's reign. With this conception of Hebrew history Ewald naturally, or rather necessarily, dates the second part of the nineteenth Psalm after the commencement of the eighth century, or, on maturer thought, after the opening of the seventh century, or even in the sixth century. The *terminus a quo* was thought by many to have been found. It remained fixed, with unessential modifications, just so long as the great divisive critics held that Deuteronomy was the latest part of the Pentateuch. So Maurer in 1838, because of the reference to the written law, concluded that the Psalm, verses 2-15 inclusive, was composed about the time of the exile. Von Lengerke regarded it as pre-exilic; and, speaking generally, he considered it a product of the literary revival of the seventh century which accompanied the newly awakened appreciation for the law (S. xvii and xxvii). "Pentateuchal criticism," he says, "affords the surest guarantee for the correctness of our result."

The *terminus ad quem* was, of course, not established; and Justus Olshausen in 1853, on other grounds than its reference to the written law, declared the poem to be post-exilic.

But a new school of Pentateuchal criticism arose. The relative ages of the Levitical law and Deuteronomy were reversed, the priestly development was placed after the prophetic, the document heretofore known as the older Elohist ceased to be regarded as ancient, and the Pentateuch was declared not to have received its final form until after the exile. At once the eighth Psalm and the first part of the nineteenth were dated, conformably to the new view of Gen. i, in the post-exilic period (cp. Kuenen; Wellhausen on Ps. viii; Cheyne, *Origin*, p. 201); and the second part of the nineteenth Psalm, by reason of the praise of the law, must belong to the same late date (Kuenen, 1865; Grätz, 1882; Cheyne, 1889, p. 202, 238; cp. Nowack).

This particular argument for a late date might be met in one of two ways: either by referring to the defense of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or else, while granting the premises of the divisive critics and accepting the dates assigned by them to the several hypothetical documents, by attempting to show that even these presuppositions do not necessitate a late date for the Psalm. Riehm adopted the latter method. De Wette, Ewald, Maurer, and Riehm himself held to the Davidic authorship of 2 Sam. xxii, that is Psalm xviii. By pointing to verses 23, 24 and 31 (22, 23 and 30, English enumeration) of that Psalm, Riehm was able to

show an appreciation for the law and an apprehension of its spirituality by David himself no less keen than is expressed in the nineteenth Psalm. Granting that Deuteronomy was a product of the seventh century, nevertheless evidence was at hand, in the eighteenth Psalm, that the praise of the law had been in men's hearts and on their lips several centuries earlier. Nowack made an ineffectual rejoinder; one indeed that was quite unnecessary, since the ground on which Riehm stood had been swept from under his feet. The Davidic authorship of the eighteenth Psalm, beyond possibly its substratum, was denied, largely for the reason that its diction has affinities with the vocabulary of Deuteronomy, and because it contains praise of the law. Advocates of a late date for Deuteronomy were coming to advocate an equally late or yet later date for both the eighteenth and the nineteenth Psalms.

Riehm's argument, however, though antiquated for the use for which it was intended, has renewed value in the debate with the most modern school of critics. Kuenen, Grätz and Cheyne regard the eighteenth Psalm as pre-exilic. Accordingly, so far as the praise of the law is concerned, the nineteenth Psalm also may have been in existence before the exile. Professor Cheyne sees this. "Even if not Davidic, may not this fragment [Ps. xix. 8-11] belong to the Josian age—to those halcyon days which followed the publication of the first Scripture? This is at least plausible. If a Josian poet wrote Ps. xviii. 21-24 and 31, why should he not have written Ps. xix. 8-11?" (*Origin of the Psalter*, p. 238). The signs are not wanting, however, that even this ground is about to be swept away. Professor Cheyne adds to his discussion the significant remark: "This at any rate [between 621 and 608 B.C.] is the earliest possible date [for the eighteenth Psalm]. I accept it not without much hesitation, and I cannot complain if some prefer to regard the Psalm as an imaginative work of the exile" (*Origin*, p. 206); and Wellhausen claims that "the [eighteenth] Psalm was written in the later days of Judaism."

