LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOURTH SERIES.

VOL. XXIX.

Delitzsch's Commentary on the Psalms.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXX.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, . . . SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE PSALMS.

BY

FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, LEIPSIC.

Translated from the German
(FROM THE SECOND EDITION, REVISED THROUGHOUT)

BY THE

REV. FRANCIS BOLTON, B.A.,
PRIZEMAN IN HEBREW AND NEW TESTAMENT GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXX.

PREFACE.

SEVEN whole years have passed since the publication of my *Commentar über den Psalter* (2 vols. 1859–60), and during this period large and important contributions have been made towards the exposition of the Psalms. Of Hupfeld's Commentary the last two volumes (vol. iii., 1860; vol. iv., 1862) have appeared since the completion of my own. Hitzig's (1835–36) has appeared in a new form (2 vols., 1863–65), enriched by the fruit of nearly thirty years' progressive study. And the Commentary of Ewald has taken the field for the third time (1866), with proud words scorning down all fellow-workers, in order that all honour may be given to itself alone. In addition to these, Böttcher's *Neue Kritische Aehrenlese*, issued by Mühlau after the author's death, has furnished valuable contributions towards the exposition of the Psalms (Abth. 2, 1864); Von Ortenberg in the department of textual criticism (*Zur Textkritik der Psalmen*, 1861), and Kurtz in that of theology (*Zur Theologie der Psalmen*, in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift*, 1864–65), have promoted the interpretation of the Psalms; and side by side with these, Böhl's *Zwölf Messianische Psalmen* ("Twelve Messianic Psalms," 1862) and Kamphausen's exposition of the Psalms in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk* (1863) also claim attention.

I had therefore no lack of external inducements for the revision of my own Commentary; but I was also not unconscious of its defects. Despite all this, Hupfeld's inconsiderate and condemnatory judgment caused me pain. In an essay

on the faithful representation of the text of the Old Testament according to the Masora (*Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1863) I incidentally gave expression to this feeling. On the 20th of October 1863 Hupfeld wrote to me, "I have only just seen your complaint of my judgment at the close of my work on the Psalms. The complaint is so gentle in its tone, it partakes so little of the bitterness of my verdict, and at the same time strikes chords that are not yet deadened within me, and which have not yet forgotten how to bring back the echo of happier times of common research and to revive the feeling of gratitude for faithful companionship, that it has touched my heart and conscience." He closes his letter with the hope that he may one day have an opportunity of expressing publicly how that harsh and untempered judgment is now repugnant to his own feelings. Up to the present time I have made no use whatever of this letter. I regarded it as a private matter between ourselves. Since, however, Riehm has transferred that judgment unaltered to the second edition of the first volume of the Commentary of Hupfeld, I owe it not to myself alone, but also to him who is since deceased, to explain that this has not been done in accordance with his wish.

Hitzig's new Commentary has been of the greatest service to me in the revision and re-working of my own. In it I found mine uniformly taken into account from beginning to end, either with or without direct mention, and subjected to severe but kindly-disposed criticism; and here and there not without a ready recognition of the scientific advance which could not but be observed in it. In comparison with such an unmerciful judgment as that which Hupfeld pronounced upon me, and which Ewald a few years later with very similar language pronounced upon him, I here met with reasonable criticism of the matter, and, notwithstanding the full consciousness of the thoroughly original inquirer, an appreciation of the toil bestowed by others upon their work.

I am the more encouraged to hope that all those who do not

hold scientific love of truth and progress to be the exclusive privilege of their own tendencies, will find in this new thoroughly revised edition of my Commentary much that is instructive, and much that is more correctly apprehended. The fact that I have still further pressed the Oriental learning of Fleischer and Wetzstein into the service of Biblical science will not be unwelcome to my readers. But that I have also laid Jewish investigators under contribution is due to my desire to see the partition wall between Synagogue and Church broken down. The exposition of Scripture has not only to serve the Church of the present, but also to help in building up the Church of the future. In this spirit I commend the present work to the grace and blessing of the God of the history of redemption.

DELITZSCH

ERLANGEN, 7*th July* 1867.

NOTE ON יהוה.

Jahve is (1) the traditional pronunciation, and (2) the pronunciation to be presupposed in accordance with the laws of formation and of vowel sounds. It is the traditional, for Theodoret and Epiphanius transcribe *Ἰαβέ*. The mode of pronunciation *Ἀϊά* (not *Ἰαβά*), on the contrary, is the reproduction of the form of the name יה, and the mode of pronunciation *Ἰαώ* of the form of the name יהו, which although occurring only in the Old Testament in composition, had once, according to traces that can be relied on, an independent existence. Also the testimonies of the Talmud and post-talmudical writings require the final sound to be ־ָה, and the corresponding name by which God calls Himself, אֶהְיֶה, is authentic security for this ending. When it is further con-

sidered that יָהֲוֶ (whence יָהוּ) according to analogous contractions has grown out of יַהֲוֶה, and not out of יַהֲוָה, and that the Hebrew language exhibits no proof of any transition from ה֫ to ה֗ which would not at the same time be a transition from the masculine to the feminine, it must be conceded that the pronunciation *Jahve* is to be regarded as the original pronunciation. The mode of pronunciation *Jehova* has only come up within the last three hundred years; our own "*Jahavā*" [in the first edition] was an innovation. We now acknowledge the patristic *Ἰαβέ*, and hope to have another opportunity of substantiating in detail what is maintained in this prefatory note.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

Any justification of the retention of the exact orthography of the author, explained above, ought to be needless. The *J* has been retained, inasmuch as this representative of the Hebrew *Jod* or *Yod* is become thoroughly naturalized in our Scripture names although wrongly pronounced (compare as an exception to this the *y* sound of the *j* in the word "Hallelujah," which may perhaps be accounted for by the Greek form of the word adopted in our version of the New Testament). Although the quiescent final *h* (*He*) has been, with Dr. Delitzsch, omitted here, it is still retained in other Scripture names in accordance with the customary orthography.

The Hebrew numbering of the verses is followed in the text of each Psalm, and in the references generally. In a few instances only, where the difference between the Hebrew and the English divisions might prove perplexing to the English reader, both are given; *e.g.* Lev. vi. 5 [12], Joel iv. [iii.] 3. To the student Baer's critical text of the Psalter (*Liber Psalmorum Hebraicus. Textum masorethicum accuratius quam adhuc factum est expressit, brevem de accentibus metricis institutionem præmisit, notas criticas adjecit S. Baer. Præfatus est Fr. Delitzsch.* 1861. Lipsiæ, Dörffling et Franke. Cr. 8vo, pp. xiv. 134), often referred to by Dr. Delitzsch, will be found to be a useful companion to this Commentary, and more particularly as illustrating the pointings and accentuation adopted or mentioned in the notes.

It is almost superfluous to say that it has been altogether impracticable to follow Dr. Delitzsch in his acrostic reproduction of the Alphabetical Psalms.

F. B.

Elland, 31*st January* 1871

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

—•—

INTRODUCTION TO THE PSALTER.

PAGE

§ 1. Position of the Psalter among the Hagiographa, and more especially among the Poetical Books, ... 3

§ 2. Names of the Psalter, ... 5

§ 3. The History of Psalm Composition, ... 7

§ 4. Origin of the Collection, ... 14

§ 5. Arrangement and Inscriptions, ... 19

§ 6. The Strophe-system of the Psalms, ... 23

§ 7. Temple Music and Psalmody, ... 30

§ 8. Translations of the Psalms, ... 37

§ 9. History of the Exposition of the Psalms, ... 47

§ 10. Theological Preliminary Considerations, ... 64

EXPOSITION OF THE PSALTER.

FIRST BOOK OF THE PSALTER, PS. I.–XLI.

Psalm i. to XXXV., ... 81–428

INTRODUCTION

TO THE PSALTER.

Πάντα ὥσπερ ἐν μεγάλῳ τινὶ καὶ κοινῷ ταμιείῳ τῇ βίβλῳ τῶν ψαλμῶν τεθησαύρισται.

Basil.

I. POSITION OF THE PSALTER AMONG THE HAGIOGRAPHA, AND MORE ESPECIALLY AMONG THE POETICAL BOOKS.

The Psalter is everywhere regarded as an essential part of the *Kethubim* or *Hagiographa*; but its position among these varies. It seems to follow from Luke xxiv. 44 that it opened the Kethubim in the earliest period of the Christian era.* The order of the books in the Hebrew MSS. of the German class, upon which our printed editions in general use are based, is actually this: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, and the five Megilloth. But the Masora and the MSS. of the Spanish class begin the Kethubim with the Chronicles which they awkwardly separate from Ezra and Nehemiah, and then range the Psalms, Job, Proverbs and the five Megilloth next.** And according to the Talmud (*Baba Bathra* 14*b*)

---

* Also from 2 Macc. ii. 13, where τὰ τοῦ Δαυὶδ appears to be the designation of the כתובים according to their beginning; and from Philo, *De vita contempl.* (*Opp.* II. 475 *ed. Mangey*), where he makes the following distinction νόμους καὶ λόγια θεσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν καὶ ὕμνους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα οἷς ἐπιστήμη καὶ εὐσέβεια συναύξονται καὶ τελειοῦνται.

** In all the Masoretic lists the twenty four books are arranged in the following order: 1) בראשית; 2) ואלה שמות; 3) ויקרא; 4) וידבר (also במדבר); 5) אלה הדברים; 6) יהושע; 7) שופטים; 8) שמואל; 9) מלכים; 10) ישעיה; 11) ירמיה; 12) יחזקאל; 13) תרי עשר; 14) דברי הימים; 15) תהלות; 16) איוב; 17) משלי; 18) רות; 19) שיר השירים; 20) קהלת; 21) קינות (איכה); 22) אחשורוש (מגלה); 23) דניאל; 24) עזרא. The Masoretic abbreviation for the three pre-eminently poetical books is accordingly, not א"מת but (in agreement with their Talmudic order) ה"אם (as also in Chajug'), *vid.* Elia Levita, *Masoreth ha-Masoreth* p. 19. 73 (*ed. Ven.* 1538) [ed. Ginsburg, 1867, p. 120, 248].

the following is the right order: Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs; the Book of Ruth precedes the Psalter as its prologue, for Ruth is the ancestor of him to whom the sacred lyric owes its richest and most flourishing era. It is undoubtedly the most natural order that the Psalter should open the division of the Kethubim, and for this reason: that, according to the stock which forms the basis of it, it represents the time of David, and then afterwards in like manner the Proverbs and Job represent the Chokma-literature of the age of Solomon. But it is at once evident that it could have no other place but among the Kethubim.

The codex of the giving of the Law, which is the foundation of the old covenant and of the nationality of Israel, as also of all its subsequent literature, occupies the first place in the canon. Under the collective title of נביאים, a series of historical writings of a prophetic character, which trace the history of Israel from the occupation of Canaan to the first gleam of light in the gloomy retributive condition of the Babylonish Exile (*Prophetæ priores*) is first attached to these five books of the Thôra; and then a series of strictly prophetical writings by the prophets themselves which extend to the time of Darius Nothus, and indeed to the time of Nehemiah's second sojourn in Jerusalem under this Persian king (*Prophetæ posteriores*). Regarded chronologically, the first series would better correspond to the second if the historical books of the Persian period (Chronicles with Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther) were joined to it; but for a very good reason this has not been done. The Israelitish literature has marked out two sharply defined and distinct methods of writing history, viz. the annalistic and the prophetic. The so-called Elohistic and so-called Jehovistic form of historical writing in the Pentateuch might serve as general types of these. The historical books of the Persian period are, however, of the annalistic, not of the prophetic character (although the Chronicles have taken up and incorporated many remnants of the prophetic form of historical writing, and the Books of the Kings, *vice versâ*, many remnants of the annalistic): they could not therefore stand among the *Prophetæ priores*. But with the Book of Ruth it is different. This short book is so like the end of the Book of the Judges (ch. xvii—xxi), that it might

very well stand between Judges and Samuel; and it did originally stand after the Book of the Judges, just as the Lamentations of Jeremiah stood after his prophecies. It is only on liturgical grounds that they have both been placed with the so-called Megilloth (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, as they are arranged in our ordinary copies according to the calendar of the festivals). All the remaining books could manifestly only be classed under the third division of the canon, which (as could hardly have been otherwise in connection with תורה and נביאים) has been entitled, in the most general way, כתובים,—a title which, as the grandson of Ben-Sira renders it in his prologue [to Ecclesiasticus], means simply τὰ ἄλλα πάτρια βιβλία, or τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων, and nothing more. For if it were intended to mean writings, written רוח הקדש, — as the third degree of inspiration which is combined with the greatest spontaneity of spirit, is styled according to the synagogue notion of inspiration, — then the words רוח הקדש would and ought to stand with it.

II. NAMES OF THE PSALTER.

At the close of the seventy-second Psalm (ver. 20) we find the subscription: "*Are ended the prayers of David, the Son of Jesse.*" The whole of the preceding Psalms are here comprehended under the name תְּפִלּוֹת. This strikes one as strange, because with the exception of Ps. xvii (and further on Ps. lxxxvi, xc, cii, cxlii) they are all inscribed otherwise; and because in part, as *e. g.* Ps. i and ii, they contain no supplicatory address to God and have therefore not the form of prayers. Nevertheless the collective name *Tephilloth* is suitable to all Psalms. The essence of prayer is a direct and undiverted looking towards God, and the absorption of the mind in the thought of Him. Of this nature of prayer all Psalms partake; even the didactic and laudatory, though containing no supplicatory address, — like Hannah's song of praise which is introduced with ותתפלל (1 Sam. ii. 1). The title inscribed on the Psalter is תְּהִלִּים (סֵפֶר) for which תְּלִים (apocopated תְּלִי) is also commonly used, as Hippolytus (*ed.*

de Lagarde p. 188) testifies: Ἑβραῖοι περιέγραψαν τὴν βίβλον Σέφρα θελείμ.* This name may also seem strange, for the Psalms for the most part are hardly hymns in the proper sense: the majority are elegiac or didactic; and only a solitary one, Ps. cxlv, is directly inscribed תְּהִלָּה. But even this collective name of the Psalms is admissible, for they all partake of the nature of the hymn, to wit the purpose of the hymn, the glorifying of God. The narrative Psalms praise the *magnalia Dei,* the plaintive likewise praise Him, since they are directed to Him as the only helper, and close with grateful confidence that He will hear and answer. The verb הָלַל includes both the *Magnificat* and the *De profundis.*

The language of the Masora gives the preference to the feminine form of the name, instead of תְּהִלִּים, and throughout calls the Psalter סִפְרָא דְּתִהְלוֹת (*e. g.* on 2 Sam. xxii. 5).** In the Syriac it is styled *k*ᵉ*tobo d*ᵉ*mazmûre,* in the Koran *zabûr* (not as Golius and Freytag point it, *zubûr*), which in the usage of the Arabic language signifies nothing more than "writing" (synon. *kitâb*: *vid.* on iii. 1), but is perhaps a corruption of *mizmor* from which a plural *mezâmîr* is formed, by a change of vowels, in Jewish-Oriental MSS. In the Old Testament writings a plural of *mizamor* does not occur. Also in the post-biblical usage *mizmorîm* or *mizmoroth* is found only in solitary instances as the name for the Psalms. In Hellenistic Greek the corresponding word ψαλμοί (from ψάλλειν = זָמַר) is the more common; the Psalm collection is called βίβλος ψαλμῶν (Lk. xx. 42, Acts i. 20) or ψαλτήριον, the name of the instrument (*psantērîn* in the Book of Daniel)*** being

* In Eusebius, vi. 25: Σέφηρ Θιλλήν; Jerome (in the Preface to his translation of the Psalms *juxta Hebraicam veritatem*) points it still differently: *SEPHAR THALLIM quod interpretatur volumen hymnorum.* Accordingly at the end of the *Psalterium ex Hebræo*, *Cod.* 19 in the Convent Library of St. Gall we find the subscription: *Sephar Tallim Quod interpretatur volumen Ymnorum explicit.*

** It is an erroneous opinion of Buxtorf in his *Tiberias* and also of Jewish Masoretes, that the Masora calls the Psalter הַלִּילָא (*hallêla*). It is only the so-called *Hallel*, Ps. cxiii—cxix, that bears this name, for in the Masora on 2 Sam. xxii. 5, Ps. cxvi. 3*a* is called הִבְרוֹ דְּהַלִּילָא (the similar passage in the Hallel) in relation to xviii. 5*a*.

*** Νάβλα — say Eusebius and others of the Greek Fathers — παρ' Ἑβραίοις λέγεται τὸ ψαλτήριον, ὃ δὴ μόνον τῶν μουσικῶν ὀργάνων ὀρθότατον

transferred metaphorically to the songs that are sung with its accompaniment. Psalms are songs for the lyre, and therefore lyric poems in the strictest sense.

III. THE HISTORY OF PSALM COMPOSITION.

Before we can seek to obtain a clear idea of the origin of the Psalm-collection we must take a general survey of the course of the development of psalm writing. The lyric is the earliest kind of poetry in general, and the Hebrew poetry, the oldest example of the poetry of antiquity that has come down to us, is therefore essentially lyric. Neither the Epos nor the Drama, but only the *Mashal*, has branched off from it and attained an independent form. Even prophecy, which is distinguished from psalmody by a higher impulse which the mind of the writer receives from the power of the divine mind, shares with the latter the common designation of נָבִא (1 Chron. xxv. 1 — 3), and the psalm-singer, מְשֹׁרֵר, is also as such called חוֹזֶה (1 Chron. xxv. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 30, xxxv. 15, cf. 1 Chron. xv. 19 and freq.); for just as the sacred lyric often rises to the height of prophetic vision, so the prophetic epic of the future, because it is not entirely freed from the sub-

καὶ μὴ συνεργούμενον εἰς ἦχον ἐκ τῶν κατωτάτω μερῶν, ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν ἔχων τὸν ὑπηχοῦντα χαλκόν. Augustine describes this instrument still more clearly *in Ps.* xlii and elsewhere: *Psalterium istud organum dicitur quod de superiore parte habet testudinem, illud scilicet tympanum et concavum lignum cui chordæ innitentes resonant, cithara vero id ipsum lignum cavum et sonorum ex inferiore parte habet.* In the cithern the strings pass over the sound-board, in the harp and lyre the vibrating body runs round the strings which are left free (without a bridge) and is either curved or angular as in the case of the harp, or encompasses the strings as in the lyre. Harps with an upper sounding body (whether of metal or wood, viz. *lignum concavum* i. e. with a hollow and hence sonorous wood, which protects the strings like a *testudo* and serves as a *tympanum*) are found both on Egyptian and on Assyrian monuments. By the *psalterium* described by Augustine, Cassiodorus and Isidorus understand the *trigonum*, which is in the form of an inverted sharp-cornered triangle; but it cannot be this that is intended because the horizontal strings of this instrument are surrounded by a three-sided sounding body, so that it must be a triangular lyre. Moreover there is also a trigon belonging to the Macedonian era which is formed like a harp (*vid.* Weiss' *Kostümkunde*, Fig. 347) and this further tends to support our view.

jectivity of the prophet, frequently passes into the strain of the psalm.

The time of Moses was the period of Israel's birth as a nation and also of its national lyric. The Israelites brought instruments with them out of Egypt and these were the accompaniments of their first song (Ex. xv.) — the oldest hymn, which re-echoes through all hymns of the following ages and also through the Psalter (comp. ver. 2 with Ps. cxviii. 14; ver. 3 with Ps. xxiv. 8; ver. 4, xiv. 27 with Ps. cxxxvi. 15; ver. 8 with Ps. lxxviii. 13; ver. 11 with Ps. lxxvii. 14, lxxxvi. 8, lxxxix. 7 sq.; ver. 13, 17 with Ps. lxxviii. 54, and other parallels of a similar kind). If we add to these, Ps. xc and Deut. xxxii, we then have the prototypes of all Psalms, the hymnic, elegiac, and prophetico-didactic. All three classes of songs are still wanting in the strophic symmetry which characterises the later art. But even Deborah's song of victory, arranged in hexastichs, — a song of triumph composed eight centuries before Pindar and far outstripping him, — exhibits to us the strophic art approximating to its perfect development. It has been thought strange that the very beginnings of the poesy of Israel are so perfect, but the history of Israel, and also the history of its literature, comes under a different law from that of a constant development from a lower to a higher grade. The redemptive period of Moses, unique in its way, influences as a creative beginning, every future development. There is a constant progression, but of such a kind as only to develope that which had begun in the Mosaic age with all the primal force and fulness of a divine creation. We see, however, how closely the stages of this progress are linked together, from the fact that Hannah the singer of the Old Testament *Magnificat,* was the mother of him who anointed, as King, the sweet singer of Israel, on whose tongue was the word of the Lord.

In David the sacred lyric attained its full maturity. Many things combined to make the time of David its golden age. Samuel had laid the foundation of this both by his energetic reforms in general, and by founding the schools of the prophets in particular, in which under his guidance (1 Sam. xix. 19 sq.), in conjunction with the awakening and fostering of the prophetic gift, music and song were taught. Through these *cœnobia*, whence sprang a spiritual awakening hitherto

unknown in Israel, David also passed. Here his poetic talent, if not awakened, was however cultivated. He was a musician and poet born. Even as a Bethlehemite shepherd he played upon the harp, and with his natural gift he combined a heart deeply imbued with religious feeling. But the Psalter contains as few traces of David's Psalms before his anointing (*vid.* on Ps. viii, cxliv.) as the New Testament does of the writings of the Apostles before the time of Pentecost. It was only from the time when the Spirit of Jahve came upon him at his anointing as king of Israel, and raised him to the dignity of his calling in connection with the covenant of redemption, that he sang Psalms, which have become an integral part of the canon. They are the fruit not only of his high gifts and the inspiration of the Spirit of God (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), but also of his own experience and of the experience of his people interwoven with his own. David's path from his anointing onwards, lay through affliction to glory. Song however, as a Hindu proverb says, is the offspring of suffering, the *çloka* springs from the *çoka*. His life was marked by vicissitudes which at one time prompted him to elegiac strains, at another to praise and thanksgiving; at the same time he was the founder of the kingship of promise, a prophecy of the future Christ, and his life, thus typically moulded, could not express itself otherwise than in typical or even consciously prophetic language. Raised to the throne, he did not forget the harp which had been his companion and solace when he fled before Saul, but rewarded it with all honour. He appointed 4000 Levites, the fourth division of the whole Levitical order, as singers and musicians in connection with the service in the tabernacle on Zion and partly in Gibeon, the place of the Mosaic tabernacle. These he divided into 24 classes under the Precentors, Asaph, Heman, and Ethan=Jeduthun (1 Chron. xxv. comp. xv. 17 sqq.), and multiplied the instruments, particularly the stringed instruments, by his own invention (1 Chron. xxiii. 5, Neh. xii. 36 *). In David's time there were three places of sacrifice:

* I tended, says David in the Greek Psalter, at the close of Ps. cl., my father's sheep, my hands made pipes (ὄργανον = עוגב) and my fingers put together (or: tuned) harps (ψαλτήριον = נבל) cf. *Numeri Rabba* c. xv (f. 264*a*) and the Targum on Am. vi. 5.

on Zion beside the ark (2 Sam. vi. 17 sq.), in Gibeon beside the Mosaic tabernacle (1 Chron. xvi. 39 sq.) and later, on the threshing-floor of Ornan, afterwards the Temple-hill (1 Chron. xxi. 28—30). Thus others also were stimulated in many ways to consecrate their offerings to the God of Israel. Beside the 73 Psalms bearing the inscription לדוד, — Psalms the direct Davidic authorship of which is attested, at least in the case of some fifty, by their creative originality, their impassioned and predominantly plaintive strain, their graceful flow and movement, their ancient but clear language, which becomes harsh and obscure only when describing the dissolute conduct of the ungodly, — the collection contains the following which are named after cotemporary singers appointed by David: 12 לאסף (Ps. l. lxxiii — lxxxiii) of which the contents and spirit are chiefly prophetic, and 12 by the Levite family of singers, the בני־קרח (Ps. xlii — xlix, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxvii, lxxxviii, including Ps. xliii), bearing a predominantly regal and priestly impress. Both the Psalms of the Ezrahites, Ps. lxxxviii by Heman and lxxxix by Ethan, belong to the time of Solomon whose name, with the exception of Ps. lxxii, is borne only by Ps. cxxvii. Under Solomon psalm-poesy began to decline; all the existing productions of the mind of that age bear the mark of thoughtful contemplation rather than of direct conception, for restless eagerness had yielded to enjoyable contentment, national concentration to cosmopolitan expansion. It was the age of the Chokma, which brought the apophthegm to its artistic perfection, and also produced a species of drama. Solomon himself is the perfecter of the *Mashal,* that form of poetic composition belonging strictly to the Chokma. Certainly according to 1 Kings v. 12 [Hebr.; iv. 32, Engl.] he was also the author of 1005 songs, but in the canon we only find two Psalms by him and the dramatic Song of Songs. This may perhaps be explained by the fact that he spake of trees from the cedar to the hyssop, that his poems, mostly of a worldly character, pertained rather to the realm of nature than to the kingdom of grace.

Only twice after this did psalm-poesy rise to any height and then only for a short period: viz. under Jehoshaphat and under Hezekiah. Under both these kings the glorious services of the Temple rose from the desecration and decay into

which they had fallen to the full splendour of their ancient glory. Moreover there were two great and marvellous deliverances which aroused the spirit of poesy during the reigns of these kings: under Jehoshaphat, the overthrow of the neighbouring nations when they had banded together for the extirpation of Judah, predicted by Jahaziel, the Asaphite; under Hezekiah the overthrow of Sennacherib's host foretold by Isaiah. These kings also rendered great service to the cause of social progress. Jehoshaphat by an institution designed to raise the educational status of the people, which reminds one of the Carlovingian *missi* (2 Chron. xvii. 7—9); Hezekiah, whom one may regard as the Pisistratus of Israelitish literature, by the establishment of a commission charged with collecting the relics of the early literature (Prov. xxv. 1); he also revived the ancient sacred music and restored the Psalms of David and Asaph to their liturgical use (2 Chron. xxix. 25 sqq). And he was himself a poet, as his מכתב (מכתם?) (Isa. xxxviii) shews, though certainly a reproductive rather than a creative poet. Both from the time of Jehoshaphat and from the time of Hezekiah we possess in the Psalter not a few Psalms, chiefly Asaphic and Korahitic, which, although bearing no historical heading, unmistakeably confront us with the peculiar circumstances of those times.* With the exception of these two periods of revival the latter part of the regal period produced scarcely any psalm writers, but is all the more rich in prophets. When the lyric became mute, prophecy raised its trumpet voice in order to revive the religious life of the nation, which previously had expressed itself in psalms. In the writings of the prophets, which represent the λεῖμμα χάριτος in Israel, we do indeed find even psalms, as Jon. ch. ii, Isa. xii, Hab. iii, but these are more imitations of the ancient congregational hymns than original compositions. It was not until after the Exile that a time of new creations set in.

As the Reformation gave birth to the German church-hymn, and the Thirty years' war, without which perhaps there might have been no Paul Gerhardt, called it into life afresh, so the Davidic age gave birth to psalm-poesy and the

* With regard to the time of Jehoshaphat even Nic. Nonne has acknowledged this in his *Diss. de Tzippor et Deror* (Bremen 1741, 4to.) which has reference to Ps. lxxxiv. 4.

Exile brought back to life again that which had become dead. The divine chastisement did not fail to produce the effect designed. Even though it should not admit of proof, that many of the Psalms have had portions added to them, from which it would be manifest how constantly they were then used as forms of supplication, still it is placed beyond all doubt, that the Psalter contains many psalms belonging to the time of the Exile, as *e. g.* Ps. cii. Still far more new psalms were composed after the Return. When those who returned from exile, among whom were many Asaphites,* again felt themselves to be a nation, and after the restoration of the Temple to be also a church, the harps which in Babylon hung upon the willows, were tuned afresh and a rich new flow of song was the fruit of this re-awakened first love. But this did not continue long. A sanctity founded on good works and the service of the letter took the place of that outward, coarse idolatry from which the people, now returned to their fatherland, had been weaned while undergoing punishment in the land of the stranger. Nevertheless in the era of the Seleucidæ the oppressed and injured national feeling revived under the Maccabees in its old life and vigour. Prophecy had then long been dumb, a fact lamented in many passages in the 1st Book of the Maccabees. It cannot be maintained that psalm-poesy flourished again at that time. Hitzig has recently endeavoured to bring forward positive proof, that it is Maccabean psalms, which form the proper groundwork of the Psalter. He regards the Maccabean prince Alexander Jannæus as the writer of Ps. i and ii, refers Ps. xliv. to 1 Macc. v. 56—62, and maintains both in his *Commentary* of 1835—36 and in the later edition of 1863—65 that from Ps. lxxiii onwards there is not a single pre-Maccabean psalm in the collection and that, from that point, the Psalter mirrors the prominent events of the time of the Maccabees in chronological order. Hitzig has been followed by von Lengerke and Olshausen. They both mark the reign of John Hyrcanus (B. C. 135—107) as the time when the latest psalms were composed and when the collec-

* In Barhebræus on Job and in his *Chronikon* several traditions are referred to "Asaph the Hebrew priest, the brother of Ezra the writer of the Scriptures."

tion as we now have it was made: whereas Hitzig going somewhat deeper ascribes Ps. i. ii. cl. with others, and the arrangement of the whole, to Hyrcanus' son, Alexander Jannæus.

On the other hand both the existence and possibility of Maccabean psalms is disputed not only by Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and Keil but also by Gesenius, Hassler, Ewald, Thenius, Böttcher, and Dillmann. For our own part we admit the possibility. It has been said that the ardent enthusiasm of the Maccabean period was more human than divine, more nationally patriotic than theocratically national in its character, but the Book of Daniel exhibits to us, in a prophetic representation of that period, a holy people of the Most High contending with the god-opposing power in the world, and claims for this contest the highest significance in relation to the history of redemption. The history of the canon, also, does not exclude the possibility of there being Maccabean psalms. For although the chronicler by 1 Chron. xvi. 36 brings us to the safe conclusion that in his day the Psalter (comp. τὰ τοῦ Δαυίδ, 2 Macc. ii. 13*) was already a whole divided into five books (*vid.* on Ps. xcvi. cv. cvi): it might nevertheless, after having been completely arranged still remain open for later insertions (just as the ספר הישר cited in the Book of Joshua and 2 Sam. i., was an anthology which had grown together in the course of time). When Judas Maccabæus, by gathering together the national literature, followed in the footsteps of Nehemiah (2 Macc. ii. 14: ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας τὰ διεσκορπισμένα διὰ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν γεγονότα ἡμῖν ἐπισυνήγαγε πάντα, καὶ ἔστι παρ' ἡμῖν), we might perhaps suppose that the Psalter was at that time enriched by some additions. And when Jewish tradition assigns to the so-called Great Synagogue (כנסת הגדולה) a share in the compilation of the canon, this is not unfavourable to the supposition of Maccabean psalms, since this συναγωγὴ μεγάλη was still in existence under the domination of the Seleucidæ (1 Macc. xiv. 28).

It is utterly at variance with historical fact to maintain that the Maccabean period was altogether incapable of producing psalms worthy of incorporation in the canon. Al-

* In the early phraseology of the Eastern and Western churches the Psalter is simply called *David, e. g.* in Chrysostom: ἐκμαθόντες ὅλον τὸν Δαβίδ, and at the close of the Æthiopic Psalter: "David is ended".

though the Maccabean period had no prophets, it is nevertheless to be supposed that many possessed the gift of poesy, and that the Spirit of faith, which is essentially one and the same with the Spirit of prophecy, might sanctify this gift and cause it to bear fruit. An actual proof of this is furnished by the so-called Psalter of Solomon (Ψαλτήριον Σαλομῶντος; in distinction from the canonical Psalter of David)* consisting of 18 psalms, which certainly come far behind the originality and artistic beauty of the canonical Psalms; but they shew at the same time, that the feelings of believers, even throughout the whole time of the Maccabees, found utterance in expressive spiritual songs. Maccabean psalms are therefore not an absolute impossibility — no doubt they were many; and that some of them were incorporated in the Psalter, cannot be denied *à priori*. But still the history of the canon does not favour this supposition. And the circumstance of the LXX version of the Psalms (according to which citations are made even in the first Book of the Maccabees), inscribing several Psalms Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου, while however it does not assign the date of the later period to any, is against it. And if Maccabean psalms be supposed to exist in the Psalter they can at any rate only be few, because they must have been inserted in a collection which was already arranged. And since the Maccabean movement, though beginning with lofty aspirations, gravitated, in its onward course, towards things carnal, we can no longer expect to find psalms relating to it, or at least none belonging to the period after Judas Maccabæus; and from all that we know of the character and disposition of Alexander Jannæus it is morally impossible that this despot should be the author of the first and second Psalms and should have closed the collection.

IV. ORIGIN OF THE COLLECTION.

The Psalter, as we now have it, consists of five books.** Τοῦτό σε μὴ παρέλθοι, ὦ φιλόλογε — says Hippolytus, whose

* First made known by De la Cerda in his *Adversaria sacra* (1626) and afterwards incorporated by Fabricius in his *Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.* pp. 914 sqq. (1713).