But if there is likelihood that the eighteenth Psalm will be declared to be a post-exilic production, there remains the Book of Deuteronomy, which was found in the temple during the reign of Josiah. "Certainly, Deuteronomy is a 'rich and varied handbook,' not perhaps unworthy even of such a glowing eulogy" as is contained in the nineteenth Psalm. "'It sought to place the whole moral and spiritual life upon a new basis'" (Cheyne, *Origin*, p. 238). In a section admittedly as early as Josiah's reign, chapters v to xxvi or xii to xxvi, it lays emphasis on the spirituality of the laws

and urgently insists upon their observance. Ps. xix. 8-15 breathes the same spirit, and may likewise be pre-exilic. So, too, as in these verses, the value of heart religion was appreciated by Jeremiah in the same age (vii. 23; xxxi. 33, 34; xxxii. 40; xxxiii. 8). And long before Jeremiah's time welfare to the body at least was talked of as a reward for keeping Jehovah's commandments and statutes (Ex. xv. 26J); and in the Decalogue itself the spirituality of the laws was clearly intimated and their pertinence to the desires as well as to the acts of men was laid bare (Ex. xx. 17).^{*} Surely the Psalmist's praise of the written law and his consciousness of its relation to the inner life as well as to the conduct of men do not involve that the Psalm was composed after the exile. Verses 8-15 may have been sung in the first temple.

THE ALLUSION TO THE PRESUMPTUOUS.

The suggestion was hazarded that this praise of the law is the main argument for a late date, and that on examination all others will be found to be subsidiary. Ewald brought forward a third matter as evidence of the late origin of the Psalm, as will be remembered. He argued from the reference to the presumptuous or arrogant:

Guard thy servant from the arrogant,
That they may not have dominion over him.

Now the word has often been rendered by presumption or presumptuous sins; but it may be translated presumptuous men, and it is contended that the historic situation may then be judged from a similar allusion in Ps. v. 6:

The arrogant shall not stand in thy sight,
Thou hatest all workers of iniquity.

Rudinger, in the year 1580, arguing from verse 11 of the fifth Psalm, concluded that the arrogant of verse 6 are the rebels under the leadership of Absalom. In Ps. lxxxvi. 14, where the same word occurs, Rosenmüller understood David to refer to Saul and his court. De Wette, making the comparison between Ps. v and xix, judged the arrogant who are mentioned in Ps. v. 6 to be perhaps

^{*} The book of the covenant, with the ten commandments, had been long in existence. As a law book it consists of formal precepts, and does not give expression to admiration of the goodness and wholesomeness of the laws, and only incidentally or, as some critics contend, not originally to the motive of love. Yet even so, how long must it be before thoughtful, earnest men in Israel would begin to appreciate the moral grandeur of the Decalogue and to discover the beneficent effect upon man of keeping Jehovah's law?

national enemies. He quoted Gürtler as holding a similar opinion in regard to these arrogant ones, and as referring the fifth Psalm to the time of persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes. He also cited the view of Ferrandus that the arrogant enemies of Ps. v are the Babylonians. But de Wette made no attempt to date the nineteenth Psalm. Ewald understood the Psalmist to refer to the strong party among the people, toward the end of the seventh century, who were indifferent to religion and frivolous, and neglected the temple partly from disdain for it and partly from an evil conscience.

From these various ascriptions it is obvious that an allusion to the presumptuous affords a basis of but doubtful value in seeking to determine the date of a Psalm. If the approximate time of the poem's composition is first known, an allusion to the presumptuous can aid in bringing the date within narrower limits. But in itself it is not determinative. It can be adjusted to different periods of the history: to mention only those already proposed, to the time of David, to the seventh and sixth centuries, to the persecutions under Antiochus Epiphanes. Maurer and von Lengerke quietly dropped this argument, and relied upon the reference to the written law; while Olshausen frankly confessed that if each Psalm is considered by itself, an allusion in it to oppression by the enemy may be adjusted to any one of several calamities which befell Israel in the course of centuries. But Olshausen did not allow the matter to rest in uncertainty. He had already appropriated the theory that the speaker in the Psalms does not represent an individual, but is a personification of the Church or nation; and he now proceeded to group the Psalms containing references to enemies. His predecessors had done so in part, Ewald, for example, in his argument on the date of the nineteenth Psalm, had referred to the frequent occurrence of a similar prayer in other Psalms which he assigned to the seventh and sixth centuries. But Olshausen groups all the Psalms which contain a prayer or a complaint or a thanksgiving concerning the enemies of the congregation. Two classes of foes are mentioned in these Psalms; and with the light of all focused in one beam, "it becomes clear that the Psalmist is not concerned with merely a struggle of Israel with foreign foes, with the heathen, but along with the conflict goes the struggle of Israel with godless and dangerous men within the nation itself, with apostates; so that while Israel as a people is opposing hostile foreign powers the loyal congregation of the pious is opposing hostile fellow-countrymen." Taking this comprehensive view, "it

cannot for a moment be doubtful," says Olshausen, "that the nation was so situated but once in its history, so far as we know, namely in the times beginning with the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes" (pp. 6, 7). This classification includes the nineteenth Psalm. But the principle of grouping thus introduced by Olshausen, although it has been enthusiastically adopted and developed by Prof. Cheyne, is, we believe, essentially vicious, prejudging the date of individual Psalms and proving itself fallacious when applied to the literature of other peoples. We might as well group Charles Wesley's hymn of 1749:

Soldiers of Christ, arise,
And put your armor on,
Strong in the strength which God supplies
Through His Eternal Son,

with Baring-Gould's hymn of 1865:

Onward, Christian soldiers,
Marching as to war,
With the cross of Jesus
Going on before:
Christ the Royal Master
Leads against the foe;
Forward into battle,
See His banners go,

and insist that they had their birth together. Or we might compare "Art thou weary, art thou languid?" by Stephen of St. Sabas, 725-794, with its translation by the Rev. John Mason Neale in 1862, and again insist that the conditions which gave birth to the one could not exist one thousand years later, to make the same encouragement timely. Or we might place Ps. xlv side by side with Luther's imitation of it, "Ein' feste Burg," and declare that both must be the product of the same age. As Prof. Robertson has stated it: "Neither individuals nor nations have the habit of exhausting a subject at one time and never recurring to it" (*Poetry and Religion of the Psalms*, pp. 51-56).

Olshausen's contention did not prevail with his contemporaries. Perhaps it influenced Ewald to defend his own position; for in the third edition of his commentary, in presenting his argument anew for assigning the Psalm to the period covered by the seventh and sixth centuries, he adds that the fear of seduction or compulsion to heathenism "increased still more when the new Jerusalem was actually under the domination of the heathen." Hupfeld was uninfluenced by Olshausen's argument; he reverted to de Wette's

comparison of the several parts of the second half of the Psalm with the late Ps. cxix; and on the basis of the relationship between these two Psalms, taken in connection with the general subject of verses 8-15, he merely held this section of the nineteenth Psalm to be later than the first section. Riehm, in editing Hupfeld's work in 1868, greatly weakened a part of the argument by pointing out the obvious fact that Ps. cxix may echo Ps. xix.*

Up to this last date those who rejected the Davidic authorship of the nineteenth Psalm were not compelled to assign it to a later period than Ewald had done. "The presumptuous ones" did not stand in their way. It was the rise of the Graf-Wellhausen school and the convenience, in accordance with its premises, of dating the praise of the law and the knowledge of Gen. i in the period after the exile that made it necessary to locate "the presumptuous ones" also after the exile. And so Reuss, Grätz, Wellhausen, Duhm. The argument ultimately rests, not upon the allusion to the arrogant, but on the theory that Israel's higher religious life came late in time. And the debate has been conducted it will be observed, without calling in question the translation "presumptuous ones" rather than "presumptuous sins."

THE RHYTHMIC MEASURE.

The rhythmic measure of the second part is urged as evidence that the Psalm is a late composition. According to Baethgen, "that this metrical form [the so-called lamentation strophe] has been employed for a subject to which according to its origin it is unsuitable is evidence that the second part belongs to a later age." The assumption that originally the measure was used in laments only calls for no remark here. It has no pertinence to the argument. Two other questions, however, are prompted by Baethgen's assertion: first, how ancient is the custom of employing this scheme for the lament? and second, how early was this scheme adopted for other themes than the lament? In regard to the first of these questions Budde himself, the chief investigator of the lamentation measure, in the article already cited, expresses his conviction that the scheme was employed for the lament in hoary antiquity, reaching back before the time of David (p. 44). As to the second question, which is the all-important one in the determination of the

* The relationship of verses 8-15 with Ps. cxix has also been urged by Baethgen as a reason for regarding the nineteenth Psalm as post-exilic. When, however, his argument as a whole is examined, it is found that his other premises have compelled him to accept a post-exilic date.