** The Karaite Jerocham (about 950 A. D.) says מגלות (rolls) instead of ספרים.

words are afterwards quoted by Epiphanius — ὅτι καὶ τὸ ψαλτήριον εἰς πέντε διεῖλον βιβλία οἱ Ἑβραῖοι, ὥστε εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸ ἄλλον πεντάτευχον. This accords with the Midrash on Ps. i. 1: Moses gave the Israelites the five books of the Thôra and corresponding to these (כנגדם) David gave them the book of Psalms which consists of five books (ספר תהלים שיש בו חמשה ספרים). The division of the Psalter into five parts makes it the copy and echo of the Thôra, which it also resembles in this particular: that as in the Thôra Elohistic and Jehovistic sections alternate, so here a group of Elohistic Psalms (xlii—lxxxiv) is surrounded on both sides by groups of Jehovistic (i—xli, lxxxv—cl). The five books are as follow: — i—xli, xlii—lxxii, lxxiii—lxxxix, xc—cvi, cvii — cl.* Each of the first four books closes with a doxology, which one might erroneously regard as a part of the preceding Psalm (xli. 14, lxxii. 18 sq., lxxxix. 53, cvi. 48), and the place of the fifth doxology is occupied by Ps. cl. as a full toned finale to the whole (like the relation of Ps. cxxxiv to the so-called Songs of degrees). These doxologies very much resemble the language of the liturgical *Beracha* of the second Temple. The אָמֵן וְאָמֵן coupled with ו (cf. on the contrary Num. v. 22 and also Neh. viii. 6) is exclusively peculiar to them in Old Testament writings. Even in the time of the writer of the Chronicles the Psalter was a whole divided into five parts, which were indicated by these landmarks. We infer this from 1 Chron. xvi. 36. The chronicler in the free manner which characterises Thucydides or Livy in reporting a speech, there reproduces David's festal hymn that resounded in Israel after the bringing home of the ark; and he does it in such a way that after he has once fallen into the track of Ps. cvi., he also puts into the mouth of David the *beracha* which follows that Ps. From this we see that the Psalter was already divided into books at that period; the closing doxologies had already become thoroughly grafted upon the body of the Psalms after which they stand. The chronicler however wrote under the pontificate of Johanan, the son of Eliashib, the predecessor of Jaddua, towards the end of the Persian supremacy, but a considerable time before the commencement of the Grecian.

* The Karaite Jefeth ben Eli calls them ספר אשרי, ס׳ כאיל, &c.

Next to this application of the *beracha* of the Fourth book by the chronicler, Ps. lxxii. 20 is a significant mark for determining the history of the origin of the Psalter. The words: "*are ended the prayers of David the son of Jesse*", are without doubt the subscription to the oldest psalm-collection, which preceded the present psalm-pentateuch. The collector certainly has removed this subscription from its original place close after lxxii. 17, by the interpolation of the *beracha* lxxii. 18 sq., but left it, at the same time, untouched. The collectors and those who worked up the older documents within the range of the Biblical literature appear to have been extremely conscientious in this respect and they thereby make it easier for us to gain an insight into the origin of their works, — as, *e. g.* the composer of the Books of Samuel gives intact the list of officers from a later document 2 Sam. viii. 16—18 (which closed with that, so far as we at present have it in its incorporated state), as well as the list from an older document (2 Sam. xx. 23—26); or, as not merely the author of the Book of Kings in the middle of the Exile, but also the chronicler towards the end of the Persian period, have transferred unaltered, to their pages, the statement that the staves of the ark are to be found in the rings of the ark "to this day", which has its origin in some annalistic document (1 Kings viii. 8, 2 Chron. v. 9). But unfortunately that subscription, which has been so faithfully preserved, furnishes us less help than we could wish. We only gather from it that the present collection was preceded by a primary collection of very much more limited compass which formed its basis and that this closed with the Salomonic Ps. lxxii; for the collector would surely not have placed the subscription, referring only to the prayers of David, after this Psalm if he had not found it there already. And from this point it becomes natural to suppose that Solomon himself, prompted perhaps by the liturgical requirements of the new Temple, compiled this primary collection, and by the addition of Ps. lxxii may have caused it to be understood that he was the originator of the collection.

But to the question whether the primary collection also contained only Davidic songs properly so called or whether the subscribed designation תהלות דוד is only intended *à potiori,* the answer is entirely wanting. If we adopt the latter supposition, one is at a loss to understand for what reason

only Ps. l. of the Psalms of Asaph was inserted in it. For this psalm is really one of the old Asaphic psalms and might therefore have been an integral part of the primary collection. On the other hand it is altogether impossible for all the Korahitic psalms xlii—xlix to have belonged to it, for some of them, and most undoubtedly xlvii and xlviii were composed in the time of Jehoshaphat, the most remarkable event of which, as the chronicler narrates, was foretold by an Asaphite and celebrated by Korahitic singers. It is therefore, apart from other psalms which bring us down to the Assyrian period (as lxvi, lxvii) and the time of Jeremiah (as lxxi) and bear in themselves traces of the time of the Exile (as lxix, 35 sqq.), absolutely impossible that the primary collection should have consisted of Ps. ii—lxxii, or rather (since Ps. ii appears as though it ought to be assigned to the later time of the kings, perhaps the time of Isaiah) of Ps. iii—lxxii. And if we leave the later insertions out of consideration, there is no arrangement left for the Psalms of David and his cotemporaries, which should in any way bear the impress of the Davidic and Salomonic mind. Even the old Jewish teachers were struck by this, and in the Midrash on Ps. iii we are told, that when Joshua ben Levi was endeavouring to put the Ps. in order, a voice from heaven cried out to him: arouse not the slumberer (אל־תפיחי את־הישן) *i. e.* do not disturb David in his grave! Why Ps. iii follows directly upon Ps. ii, or as it is expressed in the Midrash פרשת אבשלום follows פרשת גוג ומגוג, may certainly be more satisfactorily explained than is done there: but to speak generally the mode of the arrangement of the first two books of the Psalms is of a similar nature to that of the last three, viz., that which in my *Symbolæ ad Psalmos illustrandos isagogicæ* (1846) is shewn to run through the entire Psalter, more according to external than internal points of contact.*

* The right view has been long since perceived by Eusebius, who in his exposition of Ps. lxiii (LXX. lxii), among other things expresses himself thus: ἐγὼ δὲ ἠγοῦμαι τῆς τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων διανοίας ἕνεκεν ἐφεξῆς ἀλλήλων τοὺς ψαλμοὺς κεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον, οὕτως ἐν πολλοῖς ἐπιτηρήσας καὶ εὑρών, διὸ καὶ συνῆφθαι αὐτοὺς ὡσανεὶ συγγένειαν ἔχοντας καὶ ἀκολουθίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· ἔνθεν μὴ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἐμφέρεσθαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τῆς διανοίας ἀκολουθίαν (in Montfaucon's *Collectio Nova*, t. i. p. 300). This ἀκολουθία διανοίας is however not always central and deep. The attempts of Luther (Walch, iv. col. 646 sqq.) and especially of So-

On the other side it cannot be denied that the groundwork of the collection that formed the basis of the present Psalter must lie within the limits of Ps. iii—lxxii, for nowhere else do old Davidic psalms stand so closely and numerously together as here. The Third book (Ps. lxxiii—lxxxix) exhibits a marked difference in this respect. We may therefore suppose that the chief bulk of the oldest hymn book of the Israelitish church is contained in Ps. iii—lxxii. But we must at the same time admit, that its contents have been dispersed and newly arranged in later redactions and more especially in the last of all; and yet, amidst these changes the connection of the subscription, lxxii. 20, with the psalm of Solomon was preserved. The two groups iii—lxxii, lxxiii—lxxxix, although not preserved in the original arrangement, and augmented by several kinds of interpolations, at least represent the first two stages of the growth of the Psalter. The primary collection may be Salomonic. The after portion of the second group was, at the earliest, added in the time of Jehoshaphat, at which time probably the book of the Proverbs of Solomon was also compiled. But with a greater probability of being in the right we incline to assign them to the time of Hezekiah, not merely because some of the psalms among them seem as though they ought to be referred to the overthrow of Assyria under Hezekiah rather than to the overthrow of the allied neighbouring nations under Jehoshaphat, but chiefly because just in the same manner "the men of Hezekiah" appended an after gleaning to the older Salomonic book of Proverbs (Prov. xxv. 1), and because of Hezekiah it is recorded, that he brought the Psalms of David and of Asaph (the bulk of which are contained in the Third book of the Psalms) into use again (2 Chron. xxix. 30). In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the collection was next extended by the songs composed during and (which are still more numerous) after the Exile. But a gleaning of old songs also had been reserved for this time. A psalm of Moses was placed first, in order to give a pleasing relief to the beginning of the new psalter by this glance back into the earliest time. And to the 56 Davidic psalms of the first three books, there are

lomon Gesner, to prove a link of internal progress in the Psalter are not convincing.

seventeen more added here in the last two. They are certainly not all directly Davidic, but partly the result of the writer throwing himself into David's temper of mind and circumstances. One chief store of such older psalms were perhaps the historical works of an annalistic or even prophetic character, rescued from the age before the Exile. It is from such sources that the historical notes prefixed to the Davidic hymns (and also to one in the Fifth book: Ps. cxlii) come. On the whole there is unmistakeably an advance from the earliest to the latest; and we may say, with Ewald, that in Ps. i—xli the real bulk of the Davidic and, in general, of the older songs is contained, in Ps. xlii—lxxxix predominantly songs of the middle period, in Ps. xc—cl the large mass of later and very late songs. But moreover it is with the Psalm-collection as with the collection of the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel: the chronological order and the arrangement according to the matter are at variance; and in many places the former is intentionally and significantly disregarded in favour of the latter. We have often already referred to one chief point of view of this arrangement according to matter, viz., the imitation of the Thôra; it was perhaps this which led to the opening of the Fourth book, which corresponds to the Book of Numbers, with a psalm of Moses of this character.

V. ARRANGEMENT AND INSCRIPTIONS.

Among the Fathers, Gregory of Nyssa has attempted to shew that the Psalter in its five books leads upward as by five steps to moral perfection, ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ὑψηλότερον τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπερτιθεὶς, ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκρότατον ἐφίκηται τῶν ἀγαθῶν;* and down to the most recent times attempts have been made to trace in the five books a gradation of principal thoughts, which influence and run through the whole collection.** We fear that in this direction, investigation has set before itself an unattainable end. Nevertheless, as we shall see, the collection bears the impress of one ordering mind. For its opening is

* *Opp. ed. Paris*, (1638) t. i. p. 288.

** Thus especially Stähelin, *Zur Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 1859, 4to.

formed by a didactic-prophetic couplet of psalms (Ps. i. ii), introductory to the whole Psalter and therefore in the earliest times regarded as one psalm, which opens and closes with אשרי; and its close is formed by four psalms (Ps. cxlvi —cxlix) which begin and end with הללויה. We do not include Ps. cl. for this psalm takes the place of the *beracha* of the Fifth book, exactly as the recurring verse Isa. xlviii. 22 is repeated in lvii. 21 with fuller emphasis, but is omitted at the close of the third part of this address of Isaiah to the exiles, its place being occupied by a terrifying description of the hopeless end of the wicked. The opening of the Psalter celebrates the blessedness of those who walk according to the will of God in redemption, which has been revealed in the law and in history; the close of the Psalter calls upon all creatures to praise this God of redemption, as it were on the ground of the completion of this great work. Bede has already called attention to the fact that the Psalter from Ps. cxlvi ends in a complete strain of praise; the end of the Psalter soars upward to a happy climax. The assumption that there was an evident predilection for attempting to make the number 150 complete, as Ewald supposes, cannot be established; the reckoning 147 (according to a Haggadah book mentioned in *Jer. Sabbath* xvi, parallel with the years of Jacob's life), and the reckoning 149, which frequently occurs both in Karaitic and Rabbinic MSS., have also been adopted; the numbering of the whole and of particular psalms varies.*

There are in the Psalter 73 psalms bearing the inscription לדוד, viz. (reckoning exactly) 37 in book i; 18 in book ii; 1 in book iii; 2 in book iv; 15 in book v. The redaction has designed the pleasing effect of closing the collection with an imposing group of Davidic psalms, just as it begins with the bulk of the Davidic psalms. And the Hallelujahs which begin with Ps. cxlvi (after the 15 Davidic psalms) are the preludes of the closing doxology.

* The LXX, like our Hebrew text, reckons 150 psalms, but with variations in separate instances, by making ix and x, and cxiv and cxv into one, and in place of these, dividing cxvi and cxlvii each into two. The combination of ix and x, of cxiv and cxv into one has also been adopted by others; cxxxiv and cxxxv, but especially i and ii, appear here and there as one psalm. Kimchi reckons 149 by making Ps. cxiv and cxv into one. The ancient Syriac version combines Ps. cxiv and cxv as one, but reckons 150 by dividing Ps. cxlvii.

The Korahitic and Asaphic psalms are found exclusively in the Second and Third books. There are 12 Asaphic psalms: l. lxxiii—lxxxiii, and also 12 Korahitic: xlii. xliii. xliv—xlix. lxxxiv. lxxxv. lxxxvii. lxxxviii, assuming that Ps. xliii is to be regarded as an independent twin psalm to xlii and that Ps. lxxxviii is to be reckoned among the Korahitic psalms. In both of these divisions we find psalms belonging to the time of the Exile and to the time after the Exile (lxxiv. lxxix. lxxxv). The fact of their being found exclusively in the Second and Third books cannot therefore be explained on purely chronological grounds. Korahitic psalms, followed by an Asaphic, open the Second book; Asaphic psalms, followed by four Korahitic, open the Third book.

The way in which Davidic psalms are interspersed clearly sets before us the principle by which the arrangement according to the matter, which the collector has chosen, is governed. It is the principle of homogeneousness, which is the old Semitic mode of arranging things: for in the alphabet, the hand and the hollow of the hand, water and fish, the eye and the mouth, the back and front of the head have been placed together. In like manner also the psalms follow one another according to their relationship as manifested by prominent external and internal marks. The Asaphic psalm, Ps. l, is followed by the Davidic psalm, li., because they both similarly disparage the material animal sacrifice, as compared with that which is personal and spiritual. And the Davidic psalm lxxxvi is inserted between the Korahitic psalms lxxxv and lxxxvii, because it is related both to Ps. lxxxv. 8 by the prayer: "*Shew me Thy way, O Jahve*" and "*give Thy conquering strength unto Thy servant*", and to Ps. lxxxvii by the prospect of the conversion of the heathen to the God of Israel. This phenomenon, that psalms with similar prominent thoughts, or even with only markedly similar passages, especially at the beginning and the end, are thus strung together, may be observed throughout the whole collection. Thus *e.g.* Ps. lvi with the inscription, "*after* (the melody): *the mute dove among strangers*", is placed after Ps. lv on account of the occurrence of the words: "*Oh that I had wings like a dove!*" &c., in that psalm; thus Ps. xxxiv and xxxv stand together as being the only psalms in which "the Angel of Jahve" oc-

curs; and just so Ps. ix and x which coincide in the expression עתות בצרה.

Closely connected with this principle of arrangement is the circumstance that the Elohimic psalms (*i. e.,* those which, according to a peculiar style of composition as I have shewn in my *Symbolæ,* not from the caprice of an editor,* almost exclusively call God אלהים, and beside this make use of such compound names of God as יהוה צבאות, יהוה אלהים צבאות and the like) are placed together without any intermixture of Jehovic psalms. In Ps. i—xli the divine name יהוה predominates; it occurs 272 times and אלהים only 15 times, and for the most part under circumstances where יהוה was not admissible. With Ps. xlii the Elohimic style begins; the last psalm of this kind is the Korahitic psalm lxxxiv, which for this very reason is placed after the Elohimic psalms of Asaph. In the Ps. lxxxv — cl יהוה again becomes prominent, with such exclusiveness, that in the psalms of the Fourth and Fifth books יהוה occurs 339 times (not 239 as in *Symbolæ* p. 5), and אלהים of the true God only once (cxliv. 9). Among the psalms of David 18 are Elohimic, among the Korahitic 9, and the Asaphic are all Elohimic. Including one psalm of Solomon and four anonymous psalms, there are 44 in all (reckoning Ps. xlii and xliii as two). They form the middle portion of the Psalter, and have on their right 41 and on their left 65 Jahve-psalms.

Community in species of composition also belongs to the manifold grounds on which the order according to the subject-matter is determined. Thus the מַשְׂכִּיל (xlii—xliii. xliv. xlv. lii—lv) and מִכְתָּם (lvi—lx) stand together among the Elohim-psalms. In like manner we have in the last two books the שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת (cxx—cxxxiv) and, divided into groups, those beginning with הוֹדוּ (cv—cvii) and those beginning and ending with הַלְלוּיָהּ (cxi—cxvii, cxlvi—cl) — whence it follows that these titles to the psalms are older than the final redaction of the collection.

It could not possibly be otherwise than that the inscriptions of the psalms, after the harmless position which the mono-

* This is Ewald's view (which is also supported by Riehm in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1857 S. 168). A closer insight into the characteristic peculiarity of the Elohim-psalms, which is manifest in other respects also, proves it to be superficial and erroneous.

graphs of Sonntag (1687), Celsius (1718), Irhof (1728) take with regard to them, should at length become a subject for criticism; but the custom which has gained ground since the last decade of the past century of rejecting what has been historically handed down, has at present grown into a despicable habit of forming a decision too hastily, which in any other department of literature where the judgment is not so prejudiced by the drift of the enquiry, would be regarded as folly. Instances like Hab. iii. 1 and 2 Sam. i. 18, comp. Ps. lx. 1, shew that David and other psalm-writers might have appended their names to their psalms and the definition of their purport. And the great antiquity of these and similar inscriptions also follows from the fact that the LXX found them already in existence and did not understand them; that they also cannot be explained from the Books of the Chronicles (including the Book of Ezra, which belongs to these) in which much is said about music, and appear in these books, like much besides, as an old treasure of the language revived, so that the key to the understanding of them must have been lost very early, as also appears from the fact that in the last two books of the Psalter they are of more rare, and in the first three of more frequent occurrence.

VI. THE STROPHE-SYSTEM OF THE PSALMS.

The early Hebrew poetry has neither rhyme nor metre, both of which (first rhyme and then afterwards metre) were first adopted by Jewish poesy in the seventh century after Christ. True, attempts at rhyme are not wanting in the poetry and prophecy of the Old Testament, especially in the *tephilla* style, Ps. cvi. 4—7 cf. Jer. iii. 21—25, where the earnestness of the prayer naturally causes the heaping up of similar flexional endings; but this assonance, in the transition state towards rhyme proper, had not yet assumed such an established form as is found in Syriac.* It is also just as difficult to point out verses of four lines only, which have a uniform or mixed metre running through them. Notwithstanding, Augustine, *Ep.* cxiii *ad Memorium,* is perfectly warranted in saying of the Psalms: *certis eos constare numeris*

* *Vid.* Zingerle in the *Deutsch. Morgenländ. Zeitschrift.* X. 110 ff.

credo illis qui eam linguam probe callent, and it is not a mere fancy when Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome and others have detected in the Old Testament songs, and especially in the Psalms, something resembling the Greek and Latin metres. For the Hebrew poetry indeed had a certain syllabic measure, since, — apart from the audible *Shebâ* and the *Chateph*, both of which represent the primitive shortenings, — all syllables with a full vowel are intermediate, and in ascending become long, in descending short, or in other words, in one position are strongly accented, in another more or less slurred over. Hence the most manifold rhythms arise, *e. g.* the anapæstic *wenashlîcha miménnu abothêmo* (ii. 3) or the dactylic *âz jedabbêr elêmo beappô* (ii. 5). The poetic discourse is freer in its movement than the Syriac poetry with its constant ascending (⏑ ⏓) or descending spondees (⏓ ⏑); it represents all kinds of syllabic movements and thus obtains the appearance of a lively mixture of the Greek and Latin metres. But it is only an appearance — for the forms of verse, which conform to the laws of quantity, are altogether foreign to early Hebrew poetry, as also to the oldest poetry; and these rhythms which vary according to the emotions are not metres, for, as Augustine says in his work *De Musica,* "*Omne metrum rhythmus, non omnis rhythmus etiam metrum est.*" Yet there is not a single instance of a definite rhythm running through the whole in a shorter or longer poem, but the rhythms always vary according to the thoughts and feelings; as *e. g.* the evening song Ps. iv towards the end rises to the anapæstic measure: *kiattâ Jahawé lebadâd,* in order then quietly to subside in the iambic: *labêtach tôshibêni.** With this alternation of rise and

* Bellermann's *Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer* (1813) is comparatively the best on this subject even down to the present time; for Saalschütz (*Von der Form der hebr. Poesie,* 1825, and elsewhere) proceeds on the erroneous assumption that the present system of accentuation does not indicate the actual strong toned syllable of the words — by following the pronunciation of the German and Polish Jews he perceives, almost throughout, a spondæo-dactylic rhythm (*e. g.* Judg. xiv. 18 *lûle charáshtem beegláthi*). But the traditional accentuation is proved to be a faithful continuation of the ancient proper pronunciation of the Hebrew; the trochaic pronunciation is more Syrian, and the tendency to draw the accent from the final syllable to the penult, regardless of the conditions originally governing it, is a phenomenon which belongs only

fall, long and short syllables, harmonizing in lively passages with the subject, there is combined, in Hebrew poetry, an expressiveness of accent which is hardly to be found anywhere else to such an extent. Thus *e. g.* Ps. ii. 5*a* sounds like pealing thunder, and 5*b* corresponds to it as the flashing lightning. And there are a number of dull toned Psalms as xvii. xlix. lviii. lix. lxxiii, in which the description drags heavily on and is hard to be understood, and in which more particularly the suffixes in *mo* are heaped up, because the indignant mood of the writer impresses itself upon the style and makes itself heard in the very sound of the words. The *non plus ultra* of such poetry, whose very tones heighten the expression, is the cycle of the prophecies of Jeremiah chap. xxiv—xxvii.

Under the point of view of rhythm the so-called *parallelismus membrorum* has also been rightly placed: that fundamental law of the higher, especially poetic, style for which this appropriate name has been coined, not very long since.* The relation of the two parallel members does not really differ from that of the two halves on either side of the principal cæsura of the hexameter and pentameter; and this is particularly manifest in the double long line of the cæsural schema (more correctly: the diæretic schema) *e. g.* Ps. xlviii. 6, 7: *They beheld, straightway they marvelled, | bewildered they took to flight. Trembling took hold upon them there | anguish, as a woman in travail.* Here the one thought is expanded in the same verse in two parallel members. But from the fact of the rhythmical organization being carried out without reference to the logical requirements of the sentence, as in the same psalm vers. 4, 8: *Elohim in her palaces | was known as a refuge. With an east wind Thou breakest | the ships of Tarshish,* we

to the later period of the language (*vid.* Hupfeld in the *Deutsch. Morgenl. Zeitschr.* vi. 187).

* Abenezra calls it בָּפוּל *duplicatum*, and Kimchi כְּפל עִנְיָן בְּמִלּוֹת שׁוֹנוֹת, *duplicatio sententiæ verbis variatis;* both regard it as an elegant form of expression (דֶּרֶךְ צַחוּת). Even the punctuation does not proceed from a real understanding of the rhythmical relation of the members of the verse to one another, and when it divides every verse that is marked off by *Silluk* wherever it is possible into two parts, it must not be inferred that this rhythmical relation is actually always one consisting of two members merely, although (as Hupfeld has shewn in his admirable treatise on the twofold law of the rhythm and accent, in the *D. M. Z.* 1852), wherever it exists it always consists of at least two members.

see that the rhythm is not called into existence as a necessity of such expansion of the thought, but *vice versâ* this mode of expanding the thought results from the requirements of the rhythm. Here is neither synonymous or identical (tautological), nor antithetical, nor synthetical parallelism, but merely that which De Wette calls rhythmical, merely the rhythmical rise and fall, the diastole and systole, which poetry is otherwise (without binding itself) wont to accomplish by two different kinds of ascending and descending logical organization. The ascending and descending rhythm does not usually exist within the compass of one line, but it is distributed over two lines which bear the relation to one another of rhythmical antecedent and consequent, of προῳδός and ἐπῳδός. This distich is the simplest ground-form of the strophe, which is visible in the earliest song, handed down to us, Gen. iv. 23 sq. The whole Ps. cxix is composed in such distichs, which is the usual form of the apophthegm; the acrostic letter stands there at the head of each distich, just as at the head of each line in the likewise distichic pair, Ps. cxi, cxii. The tristich is an outgrowth from the distich, the ascending rhythm being prolonged through two lines and the fall commencing only in the third, *e. g.* xxv. 7 (the ה of this alphabetical Psalm):

Have not the sins of my youth and my transgressions in remembrance,
According to Thy mercy remember Thou me
For Thy goodness' sake, O Jahve!

This at least is the natural origin of the tristich, which moreover in connection with a most varied logical organization still has the inalienable peculiarity, that the full fall is reserved until the third line, *e. g.* in the first two strophes of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, where each line is a long line in two parts consisting of rise and fall, the principal fall, however, after the cæsura of the third long line, closes the strophe:

Ah! how doth the city sit solitary, otherwise full of people!
She is become as a widow, the great one among nations,
The princess among provinces, she is become tributary.

By night she weepeth sore and her tears are upon her cheeks;
There is not one to comfort her of all her lovers,
All her friends have betrayed her, they are become her enemies.

If we now further enquire, whether Hebrew poesy goes beyond these simplest beginnings of the strophe-formation and even

extends the network of the rhythmical period, by combining the two and three line strophe with ascending and descending rhythm into greater strophic wholes rounded off into themselves, the alphabetical Psalm xxxvii furnishes us with a safe answer to the question, for this is almost entirely tetrastichic, *e. g.*

About evil-doers fret not thyself,
About the workers of iniquity be thou not envious.
For as grass they shall soon be cut down,
And as the green herb they shall wither,

but it admits of the compass of the strophe increasing even to the pentastich, (ver. 25, 26) since the unmistakeable landmarks of the order, the letters, allow a freer movement:

Now I, who once was young, am become old,
Yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken
And his seed begging bread.
He ever giveth and lendeth
And his seed is blessed.

From this point the sure guidance of the alphabetical Psalms* fails us in investigating the Hebrew strophe-system. But in our further confirmatory investigations we will take with us from these Psalms, the important conclusion that the verse bounded by *Sôph pasûk,* the placing of which harmonizes with the accentuation first mentioned in the post-Talmudic tractate *Sofrim,*** is by no means (as, since Köster, 1831, it has been almost universally supposed) the original form of the strophe but that strophes are a whole consisting of an equal or symmetrical number of stichs.*** Hupfeld (*Ps.* iv.

* Even the older critics now and then supposed that we were to make these Ps. the starting point of our enquiries. For instance, Serpilius says: "It may perhaps strike some one whether an opinion as to some of the modes of the Davidic species of verse and poetry might not be formed from his, so-to-speak, alphabetical psalms."

** Even if, and this is what Hupfeld and Riehm (*Luth. Zeitschr.* 1866, S. 300) advance, the Old Testament books were divided into verses, פסוקים, even before the time of the Masoretes, still the division into verses, as we now have it and especially that of the three poetical books, is Masoretic.

*** It was these stichs, of which the Talmud (*B. Kiddushin* 30 *a*) counts eight more in the Psalter than in the Thôra, viz. 5896, which were originally called פסוקים. Also in Augustine we find *versus* thus used like στίχος. With him the words *Populus ejus et oves pascuæ ejus* are one *versus.* There is no Hebrew MS. which could have formed the basis of

450) has objected against this, that "this is diametrically opposed to the nature of rhythm = parallelism, which cannot stand on one leg, but needs two, that the distich is therefore the rhythmical unit."

But does it therefore follow, that a strophe is to be measured according to the number of distichs? The distich is itself only the smallest strophe, viz. one consisting of two lines. And it is even forbidden to measure a greater strophe by the number of distichs, because the rhythmical unit, of which the distich is the ground-form, can just as well be tristichic, and consequently these so-called rhythmical units form neither according to time nor space parts of equal value. But this applies still less to the Masoretic verses. True, we have shewn in our larger Commentary on the Psalms, ii. 522 sq., in agreement with Hupfeld, and in opposition to Ewald, that the accentuation proceeds upon the law of dichotomy. But the Masoretic division of the verses is not only obliged sometimes to give up the law of dichotomy, because the verse (as *e. g.* xviii. 2, xxv. 1, xcii. 9,) does not admit of being properly divided into two parts : and it subjects not only verses of three members (as *e. g.* i. 1, ii. 2) in which the third member is embellishingly or synthetically related to the other two — both are phenomena which in themselves furnish proof in favour of the relative independence of the lines of the verse — but also verses of four members where the sense requires it (as i. 3, xviii. 16) and where it does not require it (as xxii. 15, xl. 6), to the law of dichotomy. And these Masoretic verses of such various compass

---

the arrangement of the Psalms in stichs; those which we possess only break the Masoretic verse, (if the space of the line admits of it) for ease of writing into the two halves, without even regarding the general injunction in c. xiv of the tractate *Sofrim* and that of Ben-Bileam in his *Horajoth ha-Kore*, that the breaks are to be regulated by the beginnings of the verses and the two great pausal accents. Nowhere in the MSS., which divide and break up the words most capriciously, is there to be seen any trace of the recognition of those old פסוקים being preserved. These were not merely lines determined by the space, as were chiefly also the στίχοι or ἔπη according to the number of which, the compass of Greek works was recorded, but lines determined by the sense, κῶλα (Suidas: κῶλον ὁ ἀπηρτισμένην ἔννοιαν ἔχων στίχος), as Jerome wrote his Latin translation of the Old Testament after the model of the Greek and Roman orators (*e. g.* the MSS. of Demosthenes), *per cola et commata* i. e. in lines breaking off according to the sense.

are to be the constituent parts according to which strophes of a like cipher shall be measured! A strophe only becomes a strophe by virtue of its symmetrical relation to others, to the ear it must have the same time, to the eye the same form and it must consequently represent the same number of lines (clauses). The fact of these clauses, according to the special characteristic of Hebrew poetry, moving on with that rising and falling movement which we call parallelism until they come to the close of the strophe where it gently falls to rest, is a thing *sui generis,* and, within the province of the strophe, somewhat of a substitute for metre; but the strophe itself is a section which comes to thorough repose by this species of rhythmical movement. So far, then, from placing the rhythm on one leg only, we give it its two: but measure the strophe not by the two feet of the Masoretic verses or even couplets of verses, but by the equal, or symmetrically alternating number of the members present, which consist mostly of two feet, often enough however of three, and sometimes even of four feet.

Whether and how a psalm is laid out in strophes, is shewn by seeing first of all what its pauses are, where the flow of thoughts and feelings falls in order to rise anew, and then by trying whether these pauses have a like or symmetrically correspondent number of stichs (*e. g.* 6. 6. 6. 6 or 6. 7. 6. 7) or, if their compass is too great for them to be at once regarded as one strophe, whether they cannot be divided into smaller wholes of an equal or symmetrical number of stichs. For the peculiarity of the Hebrew strophe does not consist in a run of definite metres closely united to form one harmonious whole (for instance, like the Sapphic strophe, which the four membered verses, Isa. xvi. 9, 10, with their short closing lines corresponding to the Adonic verse, strikingly resemble), but in a closed train of thought which is unrolled after the distichic and tristichic ground-form of the rhythmical period. The strophe-schemata, which are thus evolved, are very diverse. We find not only that all the strophes of a poem are of the same compass (*e. g.* 4. 4. 4. 4), but also that the poem is made up of symmetrical relations formed of strophes of different compass. The condition laid down by some,* that only a poem that consists of strophes of equal

* For instance Meier in his *Geschichte der poetischen Nationallitera-*

length can be regarded as strophic, is refuted not only by the Syriac* but also by the post-biblical Jewish poetry.** We find the following variations: strophes of the same compass followed by those of different compass (*e. g.* 4. 4. 6. 6); as in the chiasmus, the outer and inner strophes of the same compass (*e. g.* 4. 6. 6. 4); the first and third, the second and fourth corresponding to one another (*e. g.* 4. 6. 4. 6); the mingling of the strophes repeated antistrophically, *i. e.* in the inverted order (*e. g.* 4. 6. 7. 7. 6. 4); strophes of equal compass surrounding one of much greater compass (*e. g.* 4. 4. 10. 4. 4.), what Köster calls the pyramidal schema; strophes of equal compass followed by a short closing stanza (*e. g.* 3. 3. 2); a longer strophe forming the base of the whole (*e. g.* 5. 3. 3. 7), and these are far from being all the different figures, which the Old Testament songs and more especially the Psalms present to us, when we arrange their contents in stichs.

With regard to the compass of the strophe, we may expect to find it consisting of as many as twelve lines according to the Syrian and the synagogue poetry. The line usually consists of three words, or at least only of three larger words; in this respect the Hebrew exhibits a capacity for short but emphatic expressions, which are inadmissible in German [or English]. This measure is often most uniformly preserved throughout a considerable length, not only in the Psalms but also in the Book of Job. For there is far more reason for saying that the strophe lies at the basis of the arrangement of the Book of Job, than for G. Hermann's observation of strophic arrangement in the Bucolic writers and Köchly's in the older portions of Homer.

VII. TEMPLE MUSIC AND PSALMODY.

The Thôra contains no directions respecting the use of song and music in divine worship except the commands con-

tur der Hebräer, S. 67, who maintains that strophes of unequal length are opposed to the simplest laws of the lyric song and melody. But the demands which melody imposes on the formation of the verse and the strophe were not so stringent among the ancients as now, and moreover — is not the sonnet a lyric poem?

* *vid.* Zingerle in the *D. M. Z.* x. 123, 124.