date of the nineteenth Psalm, Budde cites examples of the adoption of the scheme for other themes in pre-exilic times. In the Book of Nahum, written, as all scholars agree, between 664 and 607 B.C., in chapter ii. 1-3, Hebrew enumeration, are "seven tolerable verses" in this measure, although "the sense is little suited to a lamentation, being a threat of punishment for Assyria and at the same time a promise for Israel." A yet earlier passage, Hosea vi. 7-11a, admittedly penned during the eighth century B.C., is cited by Budde. It is an accusation laid against the people, yet is constructed according to the lamentation scheme; verses 7 and 8 being such just as they stand, and verses 9 to 11a becoming such by a mere change of the Masoretic accents. Budde's list of examples from pre-exilic literature, of which two have been mentioned, may be increased. Women welcomed Saul and David on their return from the slaughter of the Philistines with song and dance and the music of timbrels, singing one to another:

Saul has slain his thousands,
And David his ten thousands.

This antiphonal song of triumph is cast in the measure of the lament: three words are in the first member, two in the second; and the predicate verb is in the first. In the didactic ode of Moses (Deut. xxxii), the prevalent measure, which consists of lines containing two members of equal length, is ultimately, after the premonitory note has been thrice sounded, in verses 24, 25, 27, interrupted to give place to six consecutive verses in the lamentation measure, verses 28-32a. And in the Blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii), the benediction of Levi is almost entirely in lines of the lament. Now these three passages are admittedly pre-exilic. The Blessing of Moses is agreed to be at least as early as the passage cited by Budde from Hosea, probably earlier. The account of the welcome of Saul and David is commonly regarded as earlier still. It is thus quite evident that the scheme of verse which appears in the second part of the nineteenth Psalm was not uncommonly used for other purposes than the lament during a long period of the history. A didactic poem might be composed in this measure after the exile, certainly. Its use in didactic and emotional writings before the exile is fully attested, and is definitely traced back well toward the time of David. The nineteenth Psalm cannot be dated by an appeal to this measure.

In recent years two more arguments have been put forward as grounds for regarding the nineteenth Psalm as a late product of the literary activity of the Hebrews.

THE DICTION.

It is argued that the language of the nineteenth Psalm betrays a late date. For example, Kuenen, speaking of the second part, or perhaps of the whole ode, says that verses 8-15 agree "both in language and the choice of words with the younger portions of the Psalter (comp. Pss. i, cxix)"; seeming to imply that they do not agree in either of these respects with the literature older than the exile, for he dates Pss. i and cxix about the time of Ezra (*Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek, derde Deel*, Blz. 281, 303). So sweeping an assertion would, however, be quite unwarranted; for with three exceptions* the root, and in most cases the form also, of every word in the Psalm are attested as in use among the Hebrews before the exile by their occurrence in literature that is universally admitted to belong to the early period. Wellhausen describes the situation somewhat differently from Kuenen and, combining two matters, says: "The language and contents agree in proving that both portions [of the Psalm] belong to the same late period." But Baethgen is definite. "A couple of strong Aramaisms in the first part (verses 3, 5) make it advisable not to date this part either before the time of Job." With less restraint as to the date, but with equal moderation regarding the diction, Prof. Cheyne says that "the Aramaism *hiwwah*, not to urge *rakia'*, confirms the natural view that this Psalm of creation is post-exilic" (*Book of Psalms*, ed. of 1904, Vol. I, p. 75).

Of these three words, which are looked upon as indications of the date of the poem, *rakia'*, firmament, is used in the first chapter of Genesis, so that the argument advanced really rests upon the date which is assigned to that chapter. At any rate, however, "both the idea and the root are good Hebrew" (Cheyne, *Origin*, p. 468), the root being found in pre-exilic literature (2 Sam. xxii. 43; Jer. x. 9) and belonging to the common Semitic stock (Dillmann on Gen. i. 1). The two other words are characterized as Aramaisms. Regarding *millah*, word, to which Baethgen evidently refers, its root occurs as a verb in Ps. cvi. 2, and is there commented on by Giesebrecht as follows: "*Millel*, speak, which one were inclined to regard as an

* The exceptions are *hiwwah*, *naba'*, and *shegi'oth*. Of the last-mentioned word Prof. Cheyne has said: "*Shegagah* occurs seventeen times in P. C. (Lev., Num., Josh.), twice in Eccles., but also in 1 Sam. xiv. 24 Sept. (see Driver, *ad loc.*). The latter passage at any rate, if we accept it as genuine, is pre-exilic. We may assume, therefore, that both *shegagah* and its synonym *shegi'ah* are early" (*Origin*, p. 468). Compare also *shagah*, Is. xxviii. 7, before 702 B.C., according to Prof. Cheyne; and its noun in Gen. xliii. 12 J. Another of the exceptions, the verb *naba'*, occurs in Prov. xv. 2, 28; xviii. 4, in one of the two sections of the book expressly assigned to Solomon.