** *vid.* Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*, S. 92—94.

cerning the ritualistic use of silver trumpets to be blown by the priests (Numb. ch. x). David is really the creator of liturgical music, and to his arrangements, as we see from the Chronicles, every thing was afterwards referred, and in times when it had fallen into disuse, restored. So long as David lived, the superintendence of the liturgical music was in his hands (1 Chron. xxv. 2). The instrument by means of which the three choir-masters (Heman, Asaph, and Ethan-Jeduthun) directed the choir was the cymbals (מְצִלְתַּיִם or צֶלְצְלִים*) which served instead of wands for beating time; the harps (נְבָלִים) represented the soprano, and the bass (the male voice in opposition to the female) was represented by the citherns an octave lower (1 Chron. xv. 17—21), which, to infer from the word לְנַצֵּחַ used there, were used at the practice of the pieces by the מְנַצֵּחַ appointed. In a Psalm where סֶלָה is appended (*vid.* on Ps. iii), the stringed instruments (which הִגָּיוֹן סֶלָה ix. 17 definitely expresses), and the instruments generally, are to join in** in such a way as to give intensity to that which is being sung. To these instruments, besides those mentioned in Ps. cl, 2 Sam. vi. 5, belonged also the flute, the liturgical use of which (*vid.* on v. 1) in the time of the first as of the second Temple is undoubted: it formed the peculiar musical accompaniment of the *hallel* (*vid.* Ps. cxiii) and of the nightly torch-light festival on the semi-festival days of the Feast of Tabernacles (*Succa* 15 *a*). The trumpets (חֲצֹצְרוֹת) were blown exclusively by the priests to whom no part was assigned in the singing (as probably also the horn שׁוֹפָר lxxxi. 4, xcviii. 6, cl. 3), and according to 2 Chron. v. 12 sq. (where the number of the two Mosaic trumpets appears to be raised to 120) took their turn *unisono* with the singing and the music of the Levites. At the dedication of Solomon's Temple the Levites sing and play and the priests sound trumpets נַגְּדִם, 2 Chron. vii. 6, and at

---

* Talmudic צִלְצַל. The usual Levitic orchestra of the temple of Herod consisted of 2 Nabla players, 9 Cithern players and one who struck the *Zelazal*, viz. Ben-Arza (*Erachin* 10 *a*, &c.; *Tamid* vii. 3), who also had the oversight of the *duchan* (*Tosiphta* to *Shekalim* ii).

** Comp. Mattheson's "*Erläutertes Selah*" 1745: Selah is a word marking a prelude, interlude, or after-piece with instruments, a sign indicating the places where the instruments play alone, in short a so-called *ritornello*.

the inauguration of the purified Temple under Hezekiah the music of the Levites and priests sound in concert until all the burnt offerings are laid upon the altar fire, and then (probably as the wine is being poured on) began (without any further thought of the priests) the song of the Levites, 2 Chron. xxix. 26—30. In the second Temple it was otherwise: the sounding of the trumpets by the priests and the Levitical song with its accompanying music alternated, they were not simultaneous. The congregation did not usually sing with the choir, but only uttered their Amen; nevertheless they joined in the *Hallel* and in some psalms after the first clause with its repetition, after the second with hallelujah (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Megilla*, 3). 1 Chron. xvi. 36 points to a similar arrangement in the time of the first Temple. Just so does Jer. xxxiii. 11 in reference to the "*Give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good*". Antiphonal singing on the part of the congregation is also to be inferred from Ezra iii. 10 sq. The Psalter itself is moreover acquainted with an allotment of the עלמות, comp. משׁררות Ezra ii. 65 (whose treble was represented by the Levite boys in the second Temple, *vid.* on xlvi 1) in choral worship and speaks of a praising of God "in full choirs", xxvi. 12, lxviii. 27. And responsive singing is of ancient date in Israel: even Miriam with the women answered the men (להם Ex. xv. 21) in alternating song, and Nehemiah (ch. xii. 27 sqq.) at the dedication of the city walls placed the Levites in two great companies which are there called תּוֹדוֹת, in the midst of the procession moving towards the Temple. In the time of the second Temple each day of the week had its psalm. The psalm for Sunday was xxiv, for Monday xlviii, Tuesday lxxxii, Wednesday xciv, Thursday lxxxi, Friday xciii, the Sabbath xcii. This arrangement is at least as old as the time of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ, for the statements of the Talmud are supported by the inscriptions of Ps. xxiv, xlviii, xciv, xciii in the LXX, and as respects the connection of the daily psalms with the drink-offering, by Sir. l. 14—16. The psalms for the days of the week were sung, to wit, at the time of the drink-offering (נֶסֶךְ) which was joined with the morning *Tamid**: two priests, who stood on

* According to the maxim אין אומר שׁירה אלא על היין, "no one singeth except over the wine."

the right and left of the player upon the cymbal *(Zelazal)* by whom the signal was given, sounded the trumpets at the nine pauses (פרקים), into which it was divided when sung by the Levites, and the people bowed down and worshipped.* The Levites standing upon the *suggestus* (דוכן), — *i. e.* upon a broad staircase consisting of a few steps, which led up from the court of the laity to that of the priests, — who were both singers and musicians, and consequently played only on stringed instruments and instruments of percussion, not wind-instruments, were at least twelve in number, with 9 citherns, 2 harps, and one cymbal: on certain days the flute was added to this number.** The usual *suggestus* on the steps at the side of the altar was changed for another only in a few cases; for it is noticed as something special that the singers had a different position at the festival of water-drawing during the Feast of Tabernacles (*vid.* introduction to Ps. cxx — cxxxiv), and that the flute-players who accompanied the *Hallel* stood before the altar, לפני המזבח (*Erachin* 10 *a*). The treble was taken

---

* *B. Rosh ha-Shana*, 31 *a*. *Tamid* vii. 3, comp. the introduction to Ps. xxiv. xcii and xciv.

** According to *B. Erachin* 10 *a* the following were the customary accompaniments of the daily service: 1) 21 trumpet blasts, to as many as 48; 2) 2 nablas, to 6 at most; 2 flutes (חלילין), to 12 at most. Blowing the flute is called striking the flute, הַבָּה חֲלִיל. On 12 days of the year the flute was played before the altar: on the 14th of Nisan at the slaying of the Passover (at which the *Hallel* was sung), on the 14th of Ijar at the slaying of the little Passover, on the 1st and 7th days of the Passover and on the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles. The mouth-piece (אבוב according to the explanation of Maimonides) was not of metal but a reed (comp. Arab. *anbûb*, the blade of the reed), because it sounds more melodious. And it was never more than one flute (אבוב יחידי, playing a solo), which continued at the end of a strain and closed it, because this produces the finest close (חלוק). On the 12 days mentioned, the *Hallel* was sung with flute accompaniment. On other days, the Psalm appointed for the day was accompanied by nablas, cymbals and citherns. This passage of the treatise *Erachin* also tells who were the flute-players. On the flute-playing at the festival of water-drawing, *vid.* my *Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie* S. 195. In the Temple of Herod, according to *Erachin* 10 *b*, there was also an organ. This was however not a water-organ (הדרולים, *hydraulis*), but a wind-organ (מַגְרֵפָה) with a hundred different tones (מיני זמר), whose thunder-like sound, according to Jerome (*Opp. ed. Mart.* v. 191), was heard *ab Jerusalem usque ad montem Olivcti et amplius*, *vid.* Saalschütz, *Archäol* i. 281—284.

by the Levite youths, who stood below the *suggestus* at the feet of the Levites (*vid.* on Ps. xlvi). The daily שיר הקרבן (*i. e.* the week-day psalm which concluded the morning sacrifice) was sung in nine (or perhaps more correctly 3*) pauses, and the pauses were indicated by the trumpet-blasts of the priests (*vid.* on Ps. xxxviii. lxxxi. 4). Beside the seven Psalms which were sung week by week, there were others appointed for the services of the festivals and intervening days (*vid.* on Ps. lxxxi), and in *Biccurim* 3, 4 we read that when a procession bearing the firstfruits accompanied by flute playing had reached the hill on which the Temple stood and the firstfruits had been brought up in baskets, at the entrance of the offerers into the *Azara,* Ps. xxx was struck up by the Levites. This singing was distinct from the mode of delivering the *Tefilla* (*vid.* on Ps. xliv *ad fin.*) and the benediction of the priests (*vid.* on Ps. lxvii), both of which were unaccompanied by music. Distinct also, as it seems, from the mode of delivering the *Hallel,* which was more as a recitative, than sung (*Pesachim* 64*a*, קָרָאוּ אֶת ההלל). It was probably similar to the Arabic, which delights in shrieking, long-winded, trilling, and especially also nasal tones. For it is related of one of the chief singers that in order to multiply the tones, he placed his thumb in his mouth and his fore finger בין הנימין (between the hairs, *i. e.* according to Rashi: on the furrow of the upper lip against the partition of the nostrils), and thus (by forming mouth and nose into a trumpet) produced sounds, before the volume of which the priests started back in astonishment.** This mode of psalm-singing in the Temple of Herod was no longer the original mode, and if the present accentuation of the Psalms represents the fixed form of the Temple song, it nevertheless does not convey to us any im-

---

* This is the view of Maimonides, who distributes the 9 trumpet-blasts by which the morning sacrifice, according to *Succa* 53*b*, was accompanied, over the 3 pauses of the song. The hymn *Haazinu,* Deut. xxxii, which is called שירת הלוים *par excellence*, was sung at the Sabbath *Musaph*-sacrifice — each Sabbath a division of the hymn, which was divided into six parts — so that it began anew on every seventh Sabbath, *vid. J. Megilla,* sect. iii, *ad fin.*

** *vid. B. Joma* 38*b* and *J. Shekalim* v. 3, comp. *Canticum Rabba* on Canticles iii. 6.

pression of that before the Exile. It does, however, neither the one nor the other.

The accents are only musical, and indirectly interpunctional, signs for the chanting pronunciation of the synagogue. And moreover we no longer possess the key to the accents of the three metrical (*i. e.* consisting of symmetrical stichs and strophes) books as musical signs. For the so-called Sarka-tables (which give the value of the accents as notes, beginning with *Zarka,* זרקא), *e. g.* at the end of the second edition of Nägelsbach's *Gramm.,* relate only to the reading of the pentateuchal and prophetic pericope, — consequently to the system of prose accents. In the German synagogue there is no tradition concerning the value of the so-called metrical accents as notes, for the Psalms were not recited according to the accents; but for all the Psalms, there are only two different modes, at least in the German ritual, *viz.* 1) the customary one according to which verse after verse is recited by the leader and the congregation, as *e. g.* Ps. xcv — xcix. xxix. every Friday evening; and 2) that peculiar to Ps. cxix in which the first seven verses of the eight are recited alternately by the leader and the congregation, but the eighth as a concluding verse is always closed by the congregation with a cadence. This psalmody does not always follow the accents. We can only by supposition approximately determine how the Psalms were to be recited according to them. For we still possess at least a few statements of Ben-Asher, Shemtob and Moses Provenzalo (in his grammatical didactic poem בֹּשֶׂם קדמין) concerning the intonation of single metrical accents. *Pazer* and *Shalshéleth* have a like intonation, which rises with a trill; though *Shalshéleth* is more prolonged, about a third longer than that of the prose books. *Legarme* (in form *Mahpach* or *Azla* followed by *Psik*) has a clear high pitch, before *Zinnor,* however, a deeper and more broken tone; *Rebia magnum* a soft tone tending to repose. By *Silluk* the tone first rises and then diminishes. The tone of *Mercha* is according to its name *andante* and sinking into the depths; the tone of *Tarcha* corresponds to *adagio.* Further hints cannot be traced: though we may infer with respect to *Ole we-jored (Mercha mahpachatum)* and *Athnach,* that their intonation ought to form a cadence, as that *Rebia parvum* and *Zinnor (Zarka)* had an

intonation hurrying on to the following distinctive accent. Further, if we place *Dechi (Tiphcha initiale)* and *Rebia gereshatum* beside the remaining six *servi* among the notes, we may indeed produce a sarka-table of the metrical accentuation, although we cannot guarantee its exact agreement with the original manner of singing.

Following Gerbert *(De musica sacra)* and Martini *(Storia della musica),* the view is at present very general that in the eight Gregorian tones together with the extra tone *(tonus peregrinus)*,* used only for Ps. cxiii (= cxiv—cxv in the Hebrew numeration), we have a remnant of the ancient Temple song; and this in itself is by no means improbable in connection with the Jewish nationality of the primitive church and its gradual severance at the first from the Temple and synagogue. In the convents of Bethlehem, which St. Paula founded, psalms were sung at six hours of prayer from early morn till midnight, and she herself was so well versed in Hebrew, *ut Psalmos hebraice caneret et sermonem absque ulla Latinæ linguæ proprietate personaret (Ep.* 108 *ad Eustoch.* c. 26). This points to a connection between the church and synagogue psalm-melodies in the *mos orientalium partium,* the oriental psalmody, which was introduced by Ambrose into the Milanese church. Nevertheless, at the same time the Jewish element has undergone scarcely any change; it has been developed under the influence of the Greek style, but is, notwithstanding, still recognizable.** Pethachja of Ratisbon, the Jewish traveller in the 12th century, when in Bagdad, the ancient seat of the Geonim (גאונים), heard the Psalms sung in a manner altogether peculiar;*** and Benjamin of Tudela, in the same century, became acquainted in Bagdad with a skilful singer of the Psalms used in divine worship. Saadia on Ps. vi. 1,

* *vid.* Friedr. Hommel's *Psalter nach der deutschen Uebersetzung* D. *M. Luthers für den Gesang eingerichtet*, 1859. The Psalms are there arranged in stichs, rightly assuming it to be the original mode and the most appropriate, that antiphonal song ought to alternate not according to the verses, as at the present day in the Romish and English church, but according to the two members of the verse.

** *vid.* Saalschütz, *Geschichte und Würdigung der Musik bei den Hebräern*, 1829, S. 121, and Otto Strauss, *Geschichtliche Betrachtung über den Psalter als Gesang- und Gebetbuch*, 1859.

*** *vid. Literaturblatt des Orients*, 4th year, col. 541.

infers from על־השמינית that there were eight different melodies (الحان). And eight נגינות are also mentioned elsewhere;* perhaps not without reference to those eight church-tones, which are also found among the Armenians.** Moreover the two modes of using the accents in chanting, which are attested in the ancient service-books,*** may perhaps be not altogether unconnected with the distinction between the festival and the simpler ferial manner in the Gregorian style of church-music.

VIII. TRANSLATIONS OF THE PSALMS.

The earliest translation of the Psalms is the Greek Alexandrine version. When the grandson of the son of Sirach came to Egypt in the year 132 B. C., not only the Law and the Prophets, but also the Hagiographa were already translated into the Greek; of course therefore also the Psalms, by which the Hagiographa are directly named in Luke xxiv. 44. The story of the LXX (LXXII) translators, in its original form, refers only to the Thôra; the translations of the other books are later and by different authors. All these translators used a text consisting only of consonants, and these moreover were here and there more or less indistinct; this text had numerous glosses, and was certainly not yet, as later, settled on the Masoretic basis. This they translated literally, in ignorance of the higher exegetical and artistic functions of the translator, and frequently the translation itself is obscure. From Philo, Josephus and the New Testament we see that we possess the text of this translation substantially in its original form, so that criticism, which since the middle of the last century has acquired many hitherto unknown helps,† more especially also in the province of the Psalms, will not need to reverse its judgment of the character of the

* Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature* p. 336 sq.

** Petermann, *Ueber die Musik der Armenier* in the *Deutsche Morgenl Zeitschrift* v. 368 f.

*** Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, S. 115.

† To this period belong 1) the *Psalterium Veronense* published by Blanchini 1740, the Greek text in Roman characters with the Italic at the side belonging to the 5th or 6th century (*vid.* Tischendorf's edition of the LXX, 1856, *Prolegg.* p. lviii sq.); 2) the *Psalterium Turicense pur-*

work. Nevertheless, this translation, as being the oldest key to the understanding of the language of the Old Testament writings, as being the oldest mirror of the Old Testament text, which is not to be exempted from modest critical investigation, and as an important check upon the interpretation of Scripture handed down in the Talmud, in the Midrash, and in that portion of the national literature in general, not originating in Egypt, — is invaluable.

In one other respect this version claims a still greater significance. Next to the Book of Isaiah, no book is so frequently cited in the New Testament as the Psalter. The Epistle to the Hebrews has grown up entirely from the roots of the language of the Old Testament psalms. The Apocalypse, the only book which does not admit of being referred back to any earlier formula as its basis, is nevertheless not without references to the Psalter: Ps. ii in particular has a significant part in the moulding of the apocalyptic conceptions and language. These New Testament citations, with few exceptions (as John xiii. 18), are based upon the LXX, even where this translation (as. *e. g.*, Ps. xix. 5, li. 6, cxvi. 10), only in a general way, correctly reproduces the original text. The explanation of this New Testament use of the LXX is to be found in the high esteem in which this translation was held among the Jewish people: it was accounted, not only by the Hellenistic, but also by the Palestinian Jews, as a providential and almost miraculous production; and this esteem was justified by the fact, that, although altogether of unequal birth with the canonical writ-

---

purcum described by Breitinger 1748, Greek Text likewise of the 5th or 6th century (*vid. ibid.* p. lix sq.); 3) *Palmorum Fragmenta papyracea Londinensia* (in the British Museum), Ps. x. 2—xviii. 6, xx. 14—xxxiv. 6, of the 4th century, given in Tischendorf's *Monumenta Sacra Inedita. Nova Collectio* t. i; 4) *Fragmenta Psalmorum Tischendorfiana* Ps. cxli (ii). 7—8, cxlii (iii). 1—3, cxliv (v). 7—13, of the 5th or 4th century in the *Monumenta* t. ii. There still remain unused to the present time 1) the *Psalterium Græco-Latinum* of the library at St. Gall, *Cod.* 17 in 4to, Greek text in uncial characters with the Latin at the side; 2) *Psalterium Gallico-Romano-Hebraico-Græcum* of the year 909, *Cod.* 230 in the public library at Bamberg (*vid.* a description of this MS. by Schönfelder in the *Serapeum*, 1865, No. 21) written by Solomon, abbot of St. Gall and bishop of Constance (d. 920), and brought to Bamberg by the emperor Henry II (d. 1024), who had received it as a gift when in St. Gall; as regards the criticism of the text of the LXX it is of like importance with the *Veronense* which it resembles.

ings, it nevertheless occupies a position in the history of divine revelation which forms a distinct epoch. For it was the first opportunity afforded to the gentile world of becoming acquainted with the Old Testament revelation, and thus the first introduction of Japheth into the tents of Shem. At the same time therewith, a distinct breaking down of the barriers of the Old Testament particularism was effected. The Alexandrine translation was, therefore, an event which prepared the way for that Christianity, in which the appointment of the religion of Israel to be the religion of the world is perfected. This version, at the outset, created for Christianity the language which it was to use; for the New Testament Scriptures are written in the popular Greek dialect (κοινή) with an Alexandrine colouring. And in a general way we may say that Alexandrinism moulded the forms beforehand, which Christianity was afterwards to fill up with the substance of the gospel. As the way of Jesus Christ lay by Egypt (Matth. ii. 15), so the way of Christianity also lay by Egypt, and Alexandria in particular.

Equally worthy of respect on account of its antiquity and independence, though not of the same importance as the LXX from a religio-historical point of view, is the Targum or Chaldee version of the Psalms: a version which only in a few passages assumes the form of a paraphrase with reference to Midrash interpretations. The date of its composition is uncertain. But as there was a written Targum to the Book of Job* even during the time of the Temple, there was also a Targum of the Psalms, though bearing in itself traces of manifold revisions, which probably had its origin during the duration of the Temple. In distinction from the Targums of Onkelos to the Pentateuch and of Jonathan to the minor Prophets the Targum of the Psalms belongs to the so-called Jerusalem group,** for the Aramaic idiom in which it is written, — while, as the Jerusalem Talmud shews, it is always distinguished in no small degree from the Palestinian popular dialect as being the language of the literature — abounds in the same manner as the former in Greek words

* *vid. Tosefta* to *Sabb.* xvi, *Jer. Sabb.* xiv, §. 1, *Bab. Sabb.* 115 *a*, *Sofrim* v, 15.

** *vid.* Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, S.* 166 f.

(as מַלְאָכִים ἄγγελοι, אַבִּירִים ἐξέδραι, קְרִיִּים κύριος), and like it also closely approximates, in sound and formation, to the Syriac. From this translation which excels the LXX in grammatical accuracy and has at its basis a more settled and stricter text, we learn the meaning of the Psalms as understood in the synagogue, as the interpretation became fixed, under the influence of early tradition, in the first centuries of the Christian era. The text of the Targum itself is at the present day in a very neglected condition. The most correct texts are to be found in Buxtorf and Norzi's Bibles. Critical observations on the Targums of the Hagiographa are given in the treatise עטרה אור by Benzion Berkowitz (Wilna, 1843).

The third most important translation of the Psalms is the *Peshîto*, the old version of the Syrian church, which was made not later than in the second century. Its author translated from the original text, which he had without the vowel points, and perhaps also in a rather incorrect form: as is seen from such errors as xvii. 15 (אמונתך instead of תמונתך), lxxxiii. 12 (שרמו ואברמי *dele eos et perde eos* instead of שיהמו נדיבמו), cxxxix. 16 (גמלי *retributionem meam* instead of גלמי). In other errors he is influenced by the LXX, as lvi. 9 (בנגדך LXX ἐνώπιόν σου instead of בנארך), he follows this version in such departures from the better text sometimes not without additional reason, as xc. 5 (*generationes eorum annus erunt,* i. e. זרעותיו שנה יהיו, LXX τὰ ἐξουδενώματα αὐτῶν ἔτη ἔσονται), cx. 3 *(populus tuus gloriosus,* i. e. עמך נְדִבוֹת in the sense of נדיבה, Job xxx. 15, nobility, rank, LXX μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχή). The fact that he had the LXX before him beside the original text is manifest, and cannot be done away by the supposition that the text of the Peshîto has been greatly distorted out of the later Hexaplarian translation; although even this is probable, for the LXX won such universal respect in the church that the Syrians were almost ashamed of their ancient version, which disagreed with it in many points, and it was this very circumstance which gave rise in the year 617 A. D. to the preparation of a new Syriac translation from the Hexaplarian LXX-text. It is not however merely between the Peshîto and the LXX, but also between the Peshîto and the Targum, that a not accidental mutual relation exists, which becomes at once apparent in Ps. i (*e. g.* in the translation of לצים by

ממיקני and of תורת by נמוסא) and hardly admits of explanation by the use of the Christian Peshito on the part of the Jewish Targumist.* It may be more readily supposed that the old Syriac translator of the Psalms, of whom we are now speaking, was a Jewish Christian and did not despise the welcome assistance of the Targum, which was already at hand, in whatever form it might be. It is evident that he was a Christian from passages like xix. 5, cx. 3, also from lxviii. 19 comp. with Ephes. iv. 8, Jer. xxxi. 31 comp. with Hebr. viii. 8; and his knowledge of the Hebrew language, with which, as was then generally the case, the knowledge of Greek was united, shews that he was a Jewish Christian. Moreover the translation has its peculiar Targum characteristics: tropical expressions are rendered literally, and by a remarkable process of reasoning interrogative clauses are turned into express declarations: lxxxviii. 11—13 is an instance of this with a bold inversion of the true meaning to its opposite. In general the author shuns no violence in order to give a pleasing sense to a difficult passage *e. g.* xii. 6*b*, lx. 6. The musical and historical inscriptions, and consequently also the סלה (including הגיון סלה ix. 17) he leaves untranslated, and the division of verses he adopts is not the later Masoretic. All these peculiarities make the *Peshîto* all the more interesting as a memorial in exegetico-historical and critical enquiry: and yet, since Dathe's edition, 1768, who took the text of Erpenius as his ground-work and added valuable notes,** scarcely anything has been done in this direction.

In the second century new Greek translations were also made. The high veneration which the LXX had hitherto enjoyed was completely reversed when the rupture between the synagogue and the church took place, so that the day when this translation was completed was no longer compared to the day of the giving of the Law, but to the day of

---

* Although more recently we are told, Hai Gaon (in Babylonia) when he came upon a difficult passage in his Academical lectures on the Psalms enquired of the patriarch of the Eastern church how he interpreted it, *vid.* Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 125 sq.

** The fragments of the translation of the Ps., which are cited under the name ὁ Σύρος, Dathe has also there collected in his preface.

the golden calf. Nor was it possible that it should be otherwise than that its defects should become more and more perceptible. Even the New Testament writers found it requiring correction here and there, or altogether unfit for use, for the Palestinian text of the Old Testament which had been handed down, was not merely as regards the consonants but also as to pronunciation substantially the same as that which has been fixed by the Masoretes since the sixth century. Consequently Aquila of Pontus (a proselyte from heathenism to Judaism) in the first half of the 2nd century, made a Greek translation of the Old Testament, which imitated the original text word for word even at the risk of un-Greek expressions, and in the choice of the Greek words used is determined by the etymology of the Hebrew words. Not to lose any of the weighty words he translates the first sentence of the Thôra thus: Ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς σὺν (את) τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν (את) τὴν γῆν. In the fragments of the translation of the Psalms, one of which has been preserved in the Talmudic literature (*vid.* on Ps. xlviii. 15), we do not meet with such instances of violence in favour of literalness, although also even there he forces the Greek into the form of the Hebrew, and always renders the words according to their primary meaning (*e. g.* דביר χρηματιστήριον, מגלה εἴλημα, פתח ἄνοιγμα, רהב ὅρμημα, אמן πεπιστευμένως), sometimes unhappily and misled by the usage the language had acquired in his time. In some passages he reads the text differently from our present pointing (*e. g.* x. 4 ὅταν ὑψωθῇ), but he moreover follows the tradition (*e. g.* סלה ἀεί, שדי ἱκανός, מכתם τοῦ ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἁπλοῦ = מך ותם) and also does not despise whatever the LXX may offer that is of any worth (*e. g.* במנים ἐν χορδαῖς), as his translation throughout, although an independent one, relies more or less upon the pioneering work of its predecessor, the LXX. His talent as a translator is unmistakeable. He has perfect command of the Hebrew, and handles the treasures of the Greek with a master-hand. For instance, in the causative forms he is never in difficulty for a corresponding Greek word (הפיל πτωματίζειν, הריץ δρομοῦν, השכיל ἐπιστημοῦν and the like). The fact that he translated for the synagogue in opposition to the church is betrayed by passages like ii. 12, xxii. 17, cx. 3 and perhaps also lxxxiv. 10, comp. Dan. ix. 26, where he pre-

ters ἠλειμμένου to Χριστοῦ: nevertheless one must not in this respect charge him with evil intentions throughout. Even Jerome, on calmer reflection, moderated his indignation against Aquila's translation to a less harsh judgment: *ut amicæ menti fatear, quæ ad nostram fidem pertineant roborandam plura reperio*, and praised it even at the expense of the translations of Theodotion and Symmachus: *Isti Semichristiani Judaice transtulerunt, et Judæus Aquila interpretatus est ut Christianus.*

The translation of Theodotion is not an original work. It is based upon the LXX and brings this version, which was still the most widely used, into closer relation to the original text, by making use of Aquila's translation. The fragments that are preserved to us of passages independently translated contain nothing pre-eminently characteristic. Symmachus also takes the LXX as his basis, but in re-moulding it according to the original text he acts far more decidedly and independently than Theodotion, and distinguishes himself from Aquila by endeavouring to unite literalness with clearness and verbal accuracy: his translation of the Psalms has even a poetic inspiration about it. Both Aquila and Symmachus issued their translations twice, so that some passages are extant translated in a twofold form (*vid.* cx. 3).

Beside the LXX. Aq. Symm. and Theod. there are also a fifth, sixth and seventh Greek translation of the Psalms. The fifth is said to have been found in Jericho under the emperor Caracalla, the sixth in Nicopolis under the emperor Alexander Severus. The former, in its remains, shews a knowledge of the language and tradition, the latter is sometimes (xxxvii. 35, Hab. iii. 13) paraphrastic. A seventh is also mentioned besides, it is most like Theodotion. In the Hexapla of Origen, which properly contains only six columns (the Hebrew text, the Hebr. text in Greek characters, Aq., Symm., LXX, Theod.), in the Ps. and elsewhere a *Quinta* (E), *Sexta* (ϛ), and *Septima* (Z) are added to these six columns: thus the Hexapla (apart from the Seventh) became an Octapla. Of the remains of these old versions as compiled by Origen, after the labours of his predecessors Nobilius and Drusius, the most complete collection is that of Bernard de Montfaucon in his *Hexaplorum Origenis quæ supersunt* (2 vols. *folio,* Paris 1713); the rich gleanings since handed down from many

different quarters* are unfortunately still scattered and uncollated.

Euthymius Zigadenus mentions beside the LXX, Aq., Symm., Theod., V., and VI., as a Seventh version that of Lucian which attempts to restore the original Septuagint-text by a comparison with the original text. Lucian died as a martyr 311 A. D. in Nicomedia, whither he had been dragged from Antioch. The autograph of this translation was found in Nicomedia, hidden in a small rough-plastered tower.** We are as little able to form a conception of this Septuagint-recension of Lucian as of that of the cotemporary Egyptian bishop Hesychius, since not a single specimen of either is extant. It would be interesting to know the difference of treatment of the two critics from that of Origen, who corrected the text of the κοινή after the Hebrew original by means of Theodotion's, *obelis jugulans quæ abundare videbantur, et quæ deerant sub asteriscis interserens,* which produced a confusion that might easily have been foreseen.

From the old Latin translation, the so-called *Itala,* made from the LXX, we possess the Psalter complete: Blanchini has published this translation of the Psalms (1740) from the Veronese Psalter, and Sabbatier in the second volume of his *Latinæ Versiones Antiquæ* (1751) from the Psalter of the monastery of St. Germain. The text in Faber Stapulensis' *Quincuplex Psalterium* (1509) is compiled from Augustine; for Augustine, like Hilary, Ambrose, Prosper, and Cassiodorus, expounds the Psalms according to the old Latin text. Jerome first of all carefully revised this in Rome, and thus originated the *Psalterium Romanum*, which has been the longest retained

---

* Thus *e. g.* Montfaucon was only able to make use of the Psalter-MS. *Cod. Vat.* 754 for 16 Psalms; Adler has compared it to the end and found in it valuable Hexapla fragments (*vid. Repert. für Bibl. u. Morgenl. Lit.* xiv. S. 183 f.). The Psalm-commentary of Barhebræus and the *Psalterium Mediolanense* have also been begun to be worked with this object; but as yet, not the Syriac Psalter of the Medici library mentioned by Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum* i. 240 and supposed to be based upon the *Quinta.*

** Comp. the Athanasian synopsis in Montfaucon, *Hexapla* t. 1 p. 59 and the contribution from a Syriac MS in the *Repertorium für Bibl. u. Morgenl. Lit. ib.* (1784) S. 48 f

by the church of Milan and the Basilica of the Vatican. He then in Bethlehem prepared a second more carefully revised edition, according to the Hexaplarian Septuagint-text* with daggers (as a sign of additions in the LXX contrary to the original) and asterisks (a sign of additions in the LXX from Theodotion in accordance with the original), and this second edition which was first adopted by the Gallican churches obtained the name of the *Psalterium Gallicanum.* It is not essentially different from the Psalter of the Vulgate, and appeared, with its critical signs, from a MS. of Bruno, bishop of Würzburg (died 1045), for the first time in the year 1494 (then edited by Cochleus, 1533): both Psalters, the Romish and the Gallican, are placed opposite one another in Faber's *Quincuplex Psalterium,* in t. x. p. 1 of the *Opp. Hieronymi, ed. Vallarsi* and elsewhere.

The Latin Psalters, springing from the common or from the Hexaplarian Septuagint-text, as also the Hexapla-Syriac and the remaining Oriental versions based upon the LXX and the Peshîto, have only an indirectly exegetico-historical value. On the contrary Jerome's translation of the Psalter, *juxta Hebraicam veritatem,* is the first scientific work of translation, and, like the whole of his independent translation of the Old Testament from the original text, a bold act by which he has rendered an invaluable service to the church, without allowing himself to be deterred by the cry raised against such innovations. This independent translation of Jerome has become the Vulgate of the church: but in a text in many ways estranged from its original form, with the simple exception of the Psalter. For the new translation of this book was opposed by the inflexible liturgical use it had attained; the texts of the *Psalterium Romanum* and *Gallicanum* maintained their ground and became (with the omission of the critical signs) an essential portion of the Vulgate. On this account it is the more to be desired that Jerome's Latin Psalter

* *Illud breviter admoneo* — says Jerome, Ep. cvi. *ad Sunniam et Fretelam — ut sciatis, aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes et Cæsarcensis Eusebius omnesque Græciæ tractatores* Κοινήν, *id est, Communem appellant atque Vulgatam et a plerisque nunc* Λουκιανός *dicitur; aliam Septuaginta Interpretum, quæ in* Ἑξαπλοῖς *eodicibus reperitur et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est et Hierosolymæ atque in Orientis ecclesiis decantatur.*

ex Hebræo (*Opp. ed. Vallarsi* t. ix. p. iii) were made more generally known and accessible by a critical edition published separately. It is not necessary to search far for critical helps for such an undertaking. There is an excellent MS., *Cod.* 19, in the library of St. Gall, presented by the abbot Hartmot (died 895).

Origen and Jerome learnt the language of the Old Testament from Jewish teachers. All the advantages of Origen's philological learning are lost to us, excepting a few insignificant remains, with his Hexapla: this gigantic bible which would be the oldest direct monument of the Old Testament text if it were but extant. Whereas in Jerome's Old Testament translated from the original text (*canon Hebraicæ veritatis*) we have the maturest fruit of the philological attainments of this indefatigable, steady investigator inspired with a zeal for knowledge. It is a work of the greatest critical and historical value in reference to language and exegesis. The translation of the Psalter is dedicated to Sophronius who had promised to translate it into Greek: this Greek translation is not preserved to us.

Jerome's translation of the Psalter has not its equal either in the synagogue or the church until the time of Saadia Gaon of Fajum, the Arabian translator of the Psalms. Two MSS. of his translation of the Psalms are to be found at Oxford; but the most important, which also contains his annotations complete, is in Munich. Schnurrer (1791) contributed Ps. xvi, xl and cx to Eichhorn's *Biblioth. der Bibl. Lit.* iii, from *Cod. Pocock.* 281, then Haneberg (1840) Ps. lxviii and several others from the Munich Cod.; the most extensive excerpts from *Cod. Pocock.* 281 and *Cod. Huntingt.* 416 (with various readings from *Cod. Mon.* appended) are given by Ewald in the first vol. of his *Beiträge zur ältesten Ausleg. u. Sprach-erklärung des A. T.* 1844. The gain which can be drawn from Saadia for the interpretation of the Psalms, according to the requirements of the present day, is very limited; but he promises a more interesting and rich advantage to philology and the history of exegesis. Saadia stands in the midst of the still ever mysterious process of development out of which the finally established and pointed text of the Old Testament came forth. He has written a treatise on the punctuation

(ניקוד) to which Rashi refers in Ps. xlv. 10, but in his treatment of the Old Testament text shews himself to be unfettered by its established punctuation. His translation is the first scientific work on the Psalms in the synagogue. The translation of Jerome is five hundred years older, but only the translation of Luther has been able to stand side by side with it and that because he was the first to go back to the fountain head of the original text.

The task, which is assigned to the translator of the sacred Scriptures, was recognised by Luther as by no one before him, and he has discharged it as no one up to the present day since his time has done. What Cicero said of his translation of the two controversial speeches of Demosthenes and Æschines holds good also of Luther: *Non converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis iisdem et earum formis tanquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis: in quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omnium verborum vimque servavi; non enim ea me adnumerare lectori putavi oportere, sed tanquam adpendere* — he has lived in thought and feeling in the original text in order not to reproduce it literally with a slavish adherence to its form, but to re-mould it into good and yet spiritually renewed German and at the same time to preserve its spirit free and true to its deepest meaning. This is especially the case with his translation of the Psalms, in which even Moses Mendelssohn has thought it to his advantage to follow him. To deny that here and there it is capable of improvement by a more correct understanding of the sense and in general by greater faithfulness to the original (without departing from the spirit of the German language), would indicate an ungrateful indifference to the advance which has been made in biblical interpretation — an advance not merely promised, but which we see actually achieved.

IX. HISTORY OF THE EXPOSITION OF THE PSALMS.

If we now take a glance over the history of the exposition of the Psalms, we shall see from it how late it was before the proper function of scientific exposition was recognised. We begin with the apostolic exposition. The Old Testament according to its very nature tends towards and centres in

Christ. Therefore the innermost truth of the Old Testament has been revealed in the revelation of Jesus Christ. But not all at once: His passion, resurrection, and ascension are three steps of this progressive opening up of the Old Testament, and of the Psalms in particular. Our Lord himself, both before and after His resurrection, unfolded the meaning of the Psalms from His own life and its vicissitudes; He shewed how what was written in the Law of Moses, in the Prophets and in the Psalms was fulfilled in Him; He revealed to His disciples the meaning τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς Luke xxiv. 44 sq. Jesus Christ's exposition of the Psalms is the beginning and the goal of Christian Psalm-interpretation. This began, as that of the Christian church, and in fact first of all that of the Apostles, at Pentecost when the Spirit, whose instrument David acknowledges himself to have been (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), descended upon the Apostles as the Spirit of Jesus, the fulfiller and fulfilment of prophecy. This Spirit of the glorified Jesus completed what, in His humiliation and after His resurrection, he had begun: He opened up to the disciples the meaning of the Psalms. How strongly they were drawn to the Psalms is seen from the fact that they are quoted about seventy times in the New Testament, which, next to Isaiah, is more frequently than any other Old Testament book. From these interpretations of the Psalms the church will have to draw to the end of time. For only the end will be like the beginning and even surpass it. But we must not seek in the New Testament Scriptures what they are not designed to furnish, viz., an answer to questions belonging to the lower grades of knowledge, to grammar, to cotemporary history and to criticism. The highest and final questions of the spiritual meaning of Scripture find their answer here; the grammatico-historico-critical under-structure, — as it were, the candlestick of the new light, — it was left for succeeding ages to produce.

The post-apostolic, patristic exposition was not capable of this. The interpreters of the early church with the exception of Origen and Jerome possessed no knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, and even these two not sufficient to be able to rise to freedom from a dependence upon the LXX which only led them into frequent error. Of Origen's Commentary and Homilies on the Ps. we possess only fragments translated

by Rufinus, and his ὑπόμνημα εἰς τοὺς ψαλμούς (edited complete by Kleopas, 1855, from a MS. in the monastery of Mar-Saba). Jerome, *contra Rufinum* i. § 19, indeed mentions *Commentarioli* on the Ps. by himself, but the *Breviarium in Psalterium* (in t. vii. p. ii of his *Opp. ed. Vallarsi*) bearing his name is allowed not to be genuine, and is worthless as regards the history of the text and the language. The almost complete Commentary (on Ps. i—cxix according to the Hebrew reckoning) of Eusebius, made known by Montfaucon (*Collectio nova Patrum et Scriptorum Græc.* t. i) is unsuspected. Eusebius, though living in Palestine and having a valuable library at command, is nevertheless so ignorant of the Hebrew, that he considers it is possible Μαριαμ (מרחם) in Ps. cx may refer to Mary. But by contributions from the Hexapla he has preserved many acceptable treasures of historical value in connection with the translation, but of little worth in other respects, for the interpretation is superficial, and capriciously allegorical and forced. Athanasius in his short explanation of the Psalms (in t. i p. ii of the Benedictine edition) is entirely dependent on Philo for the meaning of the Hebrew names and words. His book: πρὸς Μαρκελλῖνον εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τῶν ψαλμῶν (in the same vol. of the Benedictine edition) is a very beautiful essay. It treats of the riches contained in the Psalms, classifies them according to their different points of view, and gives directions how to use them profitably in the manifold circumstances and moods of the outward and inner life. Johann Reuchlin has translated this little book of Athanasius into Latin, and Jörg Spalatin from the Latin of Reuchlin into German (1516. 4to.). Of a similar kind are the two books of Gregory of Nyssa εἰς τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν τῶν ψαλμῶν (*Opp. ed. Paris,* t. i), which treat of the arrangement and inscriptions; but in respect of the latter he is so led astray by the LXX, that he sets down the want of titles of 12 Ps. (this is the number according to Gregory), which have titles in the LXX, to Jewish ἀπιστία and κακία. Nevertheless there are several valuable observations in this introduction of the great Nyssene. About cotemporaneously with Athanasius, Hilarius Pictaviensis, in the Western church, wrote his allegorizing (after Origen's example) *Tractatus in librum Psalmorum* with an extensive prologue, which strongly reminds one of Hippolytus'

We still have his exposition of Ps. i. ii. ix. xiii. xiv. li. lii. liii—lxix. xci. cxviii—cl (according to the numbering of the LXX); according to Jerome (*Ep. ad Augustin.* cxii*) it is transferred from Origen and Eusebius. It is throughout ingenious and pithy, but more useful to the dogmatic theologian than to the exegete (t. xxvii. xxviii of the *Collectio Patrum* by Caillau and Guillon).** Somewhat later, but yet within the last twenty years of the fourth century (about 386—397), come Ambrose's *Enarrationes in Ps.* i. xxxv—xl. xliii. xlv. xlvii. xlviii. lxi. cxviii (in t. ii of the Benedictine edition). The exposition of Ps. i is likewise an introduction to the whole Psalter, taken partly from Basil. He and Ambrose have pronounced the highest eulogiums on the Psalter. The latter says: *Psalmus enim benedictio populi est, Dei laus, plebis laudatio, plausus omnium, sermo universorum, vox Ecclesiæ, fidei canora confessio, auctoritatis plena devotio, libertatis lætitia, clamor jucunditatis, lætitiæ resultatio. Ab iracundia mitigat, a sollicitudine abdicat, a mœrore allevat. Nocturna arma, diurna magisteria; scutum in timore, festum in sanctitate, imago tranquillitatis, pignus pacis atque concordiæ, citharæ modo ex diversis et disparibus vocibus unam exprimens cantilenam. Diei ortus psalmum resultat, psalmum resonat occasus.* After such and similar prefatory language we are led to expect from the exposition great fervour and depth of perception: and such are really its characteristics, but not to so large an extent as might have been the case had Ambrose — whose style of writing is as musical as that of Hilary is stiff and angular — worked

* The following Greek expositors of the Psalms are mentioned there: 1) Origen, 2) Eusebius of Cæsarea, 3) Theodore of Heraclea (the *Anonymus* in Corderius' *Catena*), 4) Asterius of Scythopolis, 5) Apollinaris (Apolinarios) of Laodicea, 6) Didymus of Alexandria. Then the following Latin expositors: 1) Hilary of Poictiers, who translated or rather remodelled Origen's Homilies on the Psalms (Jerome himself says of him, *Ep.* lvii *ad Pammach.*: *captivos sensus in suam linguam victoris jure transposuit*), 2) Eusebius of Vercelli, translator of the commentary of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and 3) Ambrose, who was partly dependent upon Origen. Of Apollinaris the elder, we have a Μετάφρασις τοῦ ψαλτῆρος διὰ στίχων ἡρωϊκῶν preserved to us. He has also translated the Pentateuch and other Old Testament books into heroic verse.

** *vid.* the characteristics of this commentary in Reinkens, *Hilarius von Poitiers* (1864) S. 291—308.

out these expositions, which were partly delivered as sermons, partly dictated, with his own hand.

The most comprehensive work of the early church on the Psalms was that of Chrysostom, which was probably written while at Antioch. We possess only the exposition of 58 Ps. or (including Ps. iii and xli, which in their present form do not belong to this work) 60 Ps. (in t. v of Montfaucon's edition). Photius and Suidas place this commentary on the Psalms in the highest rank among the works of Chrysostom. It is composed in the form of sermons, the style is brilliant, and the contents more ethical than dogmatic. Sometimes the Hebrew text according to the Hexapla is quoted, and the Greek versions which depart from the original are frequently compared, but, unfortunately, generally without any name. There is hardly any trace in it of the renowned philologico-historical tendency of the school of Antioch. Theodoret (in t. ii p. ii of the Halle edition) was the first to set before himself the middle course between an extravagant allegorising and an unspiritual adherence to the literal historical sense (by which he doubtless has reference to Theodore of Mopsuestia), and thus to a certain extent he makes a beginning in distinguishing between the province of exegesis and practical application. But this scientific commencement, with even more of the grammatico-historical tendency, is still defective and wanting in independence. For example, the question whether all the Psalms are by David or not, is briefly decided in the affirmative, with κρατείτω τῶν πλειόνων ἡ ψῆφος.* The designed, minute comparison of the Greek translators is most thankworthy; in other respects, this expositor, like the Syrians generally, is wanting in the mystic depth which might compensate for the want of scientific insight. All this may be also said of Euthymius Zigadenus (Zigabenus): his commentary on the

* In the Talmud R. Meir, *Pesachim* 117 *a*, adopts the view that David is the author of all the Ps.: כל השבחות שבספר תהלים כולן דוד אמרן, while in *Bathra* 14 *b* ten authors are supposed: דוד כתב ספר תהלים על ידי עשרה זקנים, *vid.* on this, Midrash to Cant. iv. 4 and Eccl. vii. 19. In the former passage להלפיות is explained as an emblematic name of the Psalter: ספר שאמרוהו לו פיות הרבה, the book of David, to which the mouths of many have contributed. And there are two modern commentaries, viz. by Klauss, 1832, and Randegger, 1841, which are written with the design of proving all the Psalms to be Davidic.

Psalms (in Greek in t. iv of the Venetian edition of the *Opp. Theophylacti*), written at the desire of the emperor Alexius Comnenus, is nothing but a skilful compilation, in the preparation of which he made good use of the Psalm-catena, likewise a compilation, of the somewhat earlier Νικήτας Σερρῶν*, which is to be found on Mount Athos and is still unprinted.

The Western counterpart to Chrysostom's commentary are Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (in t. iv of the Benedictine edition). The psalm-singing in the Milanese church had contributed greatly to Augustine's conversion. But his love to his Lord was fired still more by the reading of the Psalms when he was preparing himself in solitude for his baptism. His commentary consists of sermons which he wrote down in part himself and in part dictated. Only the thirty-two *sermones* on Ps. cxviii (cxix), which he ventured upon last of all, were not actually delivered. He does not adopt the text of Jerome as his basis, but makes use of the older Latin version, the original text of which he sought to establish, and here and there to correct, by the LXX; whereas Arnobius, the Semi-Pelagian, in his paraphrastic Africano-Latin commentary on the Psalms (first edition by Erasmus, *Basileæ, Froben.* 1522, who, as also Trithemius, erroneously regarded the author as one and the same with the Apologist) no longer uses the so-called Itala, but takes Jerome's translation as his basis. The work of Augustine far surpassing that of Chrysostom in richness and depth of thought, has become, in the Western church, the chief mine of all later exposition of the Psalms. Cassiodorus in his *Expositiones in omnes Psalmos* (in t. ii of the Bened. ed.) draws largely from Augustine, though not devoid of independence.

What the Greek church has done for the exposition of the Psalms has been garnered up many times since Photius in so-called Σειραί, *Catenæ*. That of Nicetas archbishop of Serra in Macedonia (about 1070), is still unprinted. One, extending only to Ps. 1, appeared at Venice 1569, and a complete one, edited by Corderius, at Antwerp 1643 (3 vols., from

* This information is found in the modern Greek edition of Euthemius' Commentary on the Ps. by Nicodemos the Agiorite (2 vols. Constantinople 1819—21), which also contains extracts from this catena of Nicetas Serronius.

Vienna and Munich MSS.). Folckmann (1601) made extracts from the Catena of Nicetas Heracleota, and Aloysius Lippomanus began a Catena from Greek and Latin writers on the largest scale (one folio vol. on Ps. i—x, *Romæ* 1585). The defects to be found in the ancient exposition of the Psalms are in general the same in the Greek and in the Western expositors. To their want of acquaintance with the text of the original was added their unmethodical, irregular mode of procedure, their arbitrary straining of the prophetic character of the Psalms (as *e. g.* Tertullian, *De spectaculis,* takes the whole of Ps. i as a prophecy concerning Joseph of Arimathea), their unhistorical perception, before which all differences between the two Testaments vanish, and their misleading predilection for the allegorical method. In all this, the meaning of the Psalms, as understood by the apostles, remains unused; they appropriate it without rightly apprehending it, and do not place the Psalms in the light of the New Testament fulfilment of them, but at once turn them into New Testament language and thoughts. But the church has never found such rapturous delight in the Psalms, which it was never weary of singing day and night, never used them with richer results even to martyrdom, than at that period. Instead of profane popular songs, as one passed through the country one might hear psalms resounding over the fields and vineyards. *Quocunque te verteris,* writes Jerome to the widow of Marcellus from the Holy Land, *arator stivam tenens Alleluja decantat, sudans messor psalmis se avocat et curva attondens vitem falce vinitor aliquid Davidicum canit. Hæc sunt in hac provincia carmina, hæ (ut vulgo dicitur) amatoriæ cantiones, hic pastorum sibilus, hæc arma culturæ.* The delights of country life he commends to Marcella in the following among other words: *Vere ager floribus pingitur et inter querulas aves Psalmi dulcius cantabuntur.* In Sidonius Apollinaris we find even psalm-singing in the mouth of the men who tow the boats, and the poet takes from this a beautiful admonition for Christians in their voyage and journey through this life:

Curvorum hinc chorus helciariorum
Responsantibus Alleluja ripis
Ad Christum levat amicum celeusma.
Sic, sic psallite, nauta et viator!

And how many martyrs have endured every form of martyrdom with psalms upon their lips! That which the church in those days failed to furnish in writing towards the exposition of the Psalms, it more than compensated for by preserving the vitality of the Psalms with its blood. Practice made far more rapid progress than theory.* These patristic works are patterns for every age of the true fervour which should characterise the expositor of the Psalms.

The mediæval church exposition did not make any essential advance upon the patristic. After Cassiodorus, came Haymo (d. 853) and Remigius of Auxerre (d. about 900), still less independent compilers; the commentary of the former, edited by Erasmus, appeared *Trib.* 1531, of the latter, first *Colon.* 1536, and then in the *Bibl. maxima Lugdunensis.* That of Petrus Lombardus (d. about 1160) is a catena taken directly from earlier expositors from Jerome to Alcuin. Of a more independent character are the commentaries of Thomas Aquinas, who however only completed 51 Ps., and Alexander of Hales, if the Commentary which appeared under his name (*Venet.* 1496) is not rather to be attributed to cardinal Hugo. Besides these, Bonaventura (d. 1274) and Albertus Magnus (d. 1280) stand out prominently in the Middle Ages as expositors of the Psalms; and on the border of the Middle Ages Michael Ayguanus (about 1400) whose commentary has been frequently reprinted since its first appearance, *Mediol.* 1510. If you know one of these expositors, you know them all. The most that they have to offer us is an echo of the earlier writers. By their dependence on the letter of the Vulgate, and consequently indirectly of the LXX, they only too frequently light upon a false track and miss the meaning. The *literalis sensus* is completely buried in *mysticæ intelligentiæ.* Without observing the distinction between the two economies, the conversion of the Psalms into New Testament language and

---

* *vid.* besides the essay by Otto Strauss, already mentioned: Arnknecht, *Die heilige Psalmodie oder der psalmodirende König David und die singende Urkirche,* 1855; and W. von Gülick, *Das Psalterium nach seinem Hauptinhalte in seiner wissenschaftlichen und praktischen Bedeutung* (a Catholic prize essay) 1858; partly also Rudelbach's *Hymnologische Studien* in the *Luther. Zeitschrift* 1855, 4, 1856, 2. and especiallynopenitential psalm-singing Zöckler's *Geschichte der Askese* (1863) S. 256—264.

thought, regardless of the intermediate steps of development, is here continued. Thus, for example, Albertus Magnus in his commentary (*Opp.* t. vii), on the principle: *Constat, quod totus liber iste de Christo,* at once expounds *Beatus vir* (Ps. i. 1), and the whole Ps., *de Christo et ejus corpore ecclesia.* But as we find in the Fathers occasional instances of deep insight into the meaning of passages, and occasional flashes of thought of lasting value, so even here the reading, especially of the mystics, will repay one. — The greatest authority in psalm-exposition for the Middle Ages was Augustine. From Augustine, and perhaps we may add from Cassiodorus, Notker Labeo (d. 1022), the monk of St. Gall, drew the short annotations which, verse by verse, accompany his German translation of the Psalms (vol. ii of H. Hattemer's *Denkmahle des Mittelalters*). In like manner the Latin Psalter-catena of bishop Bruno of Würzburg (d. 1045), mentioned above, is compiled from Augustine and Cassiodorus, but also from Jerome, Bede and Gregory. And the Syriac annotations to the Psalms of Gregory Barhebræus (d. 1286), — of which Tullberg and Koraen, Upsala 1842, and Schröter, Breslau 1857, have published specimens, — are merely of importance in connection with the history of exposition, and are moreover in no way distinguished from the mediæval method.

The mediæval synagogue exposition is wanting in the recognition of Christ, and consequently in the fundamental condition required for a spiritual understanding of the Psalms. But as we are indebted to the Jews for the transmission of the codex of the Old Testament, we also owe the transmission of the knowledge of Hebrew to them. So far the Jewish interpreters give us what the Christian interpreters of the same period were not able to tender. The interpretations of passages from the Psalms scattered up and down in the Talmud are mostly unsound, arbitrary, and strange. And the Midrash on the Ps., bearing the title שוחר טוב (*vid.* Zunz, *Vorträge*, §. 266 ff.), and the Midrash-catenæ entitled ילקוט, of which at present only ילקוט שמעוני (by Simeon Kara ha-Darshan) is known, and ילקוט מכירי (by Machir b. Abba-Mari), contain far more that is limitlessly digressive than what is to the point and usable. This class of psalm-exposition was always employed for the thoroughly practical end

of stimulating and edifying discourse. It is only since about 900 A. D., when indirectly under Syro-Arabian influence, the study of grammar began to be cultivated among the Jews, that the exposition and the application of Scripture began to be disentangled. At the head of this new era of Jewish exegesis stands Saadia Gaon (d. 941—2), from whose Arabic translation and annotations of the Ps. Haneberg (1840) and Ewald (1844) have published extracts. The Karaites, Salmon b. Jerocham and Jefeth, both of whom have also expounded the Psalms, are warm opponents of Saadia; but Jefeth whose commentary on the Psalms* has been in part made known by Bargès (since 1846), nevertheless already recognises the influence of grammar, which Saadia raised to the dignity of a science, but which Salmon utterly discards. The next great expositor of the Psalms is Rashi (*i. e.* Rabbi Salomo Isaaki) of Troyes (d. 1105), who has interpreted the whole of the Old Testament (except the Chronicles) and the whole of the Talmud;** and he has not only treasured up with pithy brevity the traditional interpretations scattered about in the Talmud and Midrash, but also (especially in the Psalms) made use of every existing grammatico-lexical help. Aben-Ezra of Toledo (d. 1167) and David Kimchi of Narbonne (d. about 1250) are less dependent upon tradition, which for the most part expended itself upon strange interpretations. The former is the more independent and genial, but seldom happy in his characteristic fancies; the latter is less original, but gifted with a keener appreciation of that which is simple and natural, and of all the Jewish expositors he is the preeminently grammatico-historical interpreter. Gecatilia's (Mose ha-Cohen Chiquitilla) commentary on the Psalms written in Arabic is only known to us from quotations, principally in Aben-Ezra. In later commentaries, as those of Mose Alshêch (Venice 1601) and Joel Shoëb (Salonica 1569), the simplicity and elegance of the older expositors degenerates into the most repulsive scholasticism. The commentary of

* It is to be found in MS. partly in Paris, partly in St. Petersburg: the former having been brought thither from Egypt by Munk in 1841 and the latter by Tischendorf in 1853.

** But on some parts of the Talmud, *e. g.* the tractate *Maccoth*, we have not any commentary by Rashi.

Obadia Sforno (d. at Bologna 1550), Reuchlin's teacher, is too much given to philosophising, but is at least withal clear and brief. Their knowledge of the Hebrew gives all these expositors a marked advantage over their Christian cotemporaries, but the veil of Moses over their eyes is thicker in proportion to their conscious opposition to Christianity. Nevertheless the church has not left these preparatory works unused. The Jewish Christians, Nicolaus de Lyra (d. about 1340), the author of the *Postillæ perpetuæ*, and Archbishop Paul de Santa Maria of Burgos (d. 1435), the author of the *Additiones ad Lyram*, took the lead in this respect. Independently, like the last mentioned writers, Augustinus Justinianus of Genoa, in his *Octaplus Psalterii* (Genoa, 1516, folio), drew chiefly from the Midrash and Sohar. The preference however was generally given to the use of Aben-Ezra and Kimchi; *e. g.* Bucer, who acknowledges his obligation to these, says: *neque enim candidi ingenii est dissimulare, per quos profeceris.* Justinianus, Pagninus, and Felix were the three highest authorities on the original text at the commencement of the Reformation. The first two had gained their knowledge of the original from Jewish sources and Felix Pratensis, whose *Psalterium ex hebreo diligentissime ad verbum fere translatum*, 1522, appeared under Leo X., was a proselyte.

We have now reached the threshold of the Reformation exposition. Psalmody in the reigning church had sunk to a lifeless form of service. The exposition of the Psalms lost itself in the dependency of compilation and the chaos of the schools. *Et ipsa quamvis frigida tractatione Psalmorum* — says Luther in his preface to Bugenhagen's Latin Psalter — *aliquis tamen odor vitae oblatus est plerisque bonæ mentis hominibus, et utcunque ex verbis illis etiam non intellectis semper aliquid consolationis et aurulæ senserunt e Psalmis pii, veluti ex roseto leniter spirantis.* Now, however, when a new light dawned upon the church through the Reformation — the light of a grammatical and deeply spiritual understanding of Scripture, represented in Germany by Reuchlin and in France by Vatablus — then the rose-garden of the Psalter began to breathe forth its perfumes as with the renewed freshness of a May day; and born again from the Psalter, German hymns resounded from the shores of the Baltic to the foot of the Alps

with all the fervour of a newly quickened first-love. "It is marvellous"—says the Spanish Carmelite Thomas à Jesu,—"how greatly the hymns of Luther helped forward the Lutheran cause. Not only the churches and schools echo with them, but even the private houses, the workshops, the markets, streets, and fields." For converted into imperishable hymns (by Luther, Albinus, Franck, Gerhardt, Jonas, Musculus, Poliander, Ringwaldt, and many more) the ancient Psalms were transferred anew into the psalmody of the German as of the Scandinavian* Lutheran church. In the French church Clément Marot translated into verse 30 Ps., then 19 more (1541—43) and Theodore Beza added the rest (1562).** Calvin introduced the Psalms in Marot's version as early as 1542 into the service of the Geneva church, and the Psalms have since continued to be the favorite hymns of the Reformed church. Goudimel, the martyr of St. Bartholemew's night and teacher of Palestrina, composed the melodies and chorales. The English Established church adopted the Psalms direct as they are, as a portion of its liturgy, the Congregational church followed the example of the sister-churches of the Continent. And how industriously the Psalter was moulded into Greek verse, as by Olympia Morata (d. 1555)*** and under the influence of Melanthon† into Latin! The paraphrases of Helius Eoban Hesse (of whom Martin Herz, 1860, has given a biographical sketch)††, Joh. Major, Jacob Micyllus (whose life Classen has written, 1859), Joh. Stigel (whose memory has been revived by Paulus Cassel 1860), Gre. Bersmann (d. 1611), and also that begun by Geo. Buchanan during his sojourn in a Portuguese monastery, are not only learned performances, but productions of an inward

* The Swedish hymns taken from the Psalms have been recently remodelled for congregational use and augmented by Runeberg (Oerebro 1858).

** *vid.* Félix Bovet, Les Psaumes de Marot et de Bèze, in the Lausanne magazine, *Le Chrétien Evangélique*, 1866, No. 4.

*** *vid.* examples in Bonnet's life of Olympia Morata. Germ. transl. by Merschmann 1860 S. 131—135.

† *vid.* Wilhelm Thilo, *Melanchthon im Dienste an heil. Schrift* (Berlin, 1859), S. 28.

†† His Psalms (to which Veit Dietrich wrote notes) passed through forty editions in seventy years.

spiritual need; although one must assent to the judgment expressed by Harless, that the best attempts of this kind only satisfy one in proportion as we are able first of all to banish the remembrance of the original from our mind.

But since the time of the Reformation the exegetical functions of psalm-exposition have been more clearly apprehended and more happily discharged than ever before. In Luther, who opened his academical lectures in 1514 with the Ps. (in Latin in Luther's own hand writing in Wolfenbüttel) and began to publish a part of them in 1519 under the title *Operationes in duas Psalmorum decades,* the depth of experience of the Fathers is united to the Pauline recognition (which he gave back to the church) of the doctrine of free grace. It is true, he is not entirely free from the allegorising which he rejected *in thesi*, and, in general, from a departure *a sensu literæ,* and there is also still wanting in Luther the historical insight into the distinctive character of the two Testaments; but with respect to experimental, mystical, and withal sound, understanding he is incomparable. His interpretations of the Psalms, especially of the penitential Ps. and of Ps. xc, excel every thing hitherto produced, and are still a perpetual mine of wealth. Bugenhagen's exposition of the Psalms (Basel 1524, 4to. and freq.) continued the interrupted work of Luther, who in a brief but forcible preface says in its praise, that it is the first worthy of the name of an exposition. Penetration and delicacy of judgment distinguish the interpretation of the five books of the Psalms by Aretius Felinus *i. e.* Martin Bucer (1529, 4to. and freq.). The *Autophyes* (= *a se et per se Existens*), by which throughout he translates יהוה, gives it a remarkable appearance. But about the same time, as an exegete, Calvin came forward at the side of the German reformer. His commentary (first published at Geneva 1564) combines with great psychological penetration more discernment of the types and greater freedom of historical perception, but is not without many errors arising from this freedom. Calvin's strict historical method of interpretation becomes a caricature in Esrom Rüdinger, the schoolmaster of the Moravian brethren, who died at Altorf in 1591 without being able, as he had intended, to issue his commentary, which appeared in 1580—81, in a

new and revised form. His is an original work which, after trying many conjectures, at last assigns even the first Psalm to the era of the Seleucidæ.

Within the range of the post-Reformation exposition the first that meets us is Reinhard Bakius, the persevering and talented pastor of Magdeburg and Grimma during the Thirty-years' war, whose *Comm. exegetico-practicus* on the Ps. (in the first edition by his son 1664) is a work of extensive reading and good sense, in many respects a welcome supplement to Luther, crammed full of all kinds of notable things about the Psalms, under which, however, the thread of simple exposition is lost. Martin Geier keeps the work of the exposition most distinctly before him, adhering more closely to it and restraining himself from digression. His lectures on the Psalms delivered at Leipzig extended over a period of eighteen years. Deep piety and extensive learning adorn his commentary (1668), but the free spirit of the men of the Reformation is no longer here. Geier is not capable of turning from dogmatics, and throwing himself into the exegesis: a traditional standard of exegesis had become fixed, to overstep which was accounted as heterodox. In the Reformed church Cocceius stands prominently forward (d. 1669). He was an original and gifted man, but starting from false principles of hermeneutics, too fond of an eschatological literalness of interpretation.

Not only the two Protestant churches, but also the Romish church took part in the advancing work of psalm-exposition. Its most prominent expositors from 1550—1650 are Genebrardus, Agellius, and De Muis, all of whom possessing a knowledge of the Semitic languages, go back to the original, and Bellarmin, who brings to the work not merely uncommon natural talents, but, within the limits of papistical restraint, a deep spiritual penetration. Later on psalm-exposition in the Romish church degenerated into scholasticism. This is at its height in Le Blanc's *Psalmorum Davidicorum Analysis* and in Joh. Lorinus' *Commentaria in Psalmos* (6 folio vols. 1665 — 1676). In the protestant churches, however, a lamentable decline from the spirit of the men of the Reformation in like manner manifested itself. The *Adnotationes uberiores in Hagiographa* (t. i. 1745, 4to: Ps. and Prov.) of Joh. Heinrich Michaelis are a mass of raw materials:

the glossarial annotations groan beneath the burden of numberless unsifted examples and parallel passages. What had been done during the past sixteen hundred years remains almost entirely unnoticed; Luther is not explored, even Calvin within the pale of his own church no longer exerts any influence over the exposition of Scripture. After 1750, the exposition of Scripture lost that spiritual and ecclesiastical character which had gained strength in the seventeenth century, but had also gradually become torpid; whereas in the Romish church, as the Psalm-expositions of De Sacy, Berthier and La Harpe shew, it never sank so low as to deny the existence of revealed religion. That love for the Ps., which produced the evangelical hymn-psalter of that truly Christian poet and minister Christoph Karl Ludwig von Pfeil (1747),* prefaced by Bengel, degenerated to a merely literary, or at most poetical, interest, — exegesis became carnal and unspiritual. The remnant of what was spiritual in this age of decline, is represented by Burk in his *Gnomon* to the Ps. (1760) which follows the model of Bengel, and by Chr. A. Crusius in the second part of his *Hypomnemata ad Theologiam Propheticam* (1761), a work which follows the track newly opened up by Bengel, and is rich in germs of progressive knowledge (*vid.* my *Biblisch-prophetische Theologie*, 1845). We may see the character of the theology of that age from Joh. Dav. Michaelis' translation of the Old Testament, with notes for the unlearned (1771), and his writings on separate Psalms. From a linguistic and historical point of view we may find something of value here; but besides, only wordy, discursive, tasteless trifling and spiritual deadness. It has been the honour of Herder that he has freed psalm-exposition from this want of taste, and the merit of Hengstenberg (first of all in his Lectures), that he has brought it back out of this want of spirituality to the believing consciousness of the church.

The transition to modern exposition is marked by Rosenmüller's *Scholia* to the Ps. (first published in 1798—1804), a compilation written in pure clear language with exegetical tact and with a thankworthy use of older expositors who had become unknown, as Rüdinger, Bucer, and

* *vid.* his Life by Heinr. Merz (1863), S. 111—117.

Agellius, and also of Jewish writers. De Wette's commentary on the Psalms (first published in 1811, 5th edition by Gustav Baur, 1856) was far more independent and forms an epoch in exegesis. De Wette is precise and clear, and also not without a perception of the beautiful; but his position in relation to the Scripture writers is too much like that of a reviewer, his research too sceptical, and his estimate of the Ps. does not sufficiently recognise their place in the history of redemption. He regards them as national hymns, partly in the most ordinary patriotic sense, and when his theological perception fails him, he helps himself out with sarcasm against the theocratic element, which he carries to the extreme of disgust. Nevertheless, De Wette's commentary opens up a new epoch so far as it has first of all set in order the hitherto existing chaos of psalm-exposition, and introduced into it taste and grammatical accuracy, after the example of Herder and under the influence of Gesenius. He is far more independent than Rosenmüller, who though not wanting in taste and tact, is only a compiler. In investigating the historical circumstances which gave rise to the composition of the different psalms, De Wette is more negative than assumptive. Hitzig in his historical and critical commentary (1835. 36), which has appeared recently in a revised form (Bd. 1, 1863, Bd. 2. Abth. 1, 1864, Abth. 2, 1865), has sought to supplement positively the negative criticism of De Wette, by ascribing to David fourteen Ps. of the seventy three that bear the inscription לדוד, assigning all the Ps. from the lxxiii onwards, together with i. ii. lx (these three, as also cxlii—cxliv, cl, by Alexander Jannæus) to the Maccabean period (*e. g.* cxxxviii —cxli to Alexander's father, John Hyrcanus), and also inferring the authors (Zechariah, 2 Chron. xxvi. 5; Isaiah, Jeremiah) or at least the date of composition of all the rest.