Aramaism, is found outside of Job and Proverbs in Gen. xxi. 7 also, in a Jehovistic connection" (Z. A. T. W., 1881, S. 296). Accordingly the word was in use among the Hebrews as early as the eighth century before Christ. The noun itself is found in "the last words of David" (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), a poem assigned by Prof. Cheyne to the age of Josiah (*Origin*, p. 69). It is the remaining word *hiwwah*, show forth, which Drs. Baethgen and Cheyne concur in regarding as an Aramaism. This verb is of frequent occurrence in Aramaic. In Hebrew it is met outside of this Psalm in the Book of Job only. It is common to several Semitic languages; it belongs to the Semitic stock. How late, then, is the Hebrew literature in which it occurs? Let us see.

It is known that influences were at work in the northern part of Palestine, during the entire period of its occupancy by the Hebrews, to keep alive among the people, or to introduce among them, words which were prominent in the Aramaic vocabulary. The evidence of this fact is furnished by the song of Deborah and the writings of the northern prophets Hosea and Jonah. That this same influence was strong in the southern part of the land for half a century or more before the exile is commonly admitted, and is abundantly evident in the pages of Jeremiah and Habakkuk. That it was felt still earlier is witnessed by such proper names as Asa, king of Judah, and Ishvi, son of King Saul; Migron, a village of Benjamin, and Jattir, a town of Judah, and Eshtaol in the lowland; by a verb like *millel* and a noun like *shalit*.* In each of these cases the word or its root is a common Aramaic term, not known in Hebrew literature or only in Psalms and the later Hebrew writings; and yet a sporadic occurrence like *shalit* in Gen. xlii. 6 and *millel* in Gen. xxi. 7 and many proper names betray the fact that such words were on the lips of the people of Judah and were used in their daily life as early as at least the eighth century before Christ, and even in many in-

* Asa, the name of a great king of Judah and also of a Levite resident in Judah, is the only trace in Hebrew of the well-known Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew *rapha'*, to heal. The name Ishvi contains a root common in the Aramaic and not unknown in northern Israel (Hos. x. 1); but the only evidence that it was ever used by people in Judah and its vicinity is afforded by the name of Saul's son and by the song of David (2 Sam. xxii. 34). The root of Migron is found in the Aramaic, but is not met with in Hebrew literature, outside of the Psalms and Ezekiel; yet in the name Migron it was familiar to the Hebrews from the time of David onward. The name of the town Jattir is an Aramaic adjective, meaning excellent; and, though not found as such in any Hebrew writing, was in the mouth of the people. Similarly Eshtaol is a fine Aramaic form, with the final vowel modified according to the Hebrew habit of pronunciation. The occurrence of the word *shalit*, ruler, in Gen. xlii. 6, E and of course JE, is the sole witness to the existence of this common Aramaic word in early Hebrew.

stances in the times of David. It is not necessary to inquire whether they were importations from the Aramæans or were survivals of the old vocabulary common to the two peoples. Such words were actually there in those early days before the exile, however they came to be there. They were within reach of the literary man, if he had occasion to resort to them.

The Psalmist had such occasion now. While singing his hymn, and while yet unfolding his first thought, he had practically exhausted the ordinary synonyms of two words; and he was obliged to draw upon terms of rarer use in literature. He had already employed the verbs declare, show and utter; and he needed another verb of similar meaning. The poverty of the English language is revealed by the fact that the translators repeat the word show. The Hebrew poet was able to give expression to the same idea in a fourth form, *hiwwah*, belonging to the common Semitic stock. He had also used speech, words, voice, line; he required yet another noun of the same import and found it at hand, although common in Aramaic, among his own people in their use of the root *millel*. And it does not escape attention that a poet is using language; and poetry is conspicuous in the literature of all peoples by reason of its fondness for rare expressions. It is clear from this exposition that the diction of the nineteenth Psalm shows the same characteristics as does Hebrew literature generally for a century and a half before the exile—features of which traces are found in yet earlier examples of the Hebrew language—and moreover in the case of the nineteenth Psalm the reason for the choice of words is at once evident.