Von Lengerke, in his commentary compiled half from Hengstenberg, half from Hitzig (1847), has attached himself to this so-called positive criticism, which always arrives at positive results and regards Maccabean psalms as the primary stock of the Psalter. Von Lengerke maintains that not a single Ps. can with certainty be ascribed to David. Olshausen (in his *Comment.* 1853), who only leaves a few Ps., as ii. xx. xxi, to the time of the kings prior to the Exile, and with a propens-

ity, which he is not able to resist, brings down all the others to the time of the Maccabees, even to the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus, also belongs to the positive school. Whereas Hupfeld in his commentary, 1855—1862 (4 vols.), considers it unworthy of earnest investigation, to lower one's self to such "childish trifling with hypotheses" and remains true to De Wette's negative criticism: but he seeks to carry it out in a different way. He also maintains that none of the Ps. admit of being with certainty ascribed to David; and proceeds on the assumption, that although only a part of the inscriptions are false, for that very reason none of them can be used by us.

We stand neither on the side of this scepticism, which everywhere negatives tradition, nor on the side of that self-confidence, which mostly negatives it and places in opposition to it its own positive counter-assumptions; but we do not on this account fail to recognise the great merit which Olshausen, Hupfeld and Hitzig have acquired by their expositions of the Psalms. In Olshausen we prize his prominent talent for critical conjectures; in Hupfeld grammatical thoroughness, and solid study so far as it is carried; in Hitzig the stimulating originality everywhere manifest, his happy perspicacity in tracing out the connection of the thoughts, and the marvellous amount of reading which is displayed in support of the usage of language and of that which is admissible according to syntax. The commentary of Ewald (*Poetische Bücher*, 1839, 40. 2nd edition 1866), apart from the introductory portion, according to its plan only fragmentarily meets the requirements of exposition, but in the argument which precedes each Ps. gives evidence of a special gift for perceiving the emotions and throbbings of the heart and entering into the changes of feeling.

None of these expositors are in truly spiritual *rapport* with the spirit of the psalmists. The much abused commentary of Hengstenberg 1842—1847 (4 vols. 2nd edition 1849—1852) consequently opened a new track, in as much as it primarily set the exposition of the Psalms in its right relation to the church once more, and was not confined to the historico-grammatical function of exposition. The kindred spirited works of Umbreit (*Christliche Erbauung aus dem Psalter* 1835) and Stier (*Siebenzig Psalmen* 1834.36), which extend only to a selection from the Psalms, may

be regarded as its forerunners, and the commentary of Tholuck (1847) who excludes verbal criticism and seeks to present the results of exegetical progress in a practical form for the use of the people, as its counterpart. For the sake of completeness we may also mention the commentary of Köster (1837) which has become of importance for its appreciation of the artistic form of the Psalms, especially the strophe-system, and Vaihinger's(1845). Out of Germany, no work on the Psalms has appeared which could be placed side by side with those of Hengstenberg, Hupfeld and Hitzig. And yet the inexhaustible task demands the combined work of many hands. Would that the examples set by Björk, by Perret-Gentil, Armand de Mestral and J. F. Thrupp, of noble rivalry with German scholarship might find many imitators in the countries of the Scandinavian, Latin, and English tongues! Would that the zealous industry of Bade and Reinke, the noble endeavours of Schegg and König, might set an example to many in the Romish church! Would that also the Greek church on the basis of the criticism of the LXX defended by Pharmakides against Oikonomos, far surpassing the works on the Ps. of Nicodimos and Anthimos, which are drawn from the Fathers, might continue in that rival connection with German scholarship of which the Prolegomena to the Psalm-commentary of the Jerusalem patriarch Anthimos, by Dionysios Kleopas (Jerusalem 1855. 4to.) give evidence! *Non plus ultra* is the watchword of the church with regard to the word of God, and *plus ultra* is its watchword with regard to the understanding of that word. Common work upon the Scriptures is the finest union of the severed churches and the surest harbinger of their future unity. The exposition of Scripture will rear the Church of the Future.

X. THEOLOGICAL PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

The expositor of the Psalms can place himself on the standpoint of the poet, or the standpoint of the Old Testament church, or the standpoint of the church of the present dispensation — a primary condition of exegetical progress is the keeping of these three standpoints distinct, and, in accordance therewith, the distinguishing between the two

Testaments, and in general, between the different steps in the development of the revelation, and in the perception of the plan, of redemption. For as redemption itself has a progressive history, so has the revelation and growing perception of it a progressive history also, which extends from paradise, through time, on into eternity. Redemption realizes itself in a system of facts, in which the divine purpose of love for the deliverance of sinful humanity unfolds itself, and the revelation of salvation is given in advance of this gradually developing course of events in order to guarantee its divine authorship and as a means by which it may be rightly understood. In the Psalms we have five centuries and more of this progressive realizing, disclosing, and perception of salvation laid open before us. If we add to this the fact that one psalm is by Moses, and that the retrospective portions of the historical psalms refer back even to the patriarchal age, then, from the call of Abraham down to the restoration of Israel's position among the nations after the Exile, there is scarcely a single event of importance in sacred history which does not find some expression in the Psalter. And it is not merely facts external to it, which echo therein in lyric strains, but, because David, — next to Abraham undoubtedly the most significant character of sacred history in the Old Testament, — is its chief composer, it is itself a direct integral part of the history of redemption. And it is also a source of information for the history of the revelation of redemption, in as much as it flowed not from the Spirit of faith merely, but mainly also from the Spirit of prophecy: but, pre-eminently, it is the most important memorial of the progressive recognition of the plan of salvation, since it shews how, between the giving of the Law from Sinai and the proclamation of the Gospel from Sion, the final, great salvation was heralded in the consciousness and life of the Jewish church.

We will consider 1) the relation of the Psalms to the prophecy of the future Christ. When man whom God had created, had corrupted himself by sin, God did not leave him to that doom of wrath which he had chosen for himself, but visited him on the evening of that most unfortunate of all days, in order to make that doom the disciplinary medium of His love. This visitation of Jahve Elohim was

the first step in the history of redemption towards the goal of the incarnation, and the so-called protevangelium was the first laying of the foundation of His verbal revelation of law and gospel — a revelation in accordance with the plan of salvation, and preparing the way towards this goal of the incarnation and the recovery of man. The way of this salvation, which opens up its own historical course, and at the same time announces itself in a form adapted to the human consciousness, runs all through Israel, and the Psalms shew us how this seed-corn of words and acts of divine love has expanded with a vital energy in the believing hearts of Israel. They bear the impress of the period, during which the preparation of the way of salvation was centred in Israel and the hope of redemption was a national hope. For after mankind was separated into different nations, salvation was confined within the limits of a chosen nation, that it might mature there, and then bursting its bounds become the property of the human race. At that period the promise of the future Mediator was in its third stage. The hope of overcoming the tendency in mankind to be led astray into evil was attached to the seed of the woman, and the hope of a blessing for all peoples, to the seed of Abraham: but, at this period, when David became the creator of psalm-poesy for the sanctuary service, the promise had assumed a Messianic character and pointed the hope of the believing ones towards the king of Israel, and in fact to David and his seed: the salvation and glory of Israel first, and indirectly of the nations, was looked for from the mediatorship of Jahve's Anointed.

The fact that among all the Davidic psalms there is only a single one, viz. Ps. cx, in which David (as in his last words 2 Sam. xxiii. 1—7) looks forth into the future of his seed and has the Messiah definitely before his mind, can only be explained by the consideration, that he was hitherto himself the object of Messianic hope, and that this hope was first gradually (especially in consequence of his deep fall) separated from himself individually, and transferred to the future. Therefore when Solomon came to the throne the Messianic desires and hopes of Israel were directed towards him, as Ps. lxxii shews; they belonged only to the one final Christ of God, but they clung for a long time enquiringly and with

a perfect right (on the ground of 2 Sam. vii) to the direct son of David. Also in Ps. xlv it is a son of David, cotemporary with the Korahite singer, to whom the Messianic promise is applied as a marriage benediction, wishing that the promise may be realized in him.

But it soon became evident that He, in whom the full realization of the idea of the Messiah is to be found, had not yet appeared either in the person of this king or of Solomon. And when in the later time of the kings the Davidic line became more and more inconsistent with its vocation in the sacred history, then the hope of the Messiah was completely weaned of its expectation of immediate fulfilment, and the present became merely the dark ground from which the image of the Messiah, as purely future, stood forth in relief. The בן־דוד, in whom the prophecy of the later time of the kings centres, and whom also Ps. ii sets forth before the kings of the earth that they may render homage to Him, is an eschatological character (although the אחרית was looked for as dawning close upon the border of the present). In the mouth of the congregation Ps. xlv and cxxxii, since their contents referred to the future, have become too prophetically and eschatologically Messianic. But it is remarkable that the number of these psalms which are not merely typically Messianic is so small, and that the church of the period after the Exile has not enriched the Psalter with a single psalm that is Messianic in the stricter sense. In the later portion of the Psalter, in distinction from the strictly Messianic psalms, the theocratic psalms are more numerously represented, *i. e.* those psalms which do not speak of the kingdom of Jahve's Anointed which shall conquer and bless the world, not of the Christocracy, in which the theocracy reaches the pinnacle of its representation, but of the theocracy as such, which is complete inwardly and outwardly in its own representation of itself, — not of the advent of a human king, but of Jahve Himself, with the kingdom of God manifest in all its glory. For the announcement of salvation in the Old Testament runs on in two parallel lines: the one has as its termination the Anointed of Jahve, who rules all nations out of Zion, the other, the LORD Himself sitting above the Cherubim, to whom all the earth does homage. These two lines do not

meet in the Old Testament; it is only the fulfilment that makes it plain, that the advent of the Anointed one and the advent of Jahve is one and the same. And of these two lines the divine is the one that preponderates in the Psalter; the hope of Israel, especially after the kingship had ceased in Israel, is directed generally beyond the human mediation directly towards Jahve, the Author of salvation. The fundamental article of the Old Testament faith runs יְשׁוּעָתָה לִיהוָה (Ps. iii. 9, Jon. ii. 10). The Messiah is not yet recognised as a God-man. Consequently the Psalms contain neither prayer to Him, nor prayer in His name. But prayer to Jahve and for Jahve's sake is essentially the same. For Jesus is in Jahve. Jahve is the Saviour. And the Saviour when he shall appear, is nothing but the visible manifestation of the יְשׁוּעָה of this God (Isa. xlix. 6).

In considering the goal of the Old Testament history in its relation to the God-man, we distinguish five classes of psalms which are directed towards this goal. After 2 Sam. vii the Messianic promise is no longer in a general way connected with the tribe of Judah, but with David; and is referred not merely to the endless duration of his kingdom, but also to one scion of his house, in whom that to which God has appointed the seed of David in its relation to Israel first, and from Israel to all the other nations, shall be fully realised, and without whom the kingdom of David is like a headless trunk. Psalms in which the poet, looking beyond his own age, comforts himself with the vision of this king in whom the promise is finally fulfilled, we call eschatological psalms, and in fact directly eschatologically Messianic psalms. These connect themselves not merely with the already existing prophetic utterances, but carry them even further, and are only distinguished from prophecy proper by their lyric form; for prophecy is a discourse and the psalms are spiritual songs.

The Messianic character of the Psalms is, however, not confined to prophecy proper, the subject of which is that which is future. Just as nature exhibits a series of stages of life in which the lower order of existence points to the next order above it and indirectly to the highest, so that, for instance, in the globular form of a drop we read the intimation of the struggle after organism, as it were, in the

simplest barest outline: so also the progress of history is typical, and not only as a whole, but also most surprisingly in single traits, the life of David is a *vaticinium reale* of the life of Him, whom prophecy calls directly עבדי דוד Ezek. xxxiv. 23 sq. xxxvii. 24 sq. and דוד מלכם Hos. iii. 5, Jer. xxx. 9, as the David who is, as it were, raised from the dead in a glorified form. Those psalms in which David himself (or even a poet throwing himself into David's position and mood) gives expression in lyric verse to prominent typical events and features of his life, we call typically Messianic psalms. This class, however, is not confined to those, of which David is directly or indirectly the subject, for the course of suffering of all the Old Testament saints, and especially of the prophets in their calling (*vid.* on xxxiv. 20 sq. and Ps. lxix), was to a certain extent a τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. All these psalms, not less than those of the first class, may be quoted in the New Testament with the words ἵνα πληρωθῇ, with this difference only, that in the former it is the prophetic word, in the latter the prophetic history, that is fulfilled. The older theologians, especially the Lutheran, contended against the supposition of such typological citations of the Old Testament in the New: they were destitute of that perception of the organic element in history granted to our age, and consequently were lacking in the true counterpoise to their rigid notions of inspiration.

But there is also a class of Psalms which we call typico-prophetically Messianic, viz. those in which David, describing his outward and inward experiences, — experiences even in themselves typical, — is carried beyond the limits of his individuality and present condition, and utters concerning himself that which, transcending human experience, is intended to become historically true only in Christ. Such psalms are typical, in as much as their contents is grounded in the individual, but typical, history of David; they are, however, at the same time prophetic, in as much as they express present individual experience in laments, hopes, and descriptions which point far forward beyond the present and are only fully realised in Christ. The psychological possibility of such psalms has been called in question; but they would only be psychologically impossible, if one were obliged

to suppose that David's self-consciousness must under such circumstances pass over into that of his antitype; but it is in reality quite otherwise. As the poet in order to describe his experiences in verse, idealises them, *i. e.* seizes the idea of them at the very root, and, stripping off all that is adventitious and insignificant, rises into the region of the ideal: so David also in these psalms idealises his experiences, which even in itself results in the reduction of them to all that is essential to their continuance as types. This he does, however, not from his own poetic impulse, but under the inspiration of the Spirit of God; and a still further result which follows from this is, that the description of his typical fortunes and their corresponding states of feeling is moulded into the prophetic description of the fortunes and feelings of his antitype.

Beside these three classes of Messianic psalms one may regard psalms like xlv and lxxii as a fourth class of indirectly eschatologically Messianic psalms. They are those in which, according to the time of their composition, Messianic hopes are referred to a cotemporary king, but without having been fulfilled in him; so that, in the mouth of the church, still expecting their final accomplishment, these psalms have become eschatological hymns and their exposition as such, by the side of their chronological interpretation, is fully warranted.

A fifth class is formed by the eschatologically Jehovic psalms, which are taken up with describing the advent of Jahve and the consummation of His kingdom, which is all through brought about by judgment (*vid.* Ps. xciii). The number of these psalms in the Psalter greatly preponderates. They contain the other premiss to the divine-human end of the history of salvation. There are sudden flashes of light thrown upon this end in the prophets. But it remains reserved to the history itself to draw the inference of the *unio personalis* from these human and divine premises. The Redeemer, in whom the Old Testament faith reposed, is Jahve. The centre of the hope lay in the divine not in the human king. That the Redeemer, when He should appear, would be God and man in one person was alien to the mind of the Old Testament church. And the perception of the fact

that He would be sacrifice and priest in one person, only penetrates in single rays into the Old Testament darkness, the cynosure of which is יהוה, and יהוה only.

Coming now to consider 2) the relation of the Psalms to the legal sacrifice, we shall find this also different from what we might expect from the stand-point of fulfilment. Passages certainly are not wanting where the outward legal sacrifice is acknowledged as an act of worship on the part of the individual and of the congregation (lxvi. 15, li. 21); but those occur more frequently, in which in comparison with the λογικὴ λατρεία it is so lightly esteemed, that without respect to its divine institution it appears as something not at all desired by God, as a shell to be cast away, and as a form to be broken in pieces (xl. 7 sq. l. li. 18 sq.). But it is not this that surprises us. It is just in this respect that the psalms contribute their share towards the progress of sacred history. It is that process of spiritualisation which begins even in Deuteronomy, and which is continued by reason of the memorable words of Samuel, 1 Sam. xv. 22 sq. It is the spirit of the New Testament, growing more and more in strength, which here and in other parts of the Psalter shakes the legal barriers and casts off the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου as a butterfly does its chrysalis shell. But what is substituted for the sacrifice thus criticised and rejected? Contrition, prayer, thankgiving, yielding one's self to God in the doing of His will, as Prov. xxi. 3 to do justly, Hos. vi. 6 kindness, Mic. vi. 6—8 acting justly, love, and humility, Jer. vii. 21—23 obedience. This it is that surprises one. The disparaged sacrifice is regarded only as a symbol not as a type; it is only considered in its ethical character, not in its relation to the history of redemption. Its nature is unfolded only so far as it is a gift to God (קרבן), not so far as the offering is appointed for atonement (בפרה); in one word: the mystery of the blood remains undisclosed. Where the New Testament mind is obliged to think of the sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ, it is, in Ps. li. 9, the sprinkling of the legal ritual of purification and atonement that is mentioned, and that manifestly figuratively but yet without the significance of the figure. Whence is it? — Because the sacrifice with blood, as such, in the Old Testament remains a question

to which Isaiah, in ch. liii, gives almost the only distinct answer in accordance with its historical fulfilment; for passages like Dan. ix. 24 sqq. Zech. xii. 10, xiii. 7 are themselves questionable and enigmatical. The prophetic representation of the passion and sacrifice of Christ is only given in direct prophetic language thus late on, and it is only the evangelic history of the fulfilment that shews, how exactly the Spirit which spoke by David has moulded that which he says concerning himself, the type, into correspondence with the antitype. The confidence of faith under the Old Testament, as it finds expression in the Psalms, rested upon Jahve even in reference to the atonement, as in reference to redemption in general. As He is the Saviour, so is He also the one who makes the atonement (מכפר), from whom expiation is earnestly sought and hoped for (lxxix. 9, lxv. 4, lxxviii. 38, lxxxv. 3 and other passages). It is Jahve who at the end of His course of the redemptive history is the God-man, and the blood given by Him as the medium of atonement (Lev. xvii. 11) is, in the antitype, His own blood.

Advancing from this point, we come to examine 3) the relation of the Psalms to the New Testament righteousness of faith and to the New Testament morality which flows from the primary command of infinite love. Both with respect to the atonement and to redemption the Psalms undergo a complete metamorphosis in the consciousness of the praying New Testament church—a metamorphosis, rendered possible by the unveiling and particularising of salvation that has since taken place, and to which they can without any reserve be accommodated. There are only two points in which the prayers of the Psalms appear to be difficult of amalgamation with the Christian consciousness. These are the moral self-confidence bordering on self-righteousness, which is frequently maintained before God in the Psalms, and the warmth of feeling against enemies and persecutors which finds vent in fearful cursings. The self-righteousness here is a mere appearance; for the righteousness to which the psalmists appeal is not the merit of works, not a sum of good works, which are reckoned up before God as claiming a reward, but a godly direction of the will and a godly form of life, which has its root in the surrender of

one's whole self to God and regards itself as the operation and work of justifying, sanctifying, preserving and ruling grace (lxxiii. 25 sq. xxv. 5—7, xix. 14 and other passages). There is not wanting an acknowledgement of the innate sinfulness of our nature (li. 7), of the man's exposure to punishment before God apart from His grace (cxliii. 2), of the many, and for the most part unperceived, sins of the converted (xix. 13), of the forgiveness of sins as a fundamental condition to the attainment of happiness (xxxii. 1 sq.), of the necessity of a new divinely-created heart (li. 12), in short, of the way of salvation which consists of penitential contrition, pardon, and newness of life.

On the other hand it is not less true, that in the light of the vicarious atonement and of the Spirit of regeneration it becomes possible to form a far more penetrating and subtle moral judgment of one's self; it is not less true, that the tribulation, which the New Testament believer experiences, though it does not produce such a strong and overwhelming sense of divine wrath as that which is often expressed in the psalms, nevertheless sinks deeper into his inmost nature in the presence of the cross on Golgotha and of the heaven that is opened up to him, in as much as it appears to him to be sent by a love that chastens, proves, and prepares him for the future; and it is not less true, that after the righteousness of God — which takes over our unrighteousness and is accounted even in the Old Testament as a gift of grace — lies before us for believing appropriation as a righteousness redemptively wrought out by the active and passive obedience of Jesus, the distinctive as well as the reciprocally conditioned character of righteousness of faith and of righteousness of life is become a more clearly perceived fact of the inner life, and one which exercises a more powerful influence over the conduct of that life.* Nevertheless even such personal testimonies, as Ps. xvii. 1—5, do not

* cf. Kurtz, *Zur Theologie der Psalmen*, III: *The self-righteousness of the psalmists*, in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift* 1865 S. 352—358: "The Old Testament righteousness of faith, represented by the *evangelium visibile* of the sacrificial worship, had not as yet the fundamental and primary, helpful position assigned to it, especially by Paul, in the New Testament

resist conversion into New Testament forms of thought and experience, for they do not hinder the mind from thinking specially, at the same time, of righteousness of faith, of God's acts which are performed through the medium of sacraments, and of that life resulting from the new birth, which maintains itself victorious in the old man; moreover the Christian ought to be himself earnestly warned by them to examine himself whether his faith is really manifest as an energising power of a new life; and the difference between the two Testaments loses its harshness even here, in the presence of the great verities which condemn all moral infirmity, viz. that the church of Christ is a community of the holy, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin, and that whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin.

But as to the so-called imprecatory psalms,* in the position occupied by the Christian and by the church towards the enemies of Christ, the desire for their removal is certainly outweighed by the desire for their conversion: but assuming, that they will not be converted and will not anticipate their punishment by penitence, the transition from a feeling of love to that of wrath is warranted in the New Testament (*e. g.* Gal. v. 12), and assuming their absolute Satanic hardness of heart the Christian even may not shrink from praying for their final overthrow. For the kingdom of God comes not only by the way of mercy but also of judgment; and the coming of the kingdom of God is the goal of the Old as well as of the New Testament saint (*vid.* ix. 21, lix. 14 and other passages), and every wish that judgment may descend upon those who oppose the coming of the kingdom of God is cherished even in the Psalms on the assumption of their lasting impenitence (*vid.* vii. 13 sq. cix. 17). Where, however, as in Ps. lxix and cix, the imprecations go into particulars and extend to the descendents of the unfortunate one

---

but only a more secondary position; justification is conceived not as a condition of the sanctification which is to be striven after, but as a supplementing of that which is wanting in the sanctification thus defectively striven after.

* cf. Kurtz, *ibid.* IV: *The imprecatory Psalms, ibid.* S. 359—372 and our discussions in the introductions to Ps. xxxv and cix, which belong to this class.

and even on to eternity, the only justification of them is this, that they flow from the prophetic spirit, and for the Christian they admit of no other adoption, except as, reiterating them, he gives the glory to the justice of God, and commends himself the more earnestly to His favour.

Also 4) the relation of the Psalms to the Last Things is such, that in order to be used as prayers expressive of the New Testament faith they require deepening and adjusting. For what Julius Africanus says of the Old Testament: οὐδέπω δέδοτο ἐλπὶς ἀναστάσεως σαφής, holds good at least of the time before Isaiah. For Isaiah is the first to foretell, in one of his latest apocalyptic cycles (ch. xxiv—xxvii), the first resurrection, *i. e.* the re-quickening of the martyr-church that has succumbed to death (ch. xxvi. 19), just as with an extended vision he foretells the termination of death itself (ch. xxv. 8); and the Book of Daniel — that Old Testament apocalypse, sealed until the time of its fulfilment — first foretells the general resurrection, *i. e.* the awakening of some to life and others to judgment (ch. xii. 2). Between these two prophecies comes Ezekiel's vision of Israel's return from the Exile under the figure of a creative quickening of a vast field of corpses (ch. xxxvii) — a figure which at least assumes that what is represented is not impossible to the wonder-working power of God, which is true to His promises. But also in the latest psalms the perception of salvation nowhere appears to have made such advance, that these words of prophecy foretelling the resurrection should have been converted into a dogmatic element of the church's belief. The hope, that the bones committed, like seed, to the ground would spring forth again, finds expression first only in a bold, but differently expressed figure (cxli. 7); the hopeless darkness of Sheôl (vi. 6, xxx. 10, lxxxviii. 11—13) remained unillumined, and where deliverance from death and Hades is spoken of, what is meant is the preservation of the living, either experienced (*e. g.* lxxxvi. 13) or hoped for (*e. g.* cxviii. 17) from falling a prey to death and Hades, and we find in connection with it other passages which express the impossibility of escaping this universal final destiny (lxxxix. 49). The hope of eternal life after death is nowhere definitely expressed, as even in the Book of Job the longing for it is never able to expand into a hope, because

no light of promise shines into that night, which reigns over Job's mind, — a night, which the conflict of temptation through which he is passing makes darker than it is in itself. The pearl which appears above the waves of temptation is only too quickly swallowed up again by them.

Also in the Psalms we find passages in which the hope of not falling a prey to death is expressed so broadly, that the thought of the final destiny of all men being inevitable is completely swallowed up by the living one's confidence of living in the strength of God (lvi. 14 and esp. xvi. 9—11); passages in which the covenant relation with Jahve is contrasted with this present life and its possession, in such a manner that the opposite of a life extending beyond the present time is implied (xvii. 14 sq., lxiii. 4); passages in which the end of the ungodly is compared with the end of the righteous as death and life, defeat and triumph (xlix. 15), so that the inference forces itself upon one, that the former die although they seem to live for ever, and the latter live for ever although they die at once; and passages in which the psalmist, though only by way of allusion, looks forward to a being borne away to God, like Enoch and Elijah (xlix. 16, lxxiii. 24). Nowhere, however, is there any general creed to be found, but we see how the belief in a future life struggles to be free, at first only, as an individual conclusion of the believing mind from premises which experience has established. And far from the grave being penetrated by a glimpse of heaven, it has, on the contrary, to the ecstasy of the life derived from God, as it were altogether vanished; for life in opposition to death only appears as the lengthening of the line of the present *ad infinitum*. Hence it is that we no more find in the Psalms than in the Book of Job a perfectly satisfactory theodicy with reference to that distribution of human fortunes in this world, which is incompatible with God's justice. — Ps. vii. xlix. lxxiii. certainly border on the right solution of the mystery, but it stops short at mere hint and presage, so that the utterances that touch upon it admit of different interpretation.*

---

* *vid.* Kurtz, *ibid.* II: *The doctrine of retribution in the Psalms*, *ibid.* S. 316—352.

But on the other hand, death and life in the mind of the psalmists are such deep-rooted notions (*i. e.* taken hold of at the very roots, which are grounded in the principles of divine wrath and divine love), that it is easy for the New Testament faith, to which they have become clear even to their back ground of hell and heaven, to adjust and deepen the meaning of all utterances in the Psalms that refer to them. It is by no means contrary to the meaning of the psalmist when, as in passages like Ps. vi. 6, Gehenna is substituted for Hades to adapt it to the New Testament saint; for since the descent of Jesus Christ into Hades there is no longer any *limbus patrum,* the way of all who die in the Lord is not earthwards but upwards, Hades exists only as the vestibule of hell. The psalmists indeed dread it, but only as the realm of wrath or of seclusion from God's love, which is the true life of man. Nor is it contrary to the idea of the poets to think of the future vision of God's face in all its glory in Ps. xvii. 15 and of the resurrection morn in Ps. xlix. 15; for the hopes expressed there, though to the Old Testament consciousness they referred to this side the grave, are future according to their New Testament fulfilment, which is the only truly satisfying one. There is, as Oetinger says, no essential New Testament truth not contained in the Psalms either νοΐ (according to its unfolded meaning), or at least πνεύματι. The Old Testament barrier encompasses the germinating New Testament life, which at a future time shall burst it. The eschatology of the Old Testament leaves a dark background, which, as is designed, is divided by the New Testament revelation into light and darkness, and is to be illumined into a wide perspective extending into the eternity beyond time. Everywhere, where it begins to dawn in this eschatological darkness of the Old Testament, it is the first morning rays of the New Testament sun-rise which is already announcing itself. The Christian also here cannot refrain from leaping the barrier of the psalmists, and understanding the Psalms according to the mind of the Spirit whose purpose in the midst of the development of salvation and of the perception of it, is directed towards its goal and consummation. Thus understood the Psalms are the hymns of the New Testament Israel as of the Old. The church by using

the language of the Psalms in supplication celebrates the unity of the two Testaments, and scholarship in expounding them honours their distinctiveness. Both are in the right; the former in regarding the Psalms in the light of the one great salvation, the latter in carefully distinguishing the eras in the history, and the steps in the perception, of this salvation.

EXPOSITION

OF THE PSALTER.

Cum consummaverit homo, tunc incipiet, et cum quieverit, aporiabitur (*novis aporiis urgebitur*).

Sir. xviii. 6 (applied by Augustine to the expositor of the Psalter).

FIRST BOOK OF THE PSALTER.

Ps. I.—XLI.

PSALM I.

THE RADICALLY DISTINCT LOT OF THE PIOUS AND THE UNGODLY.

1 BLESSED is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly,
And standeth not in the way of sinners,
And sitteth not in the company of scorners,
2 But his delight is in the Law of Jahve
And in His Law doth he meditate day and night —
3 And he is like a tree planted by the water-courses,
Which bringeth forth its fruit in its season,
And its leaf withereth not,
And whatsoever he doeth, he carrieth through.

4 Not thus are the ungodly,
But they are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.
5 Therefore the ungodly cannot stand in the judgment,
Nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous;
6 For Jahve knoweth the way of the righteous,
But the way of the ungodly perisheth.

The collection of the Psalms and that of the prophecies of Isaiah resemble one another in the fact, that the one begins with a discourse that bears no superscription, and the other

with a Psalm of the same character; and these form the prologues to the two collections. From Acts xiii. 33, where the words: *Thou art My Son . . .* are quoted as being found ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ, we see that in early times Ps. i. was regarded as the prologue to the collection. The reading ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ, rejected by Griesbach, is an old correction. But this way of numbering the Psalms is based upon tradition. A scholium from Origen and Eusebius says of Ps. i. and ii.: ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ συνημμένοι, and just so Apollinaris:

Ἐπιγραφῆς ὁ ψαλμὸς εὑρέθη δίχα,
Ἡνωμένος δὲ τοῖς παρ᾽ Ἑβραίοις στίχοις.

For it is an old Jewish way of looking at it, as Albertus Magnus observes: *Psalmus primus incipit a beatitudine et terminatur a beatitudine, i. e.* it begins with אשרי i. 1 and ends with אשרי ii. 12, so that consequently Ps. i. and ii., as is said in *B. Berachoth* 9 *b* (cf. *Jer. Taanith* ii. 2), form one Psalm (הרא פרשה). As regards the subject-matter this is certainly not so. It is true Ps. i. and ii. coincide in some respects (in the former יהגה, in the latter יהגו; in the former תאבד · · ודרך, in the latter ותאבדו דרך; in the former אשרי at the beginning, in the latter, at the end), but these coincidences of phraseology are not sufficient to justify the conclusion of unity of authorship (Hitz.), much less that the two Psalms are so intimately connected as to form one whole. These two anonymous hymns are only so far related, as that the one is adapted to form the *proœmium* of the Psalter from its ethical, the other from its prophetic character. The question, however, arises whether this was in the mind of the collector. Perhaps Ps. ii. is only attached to Ps. i. on account of those coincidences; Ps. i. being the proper prologue of the Psalter in its pentateuchal arrangement after the pattern of the Tôra. For the Psalter is the Yea and Amen in the form of hymns to the word of God given in the Tôra. Therefore it begins with a Psalm which contrasts the lot of him who loves the Tôra with the lot of the ungodly, — an echo of that exhortation, Josh. i. 8, in which, after the death of Moses, Jahve charges his successor Joshua to do all that is written in the book of the Tôra. As the New Testament sermon on the Mount, as a sermon on the spiritualized Law,

begins with μακάριοι, so the Old Testament Psalter, directed entirely to the application of the Law to the inner life, begins with אשרי. The First book of the Psalms begins with two אשרי i. 1, ii. 12, and closes with two אשרי xl. 5, xli. 2. A number of Psalms begin with אשרי, Ps. xxxii. xli. cxii. cxix. cxxviii.; but we must not therefore suppose the existence of a special kind of *ashrê*-psalms; for, *e. g.*, Ps. xxxii. is a משכיל, Ps. cxii. a *Hallelujah*, Ps. cxxviii. a שיר המעלות.

As regards the time of the composition of the Psalm, we do not wish to lay any stress on the fact that 2 Chron. xxii. 5 sounds like an allusion to it. But 1st, it is earlier than the time of Jeremiah; for Jeremiah was acquainted with it. The words of curse and blessing, Jer. xvii. 5—8, are like an expository and embellished paraphrase of it. It is customary with Jeremiah to reproduce the prophecies of his predecessors, and more especially the words of the Psalms, in the flow of his discourse and to transform their style to his own. In the present instance the following circumstance also favours the priority of the Psalm: Jeremiah refers the curse corresponding to the blessing to Jehoiakim and thus applies the Psalm to the history of his own times. It is 2ndly, not earlier than the time of Solomon. For לֵצִים occurring only here in the whole Psalter, a word which came into use, for the unbelievers, in the time of the Chokma (*vid.* the definition of the word, Prov. xxi. 24), points us to the time of Solomon and onwards. But since it contains no indications of cotemporary history whatever, we give up the attempt to define more minutely the date of its composition, and say with St. Columba (against the reference of the Psalm to Joash the *protegé* of Jehoiada, which some incline to): *Non audiendi sunt hi, qui ad excludendam Psalmorum veram expositionem falsas similitudines ab historia petitas conantur inducere.**

Vers. 1—3. The exclamatory אַשְׁרֵי, as also xxxii. 2, xl. 5, Prov. viii. 34, has *Gaja* (*Metheg*) by the *Aleph*, and in some

* *vid.* Zeuss, *Grammatica Celtica* (1853) ii. 1065. The Commentary of Columba on the Psalms, with Irish explanations, and coming from the monastery of Bobbio, is among the treasures of the Ambrosiana.

Codd. even a second by שְׁ, because it is intended to be read *ash'rê* as an exception, on account of the significance of the word (Baer, in *Comm.* ii. 495). It is the construct of the *pluralet.* אַשָׁרִים (from אָשַׁר, cogn. יָשַׁר, כָּשַׁר, to be straight, right, well-ordered), and always in the form אַשְׁרֵי, even before the light suffixes (Olsh. § 135, *c*), as an exclamation: O the blessedness of so and so. The man who is characterised as blessed is first described according to the things he does not do, then (which is the chief thought of the whole Ps.) according to what he actually does: he is not a companion of the unrighteous, but he abides by the revealed word of God. רְשָׁעִים are the godless, whose moral condition is lax, devoid of stay, and as it were gone beyond the reasonable bounds of a true unity (wanting in stability of character), so that they are like a tossed and stormy sea, Isa. lvii. 20 sq.;* חַטָּאִים (from the *sing.* חַטָּא, instead of which הַטֶּא is usually found) sinners, ἁμαρτωλοί, who pass their lives in sin, especially coarse and manifest sin; לֵצִים (from לוּץ, as מֵת from מוּת) scoffers, who make that which is divine, holy, and true a subject of frivolous jesting. The three appellations form a climax: *impii corde, peccatorés opere, illusores ore,* in accordance with which עֵצָה (from יָעַץ *figere, statuere*), resolution, bias of the will, and thus way of thinking, is used in reference to the first, as in Job xxi. 16, xxii. 18; in reference

---

* Nevertheless we have not to compare רעשׁ, רגשׁ, for רשׁע, but the Arabic in the two roots رسع and رسغ shews for רשׁע the primary notion to be slack, loose, in opposition to צדק صدق to be hard, firm, tight; as رمح صدق *i. e.* according to the Kamus رمح صلب متين مستوٍ a hard, firm and straight spear. We too transfer the idea of being lax and loose to the province of ethics: the difference is only one of degree. The same two primary notions are also opposed to one another in speaking of the intellect: حَكَمَ wise, prop. thick, firm, stout, solid, and سَخُفَ foolish, simple, prop. thin, loose, without stay, like a bad piece of weaving, *vid.* Fleischer's translation of Samachschari's *Golden Necklace* pp. 26 and 27 Anm. 76. Thus רָשָׁע means the loose man and indeed as a moral-religious notion loose from God, godless [comp. *Bibl. Psychol.* p. 189. transl.].

to the second, דֶּרֶךְ mode of conduct, action, life; in reference to the third, מוֹשָׁב which like the Arabic *meǵlis* signifies both seat (Job xxix. 7) and assembling (cvii. 32), be it official or social (cf. xxvi. 4 sq., Jer. xv. 17). On הָלַךְ בְּ, in an ethical sense, cf. Mic. vi. 16, Jer. vii. 24. Therefore: Blessed is he who does not walk in the state of mind which the ungodly cherish, much less that he should associate with the vicious life of sinners, or even delight in the company of those who scoff at religion. The description now continues with כִּי אִם (*imo si*, Ges. § 155, 2, *i*): but (if) his delight is, = (substantival instead of the verbal clause:) he delights (חָפֵץ cf. خفض *f. i.* with the primary notion of firmly adhering, *vid.* on Job xl. 17) in תּוֹרַת ה׳, the teaching of Jahve, which is become Israel's νόμος, rule of life; in this he meditates profoundly by day and night (two *acc.* with the old accusative terminations *am* and *ah*). The *perff.* in ver. 1 describe what he all along has never done, the *fut.* יֶהְגֶּה, what he is always striving to do; הָגָה of a deep (cf. هجّ *depressum esse*), dull sound, as if vibrating between within and without, here signifies the quiet soliloquy (cf. هجس *mussitando secum loqui*) of one who is searching and thinking.

With וְהָיָה,* in ver. 3, the development of the אַשְׁרֵי now begins; it is the *præt. consec.*: he becomes in consequence of this, he is thereby, like a tree planted beside the water-courses, which yields its fruit at the proper season and its leaf does not fall off. In distinction from נָטוּעַ, according to *Jalkut* § 614, שָׁתוּל means firmly planted, so that no winds that may rage around it are able to remove it from its place (אין מזיזין אתו ממקומו). In פַּלְגֵי מַיִם, both מַיִם and the plur. serve to give intensity to the figure; פֶּלֶג (Arab. *falǵ*, from פלג to divide, Job xxxviii. 25) means the brook meandering

* By the *Shebâ* stands *Metheg* (*Gaja*), as it does wherever a word, with *Shebâ* in the first syllable, has *Olewejored*, *Rebia magnum*, or *Dechî* without a conjunctive preceding, in case at least one vowel and no *Metheg* — except perhaps that standing before *Shebâ compos.* — lies between the *Shebâ* and the tone, *e. g.* נְנַתְּקָה (with *Dechî*) ii. 3, וְאֶעֱנֵהוּ xci. 15 and the like. The intonation of the accent is said in these instances to begin, by anticipation, with the fugitive *ĕ*.

and cleaving its course for itself through the soil and stones; the *plur.* denotes either one brook regarded from its abundance of water, or even several which from different directions supply the tree with nourishing and refreshing moisture. In the relative clause the whole emphasis does not rest on בְּעִתּוֹ (Calvin: *impii, licet præcoces fructus ostentent, nihil tamen producunt nisi abortivum*), but פִּרְיוֹ is the first, בְּעִתּוֹ the second tone-word: the fruit which one expects from it, it yields (equivalent to יַעֲשֶׂה it produces, elsewhere), and that at its appointed, proper time (= בְּעִדָּתוֹ, for עֵת is = עֶדֶת or עֶדֶת, like רֶדֶת, לֶדֶת, from וָעַד), without ever disappointing that hope in the course of the recurring seasons. The clause וְעָלֵהוּ לֹא יִבּוֹל is the other half of the relative clause: and its foliage does not fall off or wither (נָבֵל like the synon. נָבַל, from the root בל).

The green foliage is an emblem of faith, which converts the water of life of the divine word into sap and strength, and the fruit, an emblem of works, which gradually ripen and scatter their blessings around; a tree that has lost its leaves, does not bring its fruit to maturity. It is only with וְכֹל, where the language becomes unemblematic, that the man who loves the Law of God again becomes the direct subject. The accentuation treats this member of the verse as the third member of the relative clause; one may, however, say of a thriving plant צָלְחָה, but not הִצְלִיחַ. This *Hiph.* (from צלח, صلح, to divide, press forward, press through, *vid.* xlv. 5) signifies both causative: to cause anything to go through, or prosper (Gen. xxxiv. 23), and transitive: to carry through, and intransitive: to succeed, prosper (Judg. xviii. 5). With the first meaning, Jahve would be the subject; with the third, the project of the righteous; with the middle one, the righteous man himself. This last is the most natural: everything he takes in hand he brings to a successful issue (an expression like 2 Chron. vii. 11, xxxi. 21, Dan. viii. 24). What a richly flowing brook is to the tree that is planted on its bank, such is the word of God to him who devotes himself to it: it makes him, according to his position and calling, ever fruitful in good and well-timed deeds and keeps him fresh

in his inner and outward life, and whatsoever such an one undertakes, he brings to a successful issue, for the might of the word and of the blessing of God is in his actions.

Vers. 4—6. The ungodly (הָרְשָׁעִים, with the demonstrative art.) are the opposite of a tree planted by the watercourses: they are כַּמֹּץ, like chaff (from מוּץ to press out), which the wind drives away, *viz.* from the loftily situated threshing-floor (Isa. xvii. 13), *i. e.* without root below, without fruit above, devoid of all the vigour and freshness of life, lying loose upon the threshing-floor and a prey of the slightest breeze, — thus utterly worthless and unstable. With עַל־כֵּן an inference is drawn from this moral characteristic of the ungodly: just on account of their inner worthlessness and instability they do not stand בַּמִּשְׁפָּט. This is the word for the judgment of just recompense to which God brings each individual man and all without exception with all their works (Eccl. xii. 14), — His righteous government, which takes cognisance of the whole life of each individual and the history of nations and recompenses according to desert. In this judgment the ungodly cannot stand (קוּם to continue to stand, like עָמַד cxxx. 3 to keep one's self erect), nor sinners בַּעֲדַת צַדִּיקִים. The congregation (עֵדָה = *ʿidah*, from יָעַד, וָעַד) of the righteous is the congregation of Jahve (עֲדַת יְ׳), which, according to its nature which is ordained and inwrought by God, is a congregation of the righteous, to which consequently the unrighteous belong only outwardly and visibly: οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ, Rom. ix. 6. God's judgment, when and wheresoever he may hold it, shall trace back this appearance to its nothingness. When the time of the divine decision shall come, which also separates outwardly that which is now inwardly separate, viz. righteous and unrighteous, wheat and chaff, then shall the unrighteous be driven away like chaff before the storm, and their temporary prosperity, which had no divine roots, come to a fearful end. For Jahve knoweth the way of the righteous, יוֹדֵעַ as in xxxvii. 18, Mat. vii. 23, 2 Tim. ii. 19, and frequently. What is intended is, as the schoolmen say, a *nosse con affectu et effectu*, a knowledge which is in living, intimate relationship to its subject and at the same time is inclined

to it and bound to it by love. The way, *i. e.* the life's course, of the righteous has God as its goal; God knows this way, which on this very account also unfailingly reaches its goal. On the contrary, the way of the ungodly תֹּאבֵד, perishes, because left to itself, — goes down to אֲבַדּוֹן, loses itself, without reaching the goal set before it, in darkest night. The way of the righteous only is דֶּרֶךְ עוֹלָם, cxxxix. 24, a way that ends in eternal life. Ps. cxii. which begins with אַשְׁרֵי ends with the same fearful תֹּאבֵד.

PSALM II.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HIS CHRIST, TO WHICH EVERYTHING MUST BOW.

1 WHY do the people rage,
And the nations imagine a vain thing?!
2 The kings of the earth rise in rebellion,
And the rulers take counsel together —
Against Jahve and against His Anointed.
3 "Up! let us burst their bands asunder,
And cast away their cords from us!"

4 He who is enthroned in the heavens laughs,
The Lord hath them in derision.
5 Then shall He speak to them in His wrath,
And thunder them down in His hot displeasure:
6 "— And yet have I set My King
Upon Zion, My holy hill."

(The Divine King:)

7 "I will speak concerning a decree!
Jahve saith unto me: Thou art My Son,
This day have I begotten Thee.
8 Demand of Me, and I will give Thee the nations for Thine inheritance,
And the ends of the earth for Thy possession.
9 Thou shalt break them with an iron sceptre,
Like a potter's vessel shalt Thou dash them in pieces."

10 And now, O ye kings, be wise,
Be admonished, ye judges of the earth!
11 Serve Jahve with fear,
And rejoice with trembling.
12 Kiss the Son, lest He be angry and ye perish,
For His wrath may kindle suddenly —
Blessed are all they who hide in Him!

The didactic Ps. i. which began with אַשְׁרֵי, is now followed by a prophetic Psalm, which closes with אַשְׁרֵי. It coincides also in other respects with Ps. i., but still more with Psalms of the earlier time of the kings (lix. 9, lxxxiii. 3—9) and with Isaiah's prophetic style. The rising of the confederate nations and their rulers against Jahve and His Anointed will be dashed to pieces against the imperturbable all-conquering power of dominion, which Jahve has entrusted to His King set upon Zion, His Son. This is the fundamental thought, which is worked out with the vivid directness of dramatic representation. The words of the singer and seer begin and end the Psalm. The rebels, Jahve, and His Anointed come forward, and speak for themselves; but the framework is formed by the composer's discourse, which, like the chorus of the Greek drama, expresses the reflexions and feelings which are produced on the spectators and hearers. The poem before us is not purely lyric. The personality of the poet is kept in the back-ground. The Lord's Anointed who speaks in the middle of the Psalm is not the anonymous poet himself. It may, however, be a king of the time, who is here regarded in the light of the Messianic promise, or that King of the future, in whom at a future period the mission of the Davidic kingship in the world shall be fulfilled: at all events this Lord's Anointed comes forward with the divine power and glory, with which the Messiah appears in the prophets.

The Psalm is anonymous. For this very reason we may not assign it to David (Hofm.) nor to Solomon (Ew.); for nothing is to be inferred from Acts iv. 25, since in the New Testament "hymn of David" and "psalm" are co-ordinate ideas, and it is always far more hazardous to ascribe an

anonymous Psalm to David or Solomon, than to deny to one inscribed לדוד or לשלמה direct authorship from David or Solomon. But the subject of the Psalm is neither David (Kurtz) nor Solomon (Bleek). It might be David, for in his reign there is at least one coalition of the peoples like that from which our Psalm takes its rise, *vid.* 2 Sam. x. 6: on the contrary it cannot be Solomon, because in his reign, though troubled towards its close (1 Kings xi. 14 sqq.), no such event occurs, but would then have to be inferred to have happened from this Psalm. We might rather guess at Uzziah (Meier) or Hezekiah (Maurer), both of whom inherited the kingdom in a weakened condition and found the neighbouring peoples alienated from the house of David. The situation might correspond to these times, for the rebellious peoples, which are brought before us, have been hitherto subject to Jahve and His Anointed. But all historical indications which might support the one supposition or the other are wanting. If the God-anointed one, who speaks in ver. 7, were the psalmist himself, we should at least know the Psalm was composed by a king filled with a lofty Messianic consciousness. But the dramatic movement of the Psalm up to the ועתה (ver. 10) which follows, is opposed to such an identification of the God-anointed one with the poet. But that Alexander Jannæus (Hitz.), that blood-thirsty ruler, so justly hated by his people, who inaugurated his reign by fratricide, may be both at the same time, is a supposition which turns the moral and covenant character of the Psalm into detestable falsehood. The Old Testament knows no kingship to which is promised the dominion of the world and to which sonship is ascribed (2 Sam. vii. 14, Ps. lxxxix. 28), but the Davidic. The events of his own time, which influenced the mind of the poet, are no longer clear to us. But from these he is carried away into those tumults of the peoples which shall end in all kingdoms becoming the kingdom of God and of His Christ (Apoc. xi. 15, xii. 10).

In the New Testament this Psalm is cited more frequently than any other. According to Acts iv. 25—28, vers. 1 and 2 have been fulfilled in the confederate hostility of Israel and the Gentiles against Jesus the holy servant of God and

against His confessors. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Ps. cx. and ii. stand side by side, the former as a witness of the eternal priesthood of Jesus after the order of Melchisedek, the latter as a witness of His sonship, which is superior to that of the angels. Paul teaches us in Acts xiii. 33, comp. Rom. i. 4, how the "to-day" is to be understood. The "to-day" according to its proper fulfilment, is the day of Jesus' resurrection. Born from the dead to the life at the right hand of God, He entered on this day, which the church therefore calls *dies regalis*, upon His eternal kingship.

The New Testament echo of this Psalm however goes still deeper and further. The two names of the future One in use in the time of Jesus, ὁ Χριστός and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, John i. 50, Mat. xxvi. 63 (in the mouth of Nathanael and of the High Priest) refer back to this Ps. and Dan. ix. 25, just as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου incontrovertibly refers to Ps. viii. 5 and Dan. vii. 13. The view maintained by De Wette and Hupfeld, that the Psalm is not applicable to the Christian conceptions of the Messiah, seems almost as though these were to be gauged according to the authoritative utterances of the professorial chair and not according to the language of the Apostles. Even in the Apocalypse, ch. xix. 15, xii. 5, Jesus appears exactly as this Psalm represents Him, as ποιμαίνων τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ. The office of the Messiah is not only that of Saviour but also of Judge. Redemption is the beginning and the judgment the end of His work. It is to this end that the Psalm refers. The Lord himself frequently refers in the Gospels to the fact of His bearing side by side with the sceptre of peace and the shepherd's staff, the sceptre of iron also, Mat. xxiv. 50 sq., xxi. 44, Luke xix. 27. The day of His coming is indeed a day of judgment — the great day of the ὀργὴ τοῦ ἀγνίου, Apoc. vi. 17, before which the ultra-spiritual Messianic creations of enlightened exegetes will melt away, just as the carnal Messianic hopes of the Jews did before His first coming.

Vers. 1—3. The Psalm begins with a seven line strophe, ruled by an interrogative Wherefore. The mischievous under-

taking condemns itself. It it groundless and fruitless. This certainty is expressed, with a tinge of involuntary astonishment, in the question. לָמָּה followed by a *præt.* enquires the ground of such lawlessness: wherefore have the peoples banded together so tumultuously (Aquila: ἐθορυβήθησαν)? and followed by a *fut.*, the aim of this ineffectual action: wherefore do they imagine emptiness? רִיק might be adverbial and equivalent to לָרִיק, but it is here, as in iv. 3, a governed accusative; for הָגָה which signifies in itself only quiet inward musing and yearning, expressing itself by a dull muttering (here: something deceitful, as in xxxviii. 13), requires an object. By this רִיק the involuntary astonishment of the question justifies itself: to what purpose is this empty affair, *i. e.* devoid of reason and continuance? For the psalmist, himself a subject and member of the divine kingdom, is too well acquainted with Jahve and His Anointed not to recognise beforehand the unwarrantableness and impotency of such rebellion. That these two things are kept in view, is implied by ver. 2, which further depicts the position of affairs without being subordinated to the למה. The *fut.* describes what is going on at the present time: they set themselves in position, they take up a defiant position (הִתְיַצֵּב as in 1 Sam. xvii. 16), after which we again (comp. the reverse order in lxxxiii. 6) have a transition to the *perf.* which is the more uncoloured expression of the actual: נוֹסַד (with יַחַד as the exponent of reciprocity) prop. to press close and firm upon one another, then (like سَاوَدَ, which, according to the correct observation of the Turkish Kamus, in its signification *clam cum aliquo locutus est*, starts from the very same primary meaning of pressing close to any object): to deliberate confidentially together (as xxxi. 14 and נוֹעַץ lxxi. 10). The subjects מַלְכֵי־אֶרֶץ and רוֹזְנִים (according to the Arabic *razuna*, to be weighty: the grave, dignitaries, σεμνοί, *augusti*) are only in accordance with the poetic style without the article. It is a general rising of the people of the earth against Jahve and His מָשִׁיחַ, Χριστός, the king anointed by Him by means of the holy oil and most intimately allied to Him. The psalmist hears (ver. 3) the decision of the deliberating

princes. The pathetic suff. *êmō* instead of *êhém* refers back to Jahve and His Anointed. The cohortatives express the mutual kindling of feeling; the sound and rhythm of the exclamation correspond to the dull murmur of hatred and threatening defiance: the rhythm is iambic, and then anapæstic. First they determine to break asunder the fetters (מוֹסְרוֹת = מאסרות) to which the אֶת, which is significant in the poetical style, points, then to cast away the cords from them (מִמֶּנּוּ *a nobis*, this is the Palestinian mode of writing, whereas the Babylonians said and wrote מִמֵּנּוּ *a nobis* in distinction from מִמֶּנּוּ *ab eo*, *B. Sota* 35 *a*) partly with the vexation of captives, partly with the triumph of freedmen. They are, therefore, at present subjects of Jahve and His Anointed, and not merely because the whole world is Jahve's, but because He has helped His Anointed to obtain dominion over them. It is a battle for freedom, upon which they are entering, but a freedom that is opposed to God.

Vers. 4—6. Above the scene of this wild tumult of battle and imperious arrogance the psalmist in this six line strophe beholds Jahve, and in spirit hears His voice of thunder against the rebels. In contrast to earthly rulers and events Jahve is called יוֹשֵׁב בַּשָּׁמַיִם : He is enthroned above them in unapproachable majesty and ever-abiding glory; He is called אֲדֹנָי as He who controls whatever takes place below with absolute power according to the plan His wisdom has devised, which brooks no hindrance in execution. The *futt.* describe not what He will do, but what He does continually (cf. Isa. xviii. 4 sq.). לָמוֹ also belongs, according to lix. 9, xxxvii. 13, to יִשְׂחָק (שׂחק which is more usual in the post-pentateuchal language = צחק). He laughs at the defiant ones, for between them and Him there is an infinite distance; He derides them by allowing the boundless stupidity of the infinitely little one to come to a climax and then He thrusts him down to the earth undeceived. This climax, the extreme limit of the divine forbearance, is determined by the אָז, as in Deut. xxix. 19, cf. שָׁם xiv. 5, xxxvi. 13, which is a "then" referring to the future and pointing towards the crisis which then supervenes. Then He begins at once to utter the actual language of His wrath to his foes and confounds them in the heat of His

anger, disconcerts them utterly, both outwardly and in spirit. בָּהַל, بهل, cogn. בָּלַהּ, means orginally to let loose, let go, then in Hebrew sometimes, externally, to overthrow, sometimes, of the mind, to confound and disconcert.

Ver. 5*a* is like a peal of thunder (cf. Isa. x. 33); בְּחֲרוֹנוֹ, 5*b*, like the lightning's destructive flash. And as the first strophe closed with the words of the rebels, so this second closes with Jahve's own words. With וְאֲנִי begins an adverbial clause like Gen. xv. 2, xviii. 13, Ps. l. 17. The suppressed principal clause (cf. Isa. iii. 14; Ew. § 341, *c*) is easily supplied: ye are revolting, whilst notwithstanding I . . . With וְאֲנִי He opposes His irresistible will to their vain untertaking. It has been shewn by Böttcher, that we must not translate "I have anointed" (Targ., Symm.). נָסַךְ, نسك, certainly means to pour out, but not to pour upon, and the meaning of pouring wide and firm (of casting metal, libation, anointing) then, as in הֵצִיג, הֵצִיק, goes over into the meaning of setting firmly in any place (*fundere* into *fundare, constituere*, as LXX., Syr., Jer., and Luther translate), so that consequently נָסִיךְ the word for prince cannot be compared with מָשִׁיחַ, but with נָצִיב.* The Targum rightly inserts וּמְנִיתֵיהּ (*et præfeci eum*) after רַבִּיתִי (*unxi*), for the place of the anointing is not עַל־צִיּוֹן. History makes no mention of a king of Israel being anointed on Zion. Zion is mentioned as the royal seat of the Anointed One; there He is installed, that He may reign there, and rule from thence, cx. 2. It is the hill of the city of David (2 Sam. v. 7, 9, 1 Kings viii. 1) including Moriah, that is intended. That hill of holiness, *i. e.* holy hill, which is the resting-place of the divine presence and therefore excels all the heights of the earth, is assigned to Him as the seat of His throne.

---

* Even the Jalkut on the Psalms, § 620, wavers in the explanation of נסכתי between אמשחתיה I have anointed him, (after Dan. x. 3), אתיכתיה I have cast him (after Exod. xxxii. 4 and freq.), and גדלתיו I have made him great (after Mic. v. 4). Aquila, by rendering it καὶ ἐδιασάμην (from διάζεσθαι = ὑφαίνειν), adds a fourth possible rendering. A fifth is נָסַךְ to purify, consecrate (Hitz.), which does not exist, for the Arabic *nasaka* obtains this meaning from the primary signification of cleansing by flooding with water (*e. g.* washing away the briny elements of a field). Also in Prov. viii. 23 נִסַּכְתִּי means I am cast = placed.

Vers. 7—9. The Anointed One himself now speaks and expresses what he is, and is able to do, by virtue of the divine decree. No transitional word or formula of introduction denotes this sudden transition from the speech of Jahve to that of His Christ. The psalmist is the seer: his Psalm is the mirrored picture of what he saw and the echo of what he heard. As Jahve in opposition to the rebels acknowledges the king upon Zion, so the king on Zion appeals to Him in opposition to the rebels. The name of God, יְהוָה, has *Rebia magnum* and, on account of the compass of the full intonation of this accent, a *Gaja* by the *Shebâ* (comp. אֱלֹהָי xxv. 2, אֱלֹהִים lxviii. 8, אֲדֹנָי xc. 1).* The construction of סָפַר with אֶל (as lxix. 27, comp. אמר Gen. xx. 2, Jer. xxvii. 19, דִּבֶּר 2 Chron. xxxii. 19, הוֹדִיעַ Isa. xxxviii. 19): to narrate or make an announcement with respect to... is minute, and therefore solemn. Self-confident and fearless, he can and will oppose to those, who now renounce their allegiance to him, a חֹק, *i. e.* an authentic, inviolable appointment, which can neither be changed nor shaken. All the ancient versions, with the exception of the Syriac, read חקיהוה together. The line of the strophe becomes thereby more symmetrical, but the expression loses in force. אֶל־חֹק rightly has *Olewejored*. It is the amplificative use of the noun when it is not more precisely determined, known in Arabic grammar: such a decree! majestic as to its author and its matter. Jahve has declared to Him: בְּנִי אַתָּה,** and that on the definite day

* We may observe here, in general, that this *Gaja* (*Methey*) which draws the *Shebâ* into the intonation is placed even beside words with the lesser distinctives *Zinnor* and *Rebia parvum* only by the Masorete *Ben-Naphtali*, not by *Ben-Asher* (both about 950 A. D.). This is a point which has not been observed throughout even in Baer's edition of the Psalter, so that consequently *e. g.* in v. 11 it is to be written אֱלֹהִים; in vi. 2 on the other hand (with *Dechi*) יְהוָה, not יְהוָה.

** Even in pause here אַתָּה remains without a lengthened *ā* (*Psalter* ii. 468), but the word is become *Milel*, while out of pause, according to Ben-Asher, it is *Milra*; but even out of pause (as in lxxxix. 10, 12, xc. 2) it is accented on the *penult.* by Ben-Naphtali. The *Athnach* of the books תֹּאם (Ps., Job, Prov.), corresponding to the *Zakeph* of the 21 other books, has only a half pausal power, and as a rule none at all where it follows *Olewejored*, cf. ix. 7, xiv. 4, xxv. 7, xxvii. 4, xxxi. 14, xxxv. 15, &c. (Baer, *Thorath Emeth* p. 37).

on which He has begotten or born him into this relationship of son. The verb יָלַד (with the changeable vowel *i**) unites in itself, like γεννᾶν, the ideas of begetting and bearing (LXX. γεγέννηκα, Aq. ἔτεκον); what is intended is an operation of divine power exalted above both, and indeed, since it refers to a setting up (נסך) in the kingship, the begetting into a royal existence, which takes place in and by the act of anointing (משׁח). Whether it be David, or a son of David, or the other David, that is intended, in any case 2 Sam. vii. is to be accounted as the first and oldest proclamation of this decree; for there David, with reference to his own anointing, and at the same time with the promise of everlasting dominion, receives the witness of the eternal sonship to which Jahve has appointed the seed of David in relation to Himself as Father, so that David and his seed can say to Jahve: אָבִי אַתָּה, Thou art my Father, lxxxix. 27, as Jahve can to him: בְּנִי אַתָּה, Thou art My son. From this sonship of the Anointed one to Jahve, the Creator and Possessor of the world, flows His claim to and expectation of the dominion of the world. The cohortative, natural after challenges, follows upon שְׁאַל, Ges. § 128, 1. Jahve has appointed the dominion of the world to His Son: on His part therefore it needs only the desire for it, to appropriate to Himself that which is allotted to Him. He needs only to be willing, and that He is willing is shewn by His appealing to the authority delegated to Him by Jahve against the rebels. This authority has a supplement in ver. 9, which is most terrible for the rebellious ones. The *suff.* refer to the גּוֹיִם, the ἔθνη, sunk in heathenism. For these his sceptre of dominion (cx. 2) becomes a rod of iron, which will shatter them into a thousand pieces like a brittle image of clay (Jer. xix. 11). With נְפֹץ alternates רָעַע (= רָעַץ *frangere*), *fut.* תְּרֹעֵם; whereas the LXX. (Syr., Jer.), which renders ποιμανεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ (as 1 Cor. iv. 21) σιδηρᾷ, points it תִּרְעֵם from רָעָה. The staff of iron, according to the Hebrew text the instrument of punitive power, becomes thus with

* The changeable *i* goes back either to a primary form יַלֵד, יַרֵשׁ, יַשֵׁאל, or it originates directly from *Pathach*; forms like יְרֵשׁוּהָ and שְׁאֵלֵהוּ favour the former, *ē* in a closed syllable generally going over into *Segol* favours the latter.

reference to שֵׁבֶט as the shepherd's staff xxiii. 4, Mic. vii. 14, an instrument of despotism.

Vers. 10—12. The poet closes with a practical application to the great of the earth of that which he has seen and heard. With וְעַתָּה, καὶ νῦν (1 John ii. 28), *itaque*, appropriate conclusions are drawn from some general moral matter of fact (*e. g.* Prov. v. 7) or some fact connected with the history of redemption (*e. g.* Isa. xxviii. 22). The exhortation is not addressed to those whom he has seen in a state of rebellion, but to kings in general with reference to what he has prophetically seen and heard. שֹׁפְטֵי אֶרֶץ are not those who judge the earth, but the judges, *i. e.* rulers (Amos ii. 3, cf. i. 8), belonging to the earth, throughout its length or breadth. The *Hiph.* הַשְׂכִּיל signifies to shew intelligence or discernment; the *Niph.* נוּסַר as a so-called *Niph. tolerativum*, to let one's self be chastened or instructed, like נוֹעַץ Prov. xiii. 10, to allow one's self to be advised, נִדְרַשׁ Ezek. xiv. 3, to allow one's self to be sought, נִמְצָא to allow one's self to be found, 1 Chron. xxviii. 9, and frequently. This general call to reflection is followed, in ver. 11, by a special exhortation in reference to Jahve, and in ver. 12, in reference to the Son. עִבְדוּ and גִּילוּ answer to each other: the latter is not according to Hos. x. 5 in the sense of חִילוּ xcvi. 9, but, — since "to shake with trembling" (Hitz.) is a tautology, and as an imperative גִּילוּ everywhere else signifies: rejoice, — according to c. 2, in the sense of rapturous manifestation of joy at the happiness and honour of being permitted to be servants of such a God. The LXX. correctly renders it: ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ. Their rejoicing, in order that it may not run to the excess of security and haughtiness, is to be blended with trembling (בְּ as Zeph. iii. 17), viz. with the trembling of reverence and self-control, for God is a consuming fire, Hebr. xii. 28.

The second exhortation, which now follows, having reference to their relationship to the Anointed One, has been missed by all the ancient versions except the Syriac, as though its clearness had blinded the translators, since they render בַּר, either בֹּר purity, chastity, discipline (LXX., Targ., Ital., Vulg.), or בַּר pure, unmixed (Aq., Symm., Jer.:

adorate pure). Thus also Hupfeld renders it "yield sincerely", whereas it is rendered by Ewald "receive wholesome warning", and by Hitzig "submit to duty" (בַּר like the Arabic *birr* = בִּר); Olshausen even thinks, there may be some mistake in בר, and Diestel decides for בו instead of בר. But the context and the usage of the language require *osculamini filium*. The *Piel* נַשְּׁקוּ means to kiss, and never anything else; and while בִּר in Hebrew means purity and nothing more, and בַּר as an adverb, *pure*, cannot be supported, nothing is more natural here, after Jahve has acknowledged His Anointed One as His Son, than that בַּר (Prov. xxxi. 2, even בְּרִי = בְּנִי) — which has nothing strange about it when found in solemn discourse, and here helps one over the dissonance of בֵּן פֶּן — should, in a like absolute manner to חֹק, denote the unique son, and in fact the Son of God.* The exhortation to submit to Jahve is followed, as Aben-Ezra has observed, by the exhortation to do homage to Jahve's Son. To kiss is equivalent to to do homage. Samuel kisses Saul (1 Sam. x. 1), saying that thereby he does homage to him.**

The subject to what follows is now, however, not the Son, but Jahve. It is certainly at least quite as natural to the New Testament consciousness to refer "lest He be angry" to the Son (*vid.* Apoc. vi. 16 sq.), and since the warning against putting trust (חֲכוֹת) in princes, cxviii. 9, cxlvi. 3, cannot be applied to the Christ of God, the reference of בּוֹ to Him (Hengst.) cannot be regarded as impossible. But since חָסָה בְּ is the usual word for taking confiding refuge in Jahve, and

* Apart from the fact of בר not having the article, its indefiniteness comes under the point of view of that which, because it combines with it the idea of the majestic, great, and terrible, is called by the Arabian grammarians التنكير لتعظيم or لتكثير or لتهويل; by the boundlessness which lies in it it challenges the imagination to magnify the notion which it thus expresses. An Arabic expositor would here (as in ver. 7 above) render it "Kiss a son and such a son!" (*vid. Ibn Hishâm* in De Sacy's *Anthol. Grammat.* p. ٨٥, where it is to be translated *hic est vir qualis vir!*). Examples which support this doctrine are בְּיַד Isa. xxviii. 2 by a hand. viz. God's almighty hand which is the hand of hands, and Isa. xxxi. 8 מִפְּנֵי־חֶרֶב before a sword, viz. the divine sword which brooks no opposing weapon.