THE LITERARY REVIVAL OF HEBREW MYTHOLOGY.

It is asserted that Ps. xix. 2-7 belongs "to that literary revival of Hebrew mythology during and after the exile of which the Books of Job and to some extent Jonah are monuments." "The swift-running hero Shemesh," the sun, a fine myth "debased by unholy association," was "transfigured," and was thus reclaimed "from superstition to the service of the Most High" (Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 202).

It is true that on certain private interpretations there are not a few mythological allusions in Hebrew writings which are assigned by the Graf-Wellhausen school to the exile and the succeeding period. Leviathan and Rahab are possible examples.

But are no similar allusions found in the literature of pre-exilic days? In Prof. Cheyne's opinion cherubim and seraphim are

mythological creations for the storm cloud and the lightning, and both find place in pre-exilic literature (Gen. iii. 24, J; 2 Sam. xx. 11, pre-exilic according to Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 193, and cp. p. 205 on the cherub; Isa. vi. 2). In "a pre-exilic song-book called 'The Book of the Upright,'" Joshua addresses the sun as though it were a living object, and "speaks almost as if he had Ps. xix. 6 in his mind" (Cheyne, *Origin*, pp. 192, 221). Prof. Cheyne should be among the last to cite a mythological allusion in a Psalm as cogent evidence for a post-exilic date. Moreover, the prophet Amos (ix. 3) makes a poetic allusion to the serpent which Prof. Gunkel interprets as the dragon Tiamat of Babylonian myth (*Schöpfung u. Chaos*, S. 81); and Deborah in her "ancient song" may perhaps be subsidizing a phrase of current speech, in which a reminiscence of heathen notions lingered, when she poetically describes the stars from their courses fighting against Sisera (Judg. v. 20). At any rate her description of the stars as fighting from their courses parallels the Psalmist's description of the sun going forth as a bridegroom and rejoicing as a runner. The prophetess refers to the sun also in words like unto the Psalmist's when she says: "Be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might" (Judg. v. 31). There should, therefore, be no denial by Prof. Cheyne of at least a willingness on the part of a Hebrew poet who lived before the exile to borrow beautiful imagery from exploded mythology, and to employ figures which still remained current in popular speech. General features of this sort, even assuming that their origin lies in mythology, afford no evidence that a Psalm is a late production.

But why find mythology in the nineteenth Psalm? For one to speak of the tabernacle of the sun is not to give credence to mythology. The phrase "to set a tabernacle" means, without a figure, to provide a dwelling, or assign a place (Alexander; comp. 1 Sam. xiii. 2=home); and it may have this meaning in the Psalm. At most the expression springs from a naïve conception of the universe which lingered in current speech. More probably both it and the comparison of the sun to a radiant bridegroom and to a runner exulting in his strength and endurance are but poetic imagery. But to whatever source the reference to the sun's tabernacle is due, it proceeds from the same mental trait which led the Hebrews to speak of the foundations of the earth (Jer. xxxi. 37; Mic. vi. 2) and the windows of heaven (Gen. vii. 11; 2 Kings vii. 2), of the chambers which Jehovah hath builded for himself in the heavens (Amos ix. 6) and the treasures whence he bringeth forth the wind (Jer. x

13), of the wings of the wind (Hos. iv. 19) and the wings of the sun (Mal. iii. 20=iv. 2, English version). Whether these allusions are traced to myth, or to a naïve conception of the universe, or to poetic imagination, they are all found in pre-exilic literature, with the exception of the citation from Malachi, as will be noticed; and as already noted, the figure by which the sun is spoken of as going forth in might is as old as the "ancient song" of Deborah; so that again it becomes clear that features of this sort furnish no criterion for adjudging a late date to the Psalm.

The crucial arguments against the pre-exilic origin of the nineteenth Psalm which have been advanced during the century of modern Biblical criticism have now been examined. There appears to be no sound reason for denying that this fine hymn had a place in the Psalter of the first temple. That it had this place is sufficiently declared by its ancient title.

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.