* On this *vid.* Scacchi *Myrothecium*, t. iii. (1637) c. 35.

the future day of wrath is always referred to in the Old Testament (*e. g.* cx. 5) as the day of the wrath of God, we refer the *ne irascatur* to Him whose son the Anointed One is; therefore it is to be rendered: lest Jahve be angry and ye perish דֶּרֶךְ. This דֶּרֶךְ is the *accus.* of more exact definition. If the way of any one perish, i. 6, he himself is lost with regard to the way, since this leads him into the abyss. It is questionable whether כִּמְעַט means "for a little" in the sense of *brevi* or *facile*. The *usus loquendi* and position of the words favour the latter (Hupf.). Everywhere else כִּמְעַט means by itself (without such additions as in Ezr. ix. 8, Isa. xxvi. 20, Ezek. xvi. 47) "for a little, nearly, easily." At least this meaning is secured to it when it occurs after hypothetical antecedent clauses as in lxxxi. 15, 2 Sam. xix. 37, Job xxxii. 22. Therefore it is to be rendered: for His wrath might kindle easily, or might kindle suddenly. The poet warns the rulers in their own highest interest not to challenge the wrathful zeal of Jahve for His Christ, which according to ver. 5 is inevitable. Well is it with all those who have nothing to fear from this outburst of wrath, because they hide themselves in Jahve as their refuge. The construct state חוֹסֵי connects בּוֹ, without a genitive relation, with itself as forming together one notion, Ges. § 116, 1. חסה the usual word for fleeing confidingly to Jahve, means according to its radical notion not so much *refugere, confugere,* as *se abdere, condere,* and is therefore never combined with אֶל, but always with בְּ. *

---

* On old names of towns, which this ancient חסה shews, *vid.* Wetzstein's remark on Job xxiv. 8 [ii. p. 22 n. 2]. The Arabic still has حسى in the reference of the primary meaning to water which, sucked in and hidden, flows under the sand and only comes to sight on digging. The rocky bottom on which it collects beneath the surface of the sand and by which it is prevented from oozing away or drying up is called حَسَى *ḥasâ* or حِسَى *ḥisâ* a hiding-place or place of protection, and a fountain dug there is called عين الحسى.

PSALM III.

MORNING HYMN OF ONE IN DISTRESS, BUT CONFIDENT IN GOD.

2 JAHVE, how many are my oppressors!
Many rise up against me,
3 Many say of my soul:
"There is no help for him in God". (*Sela*)

4 But Thou, O Jahve, art a shield for me,
My glory and the lifter up of my head.
5 I cried unto Jahve with my voice
And He answered me from His holy hill. (*Sela*)

6 I laid me down, and slept;
I awaked, for Jahve sustaineth me.
7 I will not be afraid of ten thousands of the people
Who have set themselves against me round about.

8 Arise, O Jahve, help me, O my God!
For Thou smitest all mine enemies on the cheek,
Thou breakest the teeth of the ungodly.
9 To Jahve belongeth salvation —
Upon Thy people be Thy blessing! (*Sela*)

The two Psalms forming the prologue, which treat of cognate themes, the one ethical, from the standpoint of the חכמה, and the other related to the history of redemption from the standpoint of the נבואה, are now followed by a morning prayer; for morning and evening prayers are surely the first that one expects to find in a prayer- and hymn-book. The morning hymn, Ps. iii., which has the mention of the "holy hill" in common with Ps. ii., naturally precedes the evening hymn Ps. iv.; for that Ps. iii. is an evening hymn as some are of opinion, rests on grammatical misconception.

With Ps. iii., begin, as already stated, the hymns arranged for music. By מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד, *a Psalm of David*, the hymn which follows is marked as one designed for musical accompaniment. Since מזמור occurs exclusively in the inscriptions of the Psalms, it is no doubt a technical expression coined by David. זָמַר (root זם) is an onomatopoetic word, which in *Kal* signifies to cut off, and in fact to prune or lop

(the vine) (cf. Arabic נִיר to write, from the buzzing noise of the style or reed on the writing material). The signification of singing and playing proper to the *Piel* are not connected with the signification "to nip". For neither the rhythmical division (Schultens) nor the articulated speaking (Hitz.) furnish a probable explanation, since the cæsura and syllable are not natural but artificial notions, nor also the nipping of the strings (Böttch., Ges.), for which the language has coined the word נִגֵּן (of like root with נָגַע). Moreover, the earliest passages in which זִמְרָה and זָמַר occur (Gen. xliii. 11, Exod. xv. 2, Judges v. 3), speak rather of song than music and both words frequently denote song in distinction from music, *e. g.* xcviii. 5, lxxxi. 3, cf. Cant. ii. 12. Also, if זָמַר originally means, like ψάλλειν, *carpere (pulsare) fides,* such names of instruments as Arab. *zemr* the hautboy and *zummâra* the pipe would not be formed. But זָמַר means, as Hupfeld has shewn, as indirect an onomatope as *canere*, "to make music" in the widest sense; the more accurate usage of the language, however, distinguishes זָמַר and שִׁיר as to play and to sing. With בְּ of the instrument זָמַר denotes song with musical accompaniment (like the Æthiopic זמר *instrumento canere*) and זִמְרָה (Aram. זְמָר) is sometimes, as in Amos v. 23, absolutely: music. Accordingly מִזְמוֹר signifies technically the music and שִׁיר the words. And therefore we translate the former by "Psalm", for ὁ ψαλμός ἐστιν — says Gregory of Nyssa — ἡ διὰ τοῦ ὀργάνου τοῦ μουσικοῦ μελωδία, ᾠδὴ δὲ ἡ διὰ στόματος γενομένου τοῦ μέλους μετὰ ῥημάτων ἐκφώνησις

That Ps. iii. is a hymn arranged for music is also manifest from the סֶלָה which occurs here 3 times. It is found in the Psalter, as Bruno has correctly calculated, 71 times (17 times in the 1st book, 30 in the 2nd, 20 in the 3rd, 4 in the 4th) and, with the exception of the anonymous Ps. lxvi. lxvii., always in those that are inscribed by the name of David and of the psalmists famed from the time of David. That it is a marginal note referring to the Davidic Temple-music is clearly seen from the fact, that all the Psalms with סלה have the לַמְנַצֵּחַ which relates to the musical execution, with the exception of eight (xxxii. xlviii. l. lxxxii. lxxxiii. lxxxvii. lxxxix. cxliii.) which, however, from the designation מִזְמוֹר

are at least manifestly designed for music. The Tephilla of Habbakuk, ch. iii., the only portion of Scripture in which סלה occurs out of the Psalter, as an exception has the למנצח at the end. Including the three סלה of this tephilla, the word does not occur less than 74 times in the Old Testament.

Now as to the meaning of this musical *nota bene*, 1st, every explanation as an abbreviation, — the best of which is = סֹב לְמַעְלָה רֹאשׁ (turn thyself towards above *i. e.* towards the front, O Singer! therefore: *da capo*), — is to be rejected, because such abbreviations fail of any further support in the Old Testament. Also 2ndly, the derivation from סָלָה = שָׁלַח *silere,* according to which it denotes a pause, or orders the singers to be silent while the music strikes up, is inadmissible, because סל in this sense is neither Hebrew nor Aramaic and moreover in Hebrew itself the interchange of שׁ with ס (סִרְיוֹן, שִׁרְיוֹן) is extremely rare. There is but one verbal stem with which סֶלָה can be combined, viz. סָלַל or סָלָה (סָלָא). The primary notion of this verbal stem is that of lifting up, from which, with reference to the derivatives סֻלָּם a ladder and מְסִלָּה in the signification an ascent, or steps, 2 Chron. ix. 11, comes the general meaning for סֶלָה, of a musical rise. When the tradition of the Mishna explains the word as a synonym of נֶצַח and the Targum, the Quinta, and the Sexta (and although variously Aquila and sometimes the Syriac version) render it in accordance therewith "for ever (always)", — in favour of which Jerome also at last decides, *Ep. ad Marcellam* "*quid sit Sela*"), — the original musical signification is converted into a corresponding logical or lexical one. But it is apparent from the διάψαλμα of the LXX. (adopted by Symm., Theod., and the Syr.), that the musical meaning amounts to a strengthening of some kind or other; for διάψαλμα signifies, according to its formation (— μα = — μενον), not the pause as Gregory of Nyssa defines it: ἡ μεταξὺ τῆς ψαλμῳδίας γενομένη κατὰ τὸ ἀθρόον ἐπηρέμησις πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ θεόθεν ἐπικρινομένου νοήματος, but either the interlude, especially of the stringed instruments, (like διαύλιον (διαύλειον), according to Hesychius the interlude of the flutes between the choruses), or an intensified playing (as διαψάλλειν τριγώνοις is found in a fragment of the comedian

Eupolis in Athenæus of the strong play of triangular harps).* According to the pointing of the word as we now have it, it ought apparently to be regarded as a noun סֶל with the *ah* of direction (synonymous with נָוָה, up! Job xxii. 29); for the omission of the *Dagesh* beside the *ah* of direction is not without example (cf. 1 Kings ii. 40 גַּתָּה which is the proper reading, instead of גַּתַּה, and referred to by Ewald) and the ־, with *Dag. forte implicitum,* is usual before liquids instead of ־, as פַּדָּנָה Gen. xxviii. 2, הָרָה Gen. xiv. 10 instead of *paddannah, harrah,* as also כַּרְמֶלָה 1 Sam. xxv. 5 instead of כַּרְמֶלָה. But the present pointing of this word, which is uniformly included in the accentuation of the Masoretic verse, is scarcely the genuine pointing: it looks like an imitation of נְצַח. The word may originally have been pronounced סֶלָה (*elevatio* after the form בַּתָּה, דַּלָה). The combination סלה הְגָיוֹן ix. 17, in which הגיון refers to the playing of the stringed instruments (xcii. 4) leads one to infer that סלה is a note which refers not to the singing but to the instrumental accompaniment. But to understand by this a heaping up of weighty expressive accords and powerful harmonies in general, would be to confound ancient with modern music. What is meant is the joining in of the orchestra, or a reinforcement of the instruments, or even a transition from *piano* to *forte.*

Three times in this Psalm we meet with this Hebrew *forte.* In sixteen Psalms (vii. xx. xxi. xliv. xlvii. xlviii. l. liv. lx. lxi. lxxv. lxxxi. lxxxii. lxxxiii. lxxxv. cxliii.) we find it only once; in fifteen Psalms (iv. ix. xxiv. xxxix. xlix. lii. lv. lvii. lix. lxii. lxvii. lxxvi. lxxxiv. lxxxvii. lxxxviii.), twice; in but seven Psalms (iii. xxxii. xlvi. lxvi. lxviii. lxxvii. cxl. and also Hab. iii.), three times; and only in one (lxxxix.), four times. It never stands at the beginning of a Psalm, for the ancient music was not as yet so fully developed, that סלה should absolutely correspond to the *ritornello.* Moreover, it does not always stand at the close of a strophe so as to be the sign of a regular interlude, but it is always placed where the instruments are to join in simultaneously and take up

* On the explanations of διάψαλμα in the Fathers and the old lexicographers. *vid.* Suicer's *Thes. Eccl.* and Augusti's *Christl. Archäologie,* Th. ii.

the melody — a thing which frequently happens in the midst of the strophe. In the Psalm before us it stands at the close of the 1st, 2nd, and 4th strophes. The reason of its omission after the third is evident.

Not a few of the Psalms bear the date of the time of the persecution under Saul, but only this and probably Ps. lxiii. have that of Absolom. The Psalter however contains other Psalms which reflect this second time of persecution. It is therefore all the more easy to accept as tradition the inscription: *when he fled before Absolom, his son.* And what is there in the contents of the Psalm against this statement? All the leading features of the Psalm accord with it, viz. the mockery of one who is rejected of God 2 Sam. xvi. 7 sq., the danger by night 2 Sam. xvii. 1, the multitudes of the people 2 Sam. xv. 13, xvii. 11, and the high position of honour held by the psalmist. Hitzig prefers to refer this and the following Psalm to the surprize by the Amalekites during David's settlement in Ziklag. But since at that time Zion and Jerusalem were not free some different interpretation of ver. 5 *b* becomes necessary. And the fact that the Psalm does not contain any reference to Absolom does not militate against the inscription. It is explained by the tone of 2 Sam. xix. 1 [xviii. 33 Engl.]. And if Psalms belonging to the time of Absolom's rebellion required any such reference to make them known, then we should have none at all.

Vers. 2—3. The first strophe contains the lament concerning the existing distress. From its combination with the exclamative מָה, רַבּוּ is accented on the *ultima* (and also in civ. 24); the accentuation of the *perf.* of verbs עִ"ע very frequently (even without the *Waw consec.*) follows the example of the strong verb, Ges. § 67 rem. 12. A declaration then takes the place of the summons and the רַבִּים implied in the predicate רַבּוּ now becomes the subject of participial predicates, which more minutely describe the continuing condition of affairs. The לְ of לְנַפְשִׁי signifies "in the direction of", followed by an address in xi. 1 (= "to"), or, as here and frequently (*e. g.* Gen. xxi. 7) followed by narration (= "of",

concerning). לְנַפְשִׁי instead of לִי implies that the words of the adversaries pronounce a judgment upon his inmost life, or upon his personal relationship to God. יְשׁוּעָתָה is an intensive form for יְשׁוּעָה, whether it be with a double feminine termination (Ges., Ew., Olsh.), or, with an original (accusative) *ah* of the direction: we regard this latter view, with Hupfeld, as more in accordance with the usage and analogy of the language (comp. xliv. 27 with lxxx. 3, and לַיְלָה prop. νύκτα, then as common Greek ἡ νύκτα, νύχθα). God is the ground of help; to have no more help in Him is equivalent to being rooted out of favour with God. Open enemies as well as disconcerted friends look upon him as one henceforth cast away. David had plunged himself into the deepest abyss of wretchedness by his adultery with Bathsheba, at the beginning of the very year in which, by the renewal of the Syro-Ammonitish war, he had reached the pinnacle of worldly power. The rebellion of Absolom belonged to the series of dire calamities which began to come upon him from that time. Plausible reasons were not wanting for such words as these which give up his cause as lost.

Vers. 4—5. But cleansed by penitence he stands in a totally different relationship to God and God to him from that which men suppose. Every hour he has reason to fear some overwhelming attack but Jahve is the shield which covers him behind and before (בְּעַד *constr.* of בַּעַד = בַּעְדִּי prop. *pone, post*). His kingdom is taken from him, but Jahve is his glory. With covered head and dejected countenance he ascended the Mount of Olives (2 Sam. xv. 30), but Jahve is the "lifter up of his head", inasmuch as He comforts and helps him. The primary passage of this believing utterance "God is a shield" is Gen. xv. 1 (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 29). Very far from praying in vain, he is assured, that when he prays his prayer will be heard and answered. The rendering "I cried and He answered me" is erroneous here where אֶקְרָא does not stand in an historical connection. The future of sequence does not require it, as is evident from lv. 17 sq. (comp. on cxx. 1); it is only an expression of confidence in the answer on God's part, which will follow his prayer. In constructions

like קוֹלִי אֶקְרָא, Hitzig and Hupfeld regard קוֹלִי as the narrower subject-notion beside the more general one (as xliv. 3, lxix. 11, lxxxiii. 19): my voice — I cried; but the position of the words is not favourable to this in the passage before us and in xvii. 10, xxvii. 7, lvii. 5, lxvi. 17, cxlii. 2, Isa. xxvi. 9, though it may be in lxix. 11, cviii. 2. According to Ew. § 281, *c*, קוֹלִי is an accusative of more precise definition, as without doubt in Isa. x. 30 cf. Ps. lx. 7, xvii. 13 sq.; the cry is thereby described as a loud cry.* To this cry, as וַיַּעֲנֵנִי as being a pure mood of sequence implies, succeeds the answer, or, which better corresponds to the original meaning of עָנָה (comp. عَنَّ to meet,stand opposite) reply;** and it it comes from the place whither it was directed: מֵהַר קָדְשׁוֹ. He had removed the ark from Kirjath Jearim to Zion. He had not taken it with him when he left Jerusalem and fled before Absolom, 2 Sam. xv. 25. He was therefore separated by a hostile power from the resting-place of the divine presence. But his prayer urged its way on to the cherubim-throne; and to the answer of Him who is enthroned there, there is no separating barrier of space or created things.

Vers. 6—7. That this God will protect him, His protection during the past night is now a pledge to him in the early morning. It is a violation of the rules of grammar to translate וְאִישָׁנָה: I shall go to sleep, or: I am going to sleep. The 1 *pers. fut. consec.* which is indicated by the וְ, is fond of taking an *ah* of direction, which gives subjective intensity to the idea of sequence: "and thus I then fell asleep", cf. vii. 5, cxix. 55, and frequently, Gen. xxxii. 6, and more especially

* Böttcher, *Collectanea* pp. 166 sq., also adopts the view, that נַפְשִׁי, פִּי, קוֹלִי are each *appositum vicarium subjecti* and therefore *nomin.* in such passages. But 1) the fact that אֵת never stands beside them is explained by the consideration that it is not suited to an adverbial collateral definition. And 2) that elsewhere the same notions appear as direct subjects, just as 3) that elsewhere they alternate with the verbal subject-notion in the parallel member of the verse (cxxx. 5, Prov. viii. 4) — these last two admit of no inference. The controverted question of the syntax is, moreover, an old one and has been treated of at length by Kimchi in his *Book of Roots s. r.* אוה.

** *vid.* Redslob in his treatise: *Die Integrität der Stelle Hos.* vii. 4—10 *in Frage gestellt* S. 7.

so in the later style,Ezra ix. 3, Neh. xiii. 21, *vid.* Ges. § 49, 2, Böttcher, *Neue Aehrenlese,* No. 412. It is a retrospective glance at the past night. Awaking in health and safety, he feels grateful to Him to whom he owes it: יהוה יִסְמְכֵנִי. It is the result of the fact that Jahve supports him, and that God's hand is his pillow.* Because this loving, almighty hand is beneath his head (Cant. ii. 6) he is inaccessible and therefore also devoid of fear. שִׁית (שׂוּם) carries its object in itself: to take up one's position, as in Isa. xxii. 7, synon. חָנָה xxviii. 3 and שִׂים 1 Kings xx. 12, cf. ἐπιτιθέναι τινί. David does not put a merely possible case. All Israel, that is to say ten thousands, myriads, were gone over to Absolom. Here, at the close of the third strophe, סלה is wanting because the לֹא אִירָא (I will not fear) is not uttered in a tone of triumph, but is only a quiet, meek expression of believing confidence. If the instruments struck up boldly and suddenly here, then a cry for help, urged forth by the difficulties that still continually surrounded him, would not be able to follow.

Vers. 8—9. The bold קוּמָה is taken from the mouth of Moses, Num. x. 35. God is said to arise when He takes a decisive part in what takes place in this world. Instead of *ḳûmah* it is accented *ḳumáh* as *Milra,* in order (since the reading קומה ארני is assumed) that the final *āh* may be sharply cut off from the guttural initial of the next word, and thus render a clear, exact pronunciation of the latter possible (Hitz., Ew. § 228, *b*).** Beside יהוה we have אֱלֹהַי, with the

* Referred to the other David, ver. 6 has become an Easter-morning call, *vid.* Val. Herberger's *Paradies-Blümlein aus dem Lustgarten der Psalmen* (Neue Ausg. 1857) S. 25.

** This is the traditional reason of the accentuation *shubáh, ḳumáh, shithâh* before יהוה: it is intended to prevent the one or other of the two gutturals being swallowed up (שלא יבולעו) by too rapid speaking. Hence it is that the same thing takes place even when another word, not the name of God, follows, if it begins with א or the like, and is closely connected with it by meaning and accentuation: *e. g.* Judges iv. 18 סוּרָה twice *Milra* before א; Ps. lvii. 9 עוּרָה, *Milra* before ה; לָמָּה, *Milra* before ה, Exod. v. 22; נָחָה Is. xi. 2, and הֲבָאתָ Gen. xxvi. 10, *Milra* before ע; and the following fact favours it, viz. that for a similar reason *Pasek* is placed were two י would come together, *e. g.* Gen. xxii 14 *Adonaj jir'eh* with the stroke of separation between the two words, cf. Ex. xv. 18, Prov. viii. 21. The fact that in Jer. xl. 5, וְשֻׁבָה remains *Milel,* is accounted

suff. of appropriating faith. The cry for help is then substantiated by כִּי and the retrospective *perf.* They are not such *perff.* of prophetically certain hope as in vi. 9, vii. 7, ix. 5 sq., for the logical connection requires an appeal to previous experience in the present passage: they express facts of experience, which are taken from many single events (hence כֹּל) down to the present time. The verb הִכָּה is construed with a double accusative, as *e. g.*, *Iliad* xvi. 597 τὸν μὲν ἄρα Γλαῦκος στῆθος μέσον οὔτασε δουρί. The idea of contempt (Job xvi. 10) is combined with that of rendering harmless in this "smiting upon the cheek". What is meant is a striking in of the jaw-bone and therewith a breaking of the teeth in pieces (שִׁבַּר). David means, an ignominious end has always come upon the ungodly who rose up against him and against God's order in general, as their punishment. The enemies are conceived of as monsters given to biting, and the picture of their fate is fashioned according to this conception. Jahve has the power and the will to defend His Anointed against their hostility: לַה' הַיְשׁוּעָה *penes Jovam est salus.* יְשׁוּעָה (from יָשַׁע, רָחַב, *amplum esse*) signifies breadth as applied to perfect freedom of motion, removal of all straitness and oppression, prosperity without exposure to danger and unbeclouded. In the לְ of possession lies the idea of the exclusiveness of the possession and of perfect freedom of disposal. At Jahve's free disposal stands הַיְשׁוּעָה, salvation, in all its fulness (just so in Jon. ii. 10, Apoc. vii. 10). In connection therewith David first of all thinks of his own need of deliverance. But as a true king he cannot before God think of himself, without connecting himself with his people. Therefore he closes with the intercessory inference: עַל־עַמְּךָ בִרְכָתֶךָ Upon Thy people be Thy blessing! We may supply תְּהִי or תָּבֹא. Instead of cursing his faithless people he implores a blessing upon

for by its being separated from the following אֶל־גִּבְעוֹן by *Pazer*; a real exception, however (*Michlol* 112 *b*), — and not as Norzi from misapprehension observes, a controverted one, — is שָׁכְבָה, *Milel* before הָעִיר 2 Sam. xv. 27, but it is by no means sufficient to oppose the purely orthophonic (not rhythmical) ground of this *ultima*-accentuation. Even the semi-guttural ר sometimes has a like influence over the tone: *ribáh ribi* xliii. 1, cxix. 154.

those who have been piteously led astray and deceived. This "upon Thy people be Thy blessing!" has its counterpart in the "Father forgive them" of the other David, whom His people crucified. The one concluding word of the Psalm — observes Ewald — casts a bright light into the very depths of his noble soul.

PSALM IV.

EVENING HYMN OF ONE WHO IS UNMOVED BEFORE BACK-BITERS AND MEN OF LITTLE FAITH.

2 WHEN I call answer me, O God of my righteousness,
Who hast made space for me in straitness;
Be merciful unto me and hear my prayer!

3 Ye sons of men, how long shall my honour become shame,
Since ye love appearance, ye seek after leasing?! (*Sela*)

4 Know then, that Jahve hath marked out the godly man for Himself;
Jahve heareth when I call to Him.

5 Be ye angry, yet sin ye not! —
Commune with your own heart upon your bed and be still! (*Sela.*)

6 Offer the sacrifices of righteousness,
And put your trust in Jahve!

7 Many say: "How can we experience good!?"
O lift up the light of Thy countenance upon us, Jahve!

8 Thou hast put gladness into my heart,
More than in the time when their corn and wine abound.

9 In peace will I lay me down and forthwith sleep,
For Thou, O Jahve, in seclusion
Makest me to dwell securely.

The Davidic morning hymn is now followed by a Davidic evening hymn. It is evident that they belong together from the mutual relation of iv. 7 with iii. 3, and iii. 6 with iv. 9. They are the only two Psalms in which the direct words of others are taken up into a prayer with the formula "many say", רבים אמרים. The history and chronological position of the one is explained from the inscription of the other. From

the *quousque* iv. 3, and the words of the feeble-faiths iv. 7, it follows that Ps. iv. is the later of the two.

It is at the head of this Psalm that we are first met by לַמְנַצֵּחַ (or לָמְנַצֵּחַ with *Gaja*, Hab. iii. 19), which still calls for investigation. It is found fifty five times in the Psalter, not 54 as is usually reckoned: viz. 19 times in book i., 25 times in book ii., 8 times in book iii., 3 times in book v. Only two of the Psalms, at the head of which it is found, are anonymous: viz. lxvi., lxvii. All the others bear the names of David and of the psalmists celebrated from David's time, viz. 39 of David, 9 of the Korahites, 5 of Asaph. No fewer than 30 of these Psalms are Elohimic. למנצח is always the first word of the inscription; only in Ps. lxxxviii., which is easily liable to be overlooked in reckoning, is it otherwise, because there two different inscriptions are put together.

The meaning of the verb נָצַח is evident from the Chronicles and the Book of Ezra, which belongs to them. The predilection of the chronicler for the history of religious worship and antiquarian lore is also of use in reference to this word. He uses it in the history of the time of David, of Solomon, of Josiah, of Zerubbabel and Joshua, and always in connection with the accounts of the Temple-service and the building of single parts of the Temple. To discharge the official duties of the Temple-service is called נָצַח עַל־מְלֶאכֶת בֵּית־ה׳ 1 Chron. xxiii. 4 (comp. 28—32), and the expression is used in Ezra iii. 8 sq. of the oversight of the work and workmen for the building of the Temple. The same 3300 (3600) overseers, who are called הָרֹדִים בָּעָם הָעֹשִׂים בַּמְּלָאכָה in 1 Kings v. 30 are described by the chronicler (2 Chron. ii. 1) as מְנַצְּחִים עֲלֵיהֶם. In connection with the repair of the Temple under Josiah we read that Levites were appointed לְנַצֵּחַ (2 Chron. xxxiv. 12), namely לְכֹל עֹשֵׂה מְלָאכָה (ver. 13), instead of which we find it said in ii. 17 לְהַעֲבִיד, to keep the people at their work. The primary notion of נצח is that of shining, and in fact of the purest and most dazzling brightness; this then passes over to the notion of shining over or outshining, and in fact both of uninterrupted continuance and of excellence and superiority (*vid. Ithpa.* Dan. vi. 4, and cf. 1 Chron. xxiii. 4 with ix. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 54 with Isa. xxv. 8).

Thus, therefore, מְנַצֵּחַ is one who shews eminent ability in any departement, and then it gains the general signification of master, director, chief overseer. At the head of the Psalms it is commonly understood of the director of the Temple-music. מְנַצֵּחַ *est dux cantus* — Luther says in one place — *quem nos dicimus den Kapellenmeister* [the band-master], *qui orditur et gubernat cantum*, ἔξαρχος *(Opp. lat.* xvii. 134 *ed. Erl.)*. But 1st, even the Psalms of Asaph have this למנצח at the beginning, and he was himself a director of the Temple-music, and in fact the chief-director (הָרֹאשׁ) 1 Chron. xvi. 5, or at any rate he was one of the three (Heman, Asaph, Ethan), to whom the 24 classes of the 4000 Levite singers under the Davidico-Salomonic sanctuary were subordinate; 2ndly, the passage of the chronicler (1 Chron. xv. 17—21) which is most prominent in reference to this question, does not accord with this explanation. According to this passage the three directors of the Temple-music managed the cymbals לְהַשְׁמִיעַ, to sound aloud; eight other musicians of high rank the nablas and six others the citherns לְנַצֵּחַ. This expression cannot mean "to direct", for the direction belonged to the three, and the cymbals were also better adapted to it than the citherns. It means "to take the lead in the playing": the cymbals directed and the citherns, better adapted to take the lead in the playing, were related to them, somewhat as the violins to the clarinets now-a-days. Hence מְנַצֵּחַ is not the director of the Temple-music but in general the master of song, and למנצח addresses the Psalm to him whose duty it is to arrange it and to train the Levite choristers; it therefore defines the Psalm as belonging to the songs of the Temple worship that require musical accompaniment. The translation of the Targum (Luther) also corresponds to this general sense of the expression: לְשַׁבָּחָא "to be sung liturgically", and the LXX : εἰς τὸ τέλος, if this signifies "to the execution" and does not on the contrary ascribe an eschatological meaning to the Psalm.*

* Thus *e. g.* Eusebius: εἰς τὸ τέλος ὡς ἂν μακροῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος μελλόντων πληροῦσθαι, and Theodoret: σημαίνει τὸ εἰς ὁ τέλος ὅτι μακροῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις πληρωθήσεται τὰ προφητευόμενα, with which accords *Pesachim* 117 *a* לבא לעתיד ונגון ניצוח, *i. e.*

The בִּנְגִינוֹת which is added is not governed by it. This can be seen at once from Hab. iii. 19: to the chief singer, with an accompaniment of my stringed instruments (*vid.* my *Commentary*), which Hitzig renders: to the chief singer of my musical pieces; but נְגַּח בְּ is not a phrase that can be supported, and נְגִינָה does not mean a piece of music. The *Piel*, נִגֵּן, complete with בְּיָד, signifies to touch the strings (cogn. נגע), to play a stringed instrument. Whence comes נגינות (lxxvii. 7, Isa. xxxviii. 20) which is almost always used as a *pluralet.*: the play of the stringed instruments, and the superscribed בִּנְגִינוֹת Ps. iv. vi. liv. lv. lxvii. lxxvi.: with an accompaniment of the stringed instruments; and ב is used as in xlix. 5, Isa. xxx. 29, 32. The hymn is to be sung in company with, probably with the sole accompaniment of, the stringed instruments. The fact of the inscribed words למנצח בנגינות preceding מזמור לדוד probably arises from the fact of their being written originally at the top over the chief title which gave the generic name of the hymn and the author.

Ver. 2. Jahve is אֱלֹהֵי צִדְקִי, the possessor of righteousness, the author of righteousness, and the vindicator of misjudged and persecuted righteousness. This God of righteousness David believingly calls his God (cf. xxiv. 5, lix. 11); for the righteousness he possesses, he possesses in Him, and the righteousness he looks for, he looks for in Him. That this is not in vain, his previous experience assures him: Thou hast made a breadth (space) for me when in a strait. In connection with this confirmatory relation of בַּצַּר הִרְחַבְתָּ לִי it is more probable that we have before us an attributive clause (Hitz.), than that we have an independent one, and at any rate it is a retrospective clause. הרחבת is not precative (Böttch.), for the *perf.* of certainty with a precative colouring is confined

---

Psalms with למנצח and בנגינות refer to the last days. Gregory of Nyssa combines the different translations by rendering: εἰς τέλος, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ νίκη. Ewald's view, that τέλος in this formula means consecration, celebration, worship, is improbable; in this signification it is not a Septuagint word.

to such exclamatory utterances as Job xxi. 16 (which see). He bases his prayer on two things, viz. on his fellowship with God, the righteous God, and on His justifying grace which he has already experienced. He has been many times in a strait already, and God has made a broad place for him. The idea of the expansion of the breathing (of the stream of air) and of space is attached to the ח ך of רחב, root רח (*Deutsch. Morgenl. Zeitschr.* xii. 657). What is meant is the expansion of the straitened heart, xxv. 17. Isa. lx. 5, and the widening of a straitened position, xviii. 20, cxviii. 5. On the *Dag.* in לִי *vid.* on lxxxiv. 4.

Vers. 3—4. Righteous in his relation to God he turns rebukingly towards those who contemn him whose honour is God's honour, viz. to the partisans of Absolom. In contrast with בְּנֵי אָדָם, men who are lost in the multitude, בְּנֵי אִישׁ denotes such as stand prominently forward out of the multitude; passages like xlix. 3, lxii. 10, Prov. viii. 4, Isa. ii. 9, v. 15, shew this distinction. In this and the preceding Psalm David makes as little mention of his degenerate son as he does of the deluded king in the Psalms belonging to the period of his persecution by Saul. The address is directed to the aristocratic party, whose tool Absolom has become. To these he says: till when (עַד־מָה beside the non-guttural which follows with *Segol,* without any manifest reason, as in x. 13, Isa. i. 5, Jer. xvi. 10), *i. e.* how long shall my honour become a mockery, namely to you and by you, just as we can also say in Latin *quousque tandem dignitas mea ludibrio?* The two following members are circumstantial clauses subordinate to the principal clause with עַד־מָה (similar to Isa. i. 5 *a*; Ew. § 341, *b*). The energetic *fut.* with *Nun parag.* does not usually stand at the head of independent clauses; it is therefore to be rendered: since ye love רִיק, that which is empty — the proper name for their high rank is hollow appearance — how long will ye pursue after כָּזָב, falsehood? — they seek to find out every possible lying pretext, in order to trail the honour of the legitimate king in the dust. The assertion that the personal honour of David, not his kingly dignity, is meant by כְּבוֹדִי, separates what is inseparable. They are eager to injure his official at the

same time as his personal reputation. Therefore David appeals in opposition to them (ver. 4) not only to the divine choice, but also to his personal relationship to God, on which that choice is based. The ו of וּדְעוּ is, as in 2 Kings iv. 41, the ו of sequence: so know then. The *Hiph.* הִפְלָה (from פָּלָא = פָּלַל, cogn. פָּלַל, prop. to divide) to make a separation, make a distinction Exod. ix. 4, xi. 7, then to distinguish in an extraordinary and remarkable way Exod. viii. 18, and to shew Ps. xvii. 7, cf. xxxi. 22, so that consequently what is meant is not the mere selection (בָּחַר), but the remarkable selection to a remarkable position of honour (LXX., Vulg. *mirificavit,* Windberg translation of the Psalms *gewunderlichet*). לוֹ belongs to the verb, as in cxxxv. 4, and the principal accent lies on חָסִיד: he whom Jahve Himself, not men, has thus remarkably distinguished is a חָסִיד, a pious man, *i. e.* either, like the Syriac חֲסִידָא = רְחִימָא: God's favourite, or, according to the biblical usage of the language (cf. xii 2 with Isa. lvii. 1), in an active signification like פָּלִיט, פָּרִיץ, and the like: a lover of God, from חָסַד (root חס חס *stringere*, whence *ḥassa* to curry, *maḥassa* a curry-comb) prop. to feel one's self drawn, *i. e.* strongly affected (comp. *ḥiss* a mental impression), in Hebrew, of a strong ardent affection. As a חסיד he does not call upon God in vain, but finds a ready hearing. Their undertaking consequently runs counter to the miraculously evidenced will of God and must fail by reason of the loving relationship in which the dethroned and debased one stands to God.

Vers. 5—6. The address is continued: they are to repent and cleave to Jahve instead of allowing themselves to be carried away by arrogance and discontent. The LXX. has rendered it correctly: ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε (cf. Ephes. iv. 26): if ye will be angry beware of sinning, viz. backbiting and rebellion (cf. the similar paratactic combinations xxviii. 1, Josh. vi. 18, Isa. xii. 1). In connection with the rendering *contremiscite* we feel to miss any expression of that before which they are to tremble (viz. the sure punishment which God decrees). He warns his adversaries against blind passion, and counsels them to quiet converse with their own hearts, and solitary meditation, in order that

they may not imperil their own salvation. To commune with one's own heart, without the addition of the object, is equivalent to to think alone by one's self, and the bed or resting-place, without requiring to be understood literally, points to a condition of mind that is favourable to quiet contemplation. The heart is the seat of the conscience, and the Spirit of God (as Hamann, *Werke* i. 98, observes on this subject) disguises itself as our own voice that we may see His exhortation, His counsel, and His wisdom well up out of our own stony heart. The second *imper.* continues the first: and cease, prop. be still (דֳּמַם from the sound of the closed mouth checking the discourse), *i. e.* come to your right mind by self-examination, cease your tumult — a warning coming with the semblance of command by reason of the consciousness of innocence on his part; and this impression has to be rendered here by the striking in of the music. The dehortation passes over into exhortation in ver. 6. Of course the sacrifices were continued in the sanctuary while David, with his faithful followers, was a fugitive from Jerusalem. Referring to this, David cries out to the Absolomites: offer וְזִבְחֵי־צֶדֶק. Here at least these are not offerings consisting of actions which are in accordance with the will of God, instead of slaughtered animals, but sacrifices offered with a right mind, conformed to the will of God, instead of the hypocritical mind with which they consecrate their evil doings and think to flatter God. In li. 21, Deut. xxxiii. 19 also, "the sacrifices of righteousness" are real sacrifices, not merely symbols of moral acts. Not less full of meaning is the exhortation וּבִטְחוּ אֶל־יְהוָה. The verb בָּטַח is construed with אֶל as in xxxi. 7, lvi. 4, lxxxvi. 2, combining with the notion of trusting that of drawing near to, hanging on, attaching one's self to any one. The Arabic word بطح, *expandere*, has preserved the primary notion of the word, a notion which, as in the synon. بسط, when referred to the effect which is produced on the heart, countenance and whole nature of the man by a joyous cheerful state of mind, passes over to the notion of this state of mind itself, so that בָּטַח (like the Arab. *inbasaṭa* to be cheerful, fearless, bold, *lit.* expanded (cf. רחב Isa. lx. 5) = unstraitened) consequently

signifies to be courageous, confident. They are to renounce the self-trust which blinds them in their opposition to the king who is deprived of all human assistance. If they will trustingly submit themselves to God, then at the same time the murmuring and rancorous discontent, from which the rebellion has sprung, will be stilled. Thus far the address to the rebellious magnates goes.

Vers. 7—8. Looking into his own small camp David is conscious of a disheartened feeling which is gaining power over him. The words: who will make us see, *i. e.* (as in xxxiv. 13) experience any good? can be taken as expressive of a wish according to 2 Sam. xxiii. 15, Isa. xlii. 23; but the situation gives it the character of a despondent question arising from a disheartened view of the future. The gloom has now lasted so long with David's companions in tribulation that their faith is turned to fear, their hope to despair. David therefore prays as he looks upon them: Oh lift upon us (נָסָה־עָלֵינוּ)* the light of Thy countenance. The form of the petition reminds one of the priestly benediction in Num. vi. There it is: יָאֵר ה׳ פָּנָיו in the second portion, in the third יִשָּׂא ה׳ פָּנָיו, here these two wishes are blended into one prayer; and moreover in נָסָה there is an allusion to נֵס a banner, for the *imper.* of נָשָׂא, the regular form of which is שָׂא, will also admit of the form נְשָׂא (x. 12), but the mode of writing נָסָה (without example elsewhere, for נָסָה Job iv. 2 signifies "to be attempted") is only explained by the mingling of the verbs נָשָׂא and נָסַם, נִסַּס, *extollere* (lx. 6); ה׳ נִסִּי (cf. lx. 6) is, moreover, a primeval word of the Tôra (Ex. xvii. 15). If we may suppose that this mingling is not merely a mingling of forms in writing, but also a mingling of the ideas in those forms, then we have three thoughts in this prayer which are brought before the eye and ear in the briefest possible expression:

* The *Metheg* which stands in the second syllable before the tone stands by the *Shebâ*, in the metrical books, if this syllable is the first in a word marked with a greater distinctive without any conjunctive preceding it, and beginning with *Shebâ*; it is, therefore, not נָסָה־עָלֵינוּ but נָסָה־עָלֵינוּ, cf. li. 2 בָּבוֹא, lxix. 28 תָּנוּחוּ, lxxxi. 3 שָׂאוּ־, cxvi. 17 לָךְ־, cxix. 175 תְּחִי־. The reason and object are the same as stated in note p. 84 *supra*.

may Jahve cause His face to shine upon them; may He lift upon them the light of His countenance so that they may have it above them like the sun in the sky, and may that light be a banner promising them the victory, around which they shall rally.

David, however, despite the hopelessness of the present, is even now at peace in His God. The joy which Jahve has put into his heart in the midst of outward trial and adversity is מֵעֵת דְּגָנָם וְתִירוֹשָׁם רָבּוּ. The expression is as concise as possible: (1) *gaudium præ* equivalent to *gaudium magnum præ* = *majus quam;* then (2) מֵעֵת after the analogy of the *comparatio decurtata* (*e. g.* xviii. 34 my feet are like hinds, *i. e.* like the feet of hinds) is equivalent to מִשֶּׁמְחַת עֵת; (3) אֲשֶׁר is omitted after עֵת according to Ges. § 123, 3, for עֵת is the construct state, and what follows is the second member of the genitival relation, dependent upon it (cf. xc. 15, Isa. xxix. 1); the plurality of things: corn and new wine, inasmuch as it is the stores of both that are specially meant, is exceptionally joined with the *plur.* instead of the *sing.*, and the chief word *rābbu* stands at the end by way of emphasis. The *suff.* does not refer to the people of the land in general (as in lxv. 10), but, in accordance with the contrast, to the Absolomites, to those of the nation who have fallen away from David. When David came to Mahanaim, while the rebels were encamped in Gilead, the country round about him was hostile, so that he had to receive provisions by stealth, 2 Sam. xvii. 26—29. Perhaps it was at the time of the feast of tabernacles. The harvest and the vintage were over. A rich harvest of corn and new wine was garnered. The followers of Absolom had, in these rich stores which were at their disposal, a powerful reserve upon which to fall back. David and his host were like a band of beggars or marauders. But the king brought down from the sceptre to the beggar's staff is nevertheless happier than they, the rebels against him. What he possesses in his heart is a richer treasure than all that they have in their barns and cellars.

Ver. 9. Thus then he lies down to sleep, cheerfully and peacefully. The hymn closes as it began with a three line verse. יַחְדָּו (*lit.* in its unions = collectively, Olshausen, § 135, *c*,

like כֻּלּוֹ altogether, בְּעִתּוֹ at the right time) is by no means unemphatic; nor is it so in xix. 10 where it means "all together, without exception". With synonymous verbs it denotes the combination of that which they imply, as Isa. xlii. 14. It is similar in cxli. 10 where it expresses the coincidence of the fall of his enemies and the escape of the persecuted one. So here: he wishes to go to sleep and also at once he falls asleep (וְאִישָׁן in a likewise cohortative sense = וְאִישְׁנָה). His God makes him to dwell in seclusion free of care. לְבָדָד is a first definition of condition, and לָבֶטַח a second. The former is not, after Deut. xxxii. 12, equivalent to לָבָדְךָ, an addition which would be without any implied antithesis and consequently meaningless. One must therefore, as is indeed required by the situation, understand לְבָדָד according to Num. xxiii. 9, Mic. vii, 14, Deut. xxxiii. 28, Jer. xlix. 31. He needs no guards for he is guarded round about by Jahve and kept in safety. The seclusion, בָּדָד, in which he is, is security, בֶּטַח, because Jahve is near him. Under what a many phases and how sweetly the nature of faith is expressed in this and the foregoing Psalm: his righteousness, exaltation, joy, peace, contentment in God! And how delicately conceived is the rhythm! In the last line the evening hymn itself sinks to rest. The iambics with which it closes are like the last strains of a lullaby which die away softly and as though falling asleep themselves. Dante is right when he says in his *Convito,* that the sweetness of the music and harmony of the Hebrew Psalter is lost in the Greek and Latin translations.

PSALM V.

MORNING PRAYER BEFORE GOING TO THE HOUSE OF GOD.

2 GIVE ear to my words, O Jahve,
Consider my meditation!
3 Hearken unto my loud cry, my King and my God,
For unto Thee do I pray.
4 Jahve, in the morning shalt Thou hear my voice
In the morning will I prepare an offering for Thee and look forth.

5 For Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness,
An evil man cannot dwell with Thee.
6 Boasters cannot stand in Thy sight,
Thou hatest all workers of iniquity;
7 Thou destroyest them that speak lies,
The man of blood-guiltiness and malice Jahve abhorreth.

8 Yet I, through Thy rich grace, may enter Thy house,
I may worship towards Thy holy Temple in Thy fear.
9 Jahve, lead me by Thy righteousness, because of them
that lie in wait for me,
Make Thy way even before my face —
10 For in his mouth is nothing certain,
their inward part is an abyss,
An open sepulchre is their throat,
with a smooth tongue.

11 Punish them, Elohim, let them fall from their counsels,
In the multitude of their transgressions cast them away,
who defy Thee;
12 That all they who trust in Thee may rejoice,
may ever shout for joy;
And defend Thou them that they may exult in Thee,
who love Thy name.
13 For Thou, even Thou, dost bless the righteous —
Jahve! with favour dost Thou compass him as with
a shield.

The evening prayer is now followed by a second morning prayer, which like the former draws to a close with כִּי־אַתָּה (iv. 9, v. 13). The situation is different from that in Ps. iii. In that Psalm David is fleeing, here he is in Jerusalem and anticipates going up to the Temple service. If this Psalm also belongs to the time of the rebellion of Absolom, it must have been written when the fire which afterwards broke forth was already smouldering in secret.

The inscription אֶל־הַנְּחִילוֹת is certainly not a motto indicative of its contents (LXX., Vulg., Luther, Hengstenberg). As such it would stand after מִזְמוֹר. Whatever is connected with למנצח, always has reference to the music. If נחילות

came from נָחַל it might according to the biblical use of this verb signify "inheritances", or according to its use in the Talmud "swarms", and in fact swarms of bees (נַחֲלֵי); and נחילות ought then to be the beginning of a popular melody to which the Psalm is adapted. Hai Gaon understands it to denote a melody resembling the hum of bees; Reggio a song that sings of bees. Or is נְחִילוֹת equivalent to נְחָלוֹת *(excavatæ)* and this a special name for the flutes (חֲלִילִים)? The use of the flute in the service of the sanctuary is attested by Isa. xxx. 29, cf. 1 Sam. x. 5, 1 Kings i. 40.* The *præp.* אֶל was, then, more appropriate than עַל; because, as Redslob has observed, the singer cannot play the flute at the same time, but can only sing to the playing of another.

The Psalm consists of four six line strophes. The lines of the strophes here and there approximate to the cæsura-schema. They consist of a rising and a sudden lowering. The German language, which uses so many more words, is not adapted to this cæsura-schema [and the same may be said of the English].

Vers. 2—4. *The introit:* Prayer to be heard. The thoughts are simple but the language is carefully chosen. אֲמָרִים is the *plur.* of אִמֶּר (אֵמֶר), one of the words peculiar to the poetic prophetical style. The denominative הַאֲזִין (like *audire* = *aus,* οὖς, *dare*) belongs more to poetry than prose. הָגִיג (like אָבִיב) or הֲגִיג (like מָחִיר) occurs only in two Psalms לדוד, viz. here and xxxix. 4. It is derived from הָגָה = הָגַג (*vid.* i. 2) and signifies that which is spoken meditatively, here praying in rapt devotion. Beginning thus the prayer gradually rises to a *vox clamoris.* שַׁוְעִי from שָׁוַע, to be distinguished from שַׁוְעִי (*inf. Pi.*) xxviii. 2, xxxi. 23, is one word with the Aram. צוח, Æthiop. צוע (to call). On הַקְשִׁיב used of intent listening, *vid.* x. 17. The invocation מַלְכִּי וֵאלֹהָי, when it is a king who utters it, is all the more significant. David, and in general the theocratic king, is only the representative of the Invisible One, whom he with all Israel adores

* On the use of the flute in the second Temple, *vid.* Introduction p. 33.

as his King. Prayer to Him is his first work as he begins the day. In the morning, בֹּקֶר (as in lv. 18 for בַּבֹּקֶר, lxxxviii. 14), shalt Thou hear my cry, is equivalent to my cry which goes forth with the early morn. Hupfeld considers the mention of the morning as only a "poetical expression" and when getting rid of the meaning *prima luce,* he also gets rid of the beautiful and obvious reference to the daily sacrifice. The verb עָרַךְ is the word used of laying the wood in order for the sacrifice, Lev. i. 7, and the pieces of the sacrifice, Lev. i. 8, 12, vi. 5, of putting the sacred lamps in order, Ex. xxvii. 21, Lev. xxiv. 3 sq., and of setting the shew-bread in order, Ex. xl. 23, Lev. xxiv. 8. The laying of the wood in order for the morning offering of a lamb (Lev. vi. 5 [12], cf. Num. xxviii. 4) was one of the first duties of the priest, as soon as the day began to dawn; the lamb was slain before sun-rise and when the sun appeared above the horizon laid piece by piece upon the altar. The morning prayer is compared to this morning sacrifice. This is in its way also a sacrifice. The object which David has in his mind in connection with אֶעֱרֹךְ is תְּפִלָּתִי. As the priests, with the early morning, lay the wood and pieces of the sacrifices of the *Tamîd* upon the altar, so he brings his prayer before God as a spiritual sacrifice and looks out for an answer (צָפָה *specu lari* as in Hab. ii. 1), perhaps as the priest looks out for fire from heaven to consume the sacrifice, or looks to the smoke to see that it rises up straight towards heaven.

Vers. 5—7: The basing of the prayer on God's holiness. The verbal adjective חָפֵץ (coming from the primitive signification of adhering firmly which is still preserved in خفض *fut. i.*) is in the *sing.* always (xxxiv. 13, xxxv. 27) joined with the accusative. רָע is conceived as a person, for although גּוּר may have a material object, it cannot well have a material subject. יָגֻרְךָ is used for brevity of expression instead of יָגוּר עִמְּךָ (Ges. § 121, 4). The verb גּוּר (to turn in, to take up one's abode with or near any one) frequently has an accusative object, cxx. 5, Judges v. 17, and Isa. xxxiii. 14 according to which the light of the divine holiness is to sinners a consuming fire, which they cannot endure. Now there follow specific designations of the wicked. הוֹלְלִים *part. Kal*

= *hōl'lim*, or even *Poal* = *hôl'lim* (= מְהוֹלָלִים),* are the foolish, and more especially foolish boasters; the primary notion of the verb is not that of being hollow, but that of sounding, then of loud boisterous, non-sensical behaviour. Of such it is said, that they are not able to maintain their position when they become manifest before the eye of God (לְנֶגֶד as in ci. 7 manifest before any one, from נָגַד to come forward, be visible far off, be distinctly visible). פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן are those who work (οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι Mat. vii. 23) iniquity; אָוֶן breath (ἄνεμος) is sometimes trouble, in connection with which one pants, sometimes wickedness, in which there is not even a trace of any thing noble, true, or pure. Such men Jahve hates; for if He did not hate evil (xi. 5), His love would not be a holy love. In דִּבְרֵי כָזָב, דִּבְרֵי is the usual form in combination when the *plur.* is used, instead of מִדַּבְרֵי. It is the same in lviii. 4. The style of expression is also Davidic in other respects, viz. אִישׁ דָּמִים וּמִרְמָה as in lv. 24, and אָבַד as in ix. 6, cf. xxi. 11. תָּעֵב (in Amos, ch. vi. 8 תִּאֵב) appears to be a secondary formation from עוּב, like תָּאַב to desire, from אָבָה, and therefore to be of a cognate root with the Aram. עִיב to despise, treat with indignity, and the Arabic *'aib* a stain (cf. on Lam. ii. 1). The fact that, as Hengstenberg has observed, wickedness and the wicked are described in a sevenfold manner is perhaps merely accidental.

Vers. 8—10. Since the Psalm is a morning hymn, the *futt.* in ver. 8 state what he, on the contrary, may and will do (lxvi. 13). By the greatness and fulness of divine favour (lxix. 14) he has access (εἴσοδον, for בּוֹא means, according to its root, "to enter") to the sanctuary, and he will accordingly repair thither to-day. It is the tabernacle on Zion in which was the ark of the covenant that is meant here. That

---

* On the rule, according to which here, as in עִוְּרֵי ver. 9 and the like, a simple *Shebâ mobile* goes over into *Chateph pathach* with *Gaja* preceding it, *vid.* the observations on giving a faithful representation of the O. T. text according to the Masora in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1863. S. 411. The Babylonian Ben-Naphtali (about 940) prefers the simple *Shebâ* in such cases, as also in others; Ben-Asher of the school of Tiberias, whom the Masora follows, and whom consequently our Masoretic text ought to follow, prefers the *Chateph, vid. Psalter* ii. 460—467.

daily liturgical service was celebrated there must be assumed, since the ark of the covenant is the sign and pledge of Jahve's presence; and it is, moreover, attested by 1 Chron. xvi. 37 sq. It is also to be supposed that sacrifice was offered daily before the tabernacle. For it is not to be inferred from 1 Chron. xvi, 39 sqq. that sacrifice was only offered regularly on the *Bama* (high place) in Gibeon before the Mosaic tabernacle.* It is true sacrifice was offered in Gibeon, where the old tabernacle and the old altars (or at least the altar of burnt-offering) were, and also that after the removal of the ark to Zion both David (1 Chron. xxi. 29 sq.) and Solomon (1 Kings iii. 4, 2 Chron. i. 2—6) worshipped and sacrificed in Gibeon. But it is self-evident sacrifices might have been offered where the ark was, and that even with greater right than in Gibeon; and since both David, upon its arrival (2 Sam. vi. 17 sq.), and Solomon after his accession (1 Kings iii. 15), offered sacrifices through the priests who were placed there, it is probable, — and by a comparison of the Davidic Psalms not to be doubted,—that there was a daily service, in conjunction with sacrifices, before the ark on Zion.

But, moreover, is it really the אֹהֶל on Zion which is meant here in ver. 8 by the house of God? It is still maintained by renowned critics that the tabernacle pitched by David over the sacred ark is never called בית ה׳ or היכל or משכן ה׳ or מקדש or קדש. But why could it not have all these names? We will not appeal to the fact that the house of God at Shilo (1 Sam. i. 9, iii. 3) is called בית and היכל ה׳, since it may be objected that it was really more of a temple than a tabernacle,** although in the same book, ch. ii. 22 it is called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, and in connection with the other appellations the poetic colouring of the historical style of 1 Sam.

---

* Thus, in particular, Stähelin, *Zur Kritik der Psalmen* in the *Deutsch. Morgenl. Zeitschr.* vi (1852) S. 108 and *Zur Einleitung in die Psalmen.* An academical programme, 1859. 4to.

** *vid.* C. H. Graf, *Commentatio de templo Silonensi ad illustrandum locum Jud.* xviii. 30, 31. (1855, 4to.), in which he seeks to prove that the sanctuary in Shilo was a temple to Jahve that lasted until the dissolution of the kingdom of Israel.

i.—iii. is to be taken into consideration. Moreover, we put aside passages like Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26, since it may be said that the future Temple was present to the mind of the Lawgiver. But in Josh. vi. 24, 2 Sam. xii. 20, the sanctuary is called בית ה׳ without being conceived of as a temple. Why then cannot the tabernacle, which David pitched for the ark of the covenant when removed to Zion (2 Sam. vi. 17), be called בית ה׳? It is only when אֹהֶל and בַּיִת are placed in opposition to one another that the latter has the notion of a dwelling built of more solid materials; but in itself *beit* (*bêt*) in Semitic is the generic term for housing of every kind whether it be made of wool, felt, and hair-cloth, or of earth, stone, and wood; consequently it is just as much a tent as a house (in the stricter sense of the word), whether the latter be a hut built of wood and clay or a palace.* If a dwelling-house is frequently called אהל, then a tent that any one dwells in may the more naturally be called his בַּיִת. And this we find is actually the case with the dwellings of the patriarchs, which, although they were not generally solid houses (Gen. xxxiii. 17), are called בית (Gen. xxvii. 15). Moreover, הֵיכָל (from יָכַל = כול to hold, *capacem esse*), although it signifies a palace does not necessarily signify one of stone, for the heavens are also called Jahve's הֵיכָל, *e. g.* xviii. 7, and not necessarily one of gigantic proportions, for even the Holy of holies of Solomon's Temple, and this *par excellence*, is called הֵיכָל, and once, 1 Kings vi. 3, הֵיכַל הַבַּיִת. Of the spaciousness and general character of the Davidic tabernacle we know indeed nothing: it certainly had its splendour, and was not so much a substitute for the original tabernacle, which according

* The Turkish Kamus says: "بيت is a house (Turk. *ew*) in the signification of *châne* (Persic the same), whether it be made of hair, therefore a tent, or built of stone and tiles". And further on: "*Beit* originally signified a place specially designed for persons to retire to at night [from بَاتَ he has passed the night, if it does not perhaps come from the בוא, Arab. بَيَّ, which stands next to it in this passage, *vid. Job* ii. 125]; but later on the meaning was extended and the special reference to the night time was lost." Even at the present day the Beduin does not call his tent *ahl*, but always *bêt* and in fact *bêt sha'r* (בית שְׂעָר), the modern expression for the older *bêt wabar* (hair-house).

to the testimony of the chronicler remained in Gibeon, as a substitute for the Temple that was still to be built. But, however insignificant it may have been, Jahve had His throne there, and it was therefore the הֵיכָל of a great king, just as the wall-less place in the open field where God manifested Himself with His angels to the homeless Jacob was בֵּית אֱלֹהִים (Gen. xxviii. 17).

Into this tabernacle of God, *i. e.* into its front court, will David enter (בּוֹא with *acc.* as in lxvi. 13) this morning, there will he prostrate himself in worship, προσκυνεῖν (הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה reflexive of the *Pilel* שַׁחֲוָה, Ges. § 75, rem. 18), towards (אֶל as in xxviii. 2, 1 Kings viii. 29, 35, cf. לְ xcix. 5, 9) Jahve's הֵיכַל קָדְשׁ, *i. e.* the דְּבִיר, the Holy of holies xxviii. 2, and that "in Thy fear", *i. e.* in reverence before Thee (*genit. objectivus*). The going into the Temple which David purposes, leads his thoughts on to his way through life, and the special δέησις, which only begins here, moulds itself accordingly: he prays for God's gracious guidance as in xxvii. 11, lxxxvi. 11, and frequently. The direction of God, by which he wishes to be guided he calls צְדָקָה. Such is the general expression for the determination of conduct by an ethical rule. The rule, acting in accordance with which, God is called *par excellence* צַדִּיק, is the order of salvation which opens up the way of mercy to sinners. When God forgives those who walk in this way their sins, and stands near to bless and protect them, He shews Himself not less צַדִּיק (just), than when He destroys those who despise Him, in the heat of His rejected love. By this righteousness, which accords with the counsel and order of mercy, David prays to be led לְמַעַן שׁוֹרְרָי, in order that the malicious desire of those who lie in wait for him may not be fulfilled, but put to shame, and that the honour of God may not be sullied by him. שׁוֹרֵר is equivalent to מְשׁוֹרֵר (Aquila ἐφοδεύων, Jerome *insidiator*) from the *Pilel* שׁוֹרֵר to fix one's eyes sharply upon, especially of hostile observation. David further prays that God will make his way (*i. e.* the way in which a man must walk according to God's will) even and straight before him, the praying one, in order that he may walk therein without going astray and unimpeded. The adj. יָשָׁר signifies both

the straightness of a line and the evenness of a surface. The fut. of the *Hiph.* הֵישִׁיר is יַיְשִׁיר in Prov. iv. 25, and accordingly the *Kerî* substitutes for the *imper.* הוֹשַׁר the corresponding form הַיְשַׁר, just as in Isa. xlv. 2 it removes the *Hiphil* form אוֹשַׁר (cf. Gen. viii. 17 הוצא *Keri* הַיְצֵא), without any grammatical, but certainly not without some traditional ground.

כִּי in ver. 10 is closely connected with לְמַעַן שׁוֹרְרָי: on account of my way-layers, for the following are their characteristics. אֵין is separated by בְּפִיהוּ (= בְּפִיו lxii. 5) from נְכוֹנָה the word it governs; this was the more easily possible as the usage of the language almost entirely lost sight of the fact that אֵין is the construct of אַיִן, Ges. § 152, 1. In his mouth is nothing that should stand firm, keep its ground, remain the same (cf. Job xlii. 7 sq.). The singular suffix of בפיהו has a distributive meaning: *in ore uniuscujusque eorum.* Hence the *sing.* at once passes over into the *plur.*: קִרְבָּם הַוּוֹת their inward part, *i. e.* that towards which it goes forth and in which it has its rise (*vid.* xlix. 12) is הוות corruption, from הַוָּה which comes from הָ.וָ.ה = שָׁוָא to yawn, gape, χαίνειν, *hiare,* a yawning abyss and a gaping vacuum, and then, inasmuch as, starting from the primary idea of an empty space, the verbal significations *libere ferri* (especially from below upwards) and more particularly *animo ad* or *in aliquid ferri* are developed, it obtains the pathological sense of strong desire, passion, just as it does also the intellectual sense of a loose way of thinking proceding from a self-willed tendency (*vid.* Fleischer on Job xxxvii. 6). In Hebrew the prevalent meaning of the word is corruption, lvii. 2, which is a metaphor for the abyss, *barathrum*, (so far, but only so far Schultens on Prov. x. 3 is right), and proceeding from this meaning it denotes both that which is physically corruptible (Job. vi. 30) and, as in the present passage and frequently, that which is corruptible from an ethical point of view. The meaning strong desire, in which הַוָּה looks as though it only differed from אַוָּה in one letter, occurs only in lii. 9, Prov. x. 3, Mic. vii. 3. The substance of their inward part is that which is corruptible in every way, and their throat, as the organ of

speech, as in cxv. 7, cxlix. 6, cf. lxix. 4, is (perhaps a figure connected with the primary meaning of הוּת) a grave, which yawns like the jaws, which open and snatch and swallow down whatever comes in their way. To this "they make smooth their tongue" is added as a circumstantial clause. Their throat is thus formed and adapted, while they make smooth their tongue (cf. Prov. ii. 16), in order to conceal their real design beneath flattering language. From this meaning, הֶחֱלִיק directly signifies to flatter in xxxvi. 3, Prov. xxix. 5. The last two lines of the strophe are formed according to the cæsura schema. This schema is also continued in the concluding strophe.

Vers. 11—13. The verb אָשַׁם or אָשֵׁם unites in itself the three closely allied meanings of becoming guilty (*e. g.* Lev. v. 19), of a feeling of guilt (Lev. v. 4 sq.), and of expiation (Ps. xxxiv. 22 sq.); just as the verbal adj. אָשֵׁם also signifies both liable to punishment and expiating, and the substantive אָשָׁם both the guilt to be expiated and the expiation. The *Hiph.* הֶאְשִׁים signifies to cause any one to render the expiation due to his fault, to make him do penance. As an exception God is here, in the midst of the Jehovic Psalms, called אֱלֹהִים, perhaps not altogether unintentionally as being God the Judge. The מִן of מִמַּעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם (with *Gaja* by the מִן and a transition of the counter-tone *Metheg* into *Galgal,* as in Hos. xi. 6 into *Meajla, vid. Psalter* ii. 526) is certainly that of the cause in Hos. xi. 6, but here it is to be explained with Olsh. and Hitz. according to Sir. xiv. 2, Judith xi. 6 (cf. Hos. x. 6): may they fall from their own counsels, *i. e.* founder in the execution of them. Therefore מִן in the sense of "down from, away", a sense which the parallel הַדִּיחֵמוֹ, thrust them away (cf. דְּחוּ from דָּחָה xxxvi. 13), presupposes. The ב of בְּרֹב is to be understood according to John viii. 21, 24 "ye shall die ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν". The multitude of their transgressions shall remain unforgiven and in this state God is to cast them into hades. The ground of this terrible prayer is set forth by כִּי מָרוּ בָךְ. The tone of מָרוּ for a well-known reason (cf. *e. g.,* xxxvii. 40, lxiv. 11, lxxii. 17) has retreated to the *penult.* מָרָה, root מר, prop. to be or hold one's self stiff towards any one, compare

مار, تمار, to press and stiffen against one another in wrestling, مارى, تمارى, to struggle against anything, whether with outward or mental and moral opposition. Their obstinacy is not obstinacy against a man, but against God Himself; their sin is, therefore, Satanic and on that account unpardonable. All the prayers of this character are based upon the assumption expressed in vii. 13, that those against whom they are directed do not wish for mercy. Accordingly their removal is prayed for. Their removal will make the *ecclesia pressa* free and therefore joyous. From this point of view the prayer in ver. 12 is inspired by the prospect of the result of their removal. The *futt.* do not express a wish, but a consequence. The division of the verse is, however, incorrect. The rise of the first half of the verse closes with בָּךְ (the pausal form by *Pazer*), its fall is לעולם ירננו; then the rise begins anew in the second half, extending to בך which ought likewise to be pointed בָּךְ, and אהבי שְׁמֶךָ is its fall. וְתָסֶךְ עֲלֵימוֹ (from הָסַךְ *Hiph.* of סָכַךְ xci. 4) is awkward in this sequence of thoughts. Hupfeld and Hitzig render it: "they shall rejoice for ever whom Thou defendest"; but then it ought not only to be pointed יְרַנְּנוּ, but the וְ must also be removed, and yet there is nothing to characterise תסך עלימו as being virtually a subject. On the other hand it does not harmonise with the other consecutive futures. It must therefore, like יִפְלוּ, be the optative: "And do Thou defend them, then shall those who love Thy name rejoice in Thee". And then upon this this joy of those who love the name of Jahve (*i. e.* God in His revelation of Himself in redemption) lxix. 37, cxix. 132, is based by כִּי־אַתָּה from a fact of universal experience which is the sum of all His historical self-attestations. עֲלֵימוֹ is used instead of עֲלֵיהֶם as a graver form of expression, just like הַדְיחֵמוֹ for הַדְיחֵם as an indignant one. The form וְיַעלְצוּ (Ges. § 63, 3) is chosen instead of the יַעֲלְצוּ found in xxv. 2, lxviii. 4, in order to assist the rhythm. The *futt.* are continuative. תַּעְטְרֶנּוּ, *cinges eum*, is not a contracted *Hiph.* according to 1 Sam. xvii. 25, but *Kal* as in 1 Sam. xxiii. 26; here it is used like the *Piel* in viii. 6 with a double accusative. The צִנָּה (from צָנַן صان *med. Waw*, Æthiop. צון to hedge round, guard) is a shield of a largest

dimensions; larger than מָגֵן 1 Kings x. 16 sq. (cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 7, where Goliath has his צִנָּה borne by a shield-bearer). כְּצִנָּה "like a shield" is equivalent to: as with a shield (Ges. § 118, 3, rem.). The name of God, יהוה, is correctly drawn to the second member of the verse by the accentuation, in order to balance it with the first; and for this reason the first clause does not begin with כִּי־אַתָּה יהוה here as it does elsewhere (iv. 9, xii. 8). רָצוֹן delight, goodwill, is also a synonym for the divine blessing in Deut. xxxiii. 23.

PSALM VI.

A CRY FOR MERCY UNDER JUDGMENT.

2 JAHVE, not in Thy wrath rebuke me,
And not in Thy hot displeasure chasten me!
3 Be gracious unto me, for I am fading away;
Oh heal me, Jahve, for my bones are affrighted,
4 And my soul is affrighted exceedingly —
And Thou, O Jahve, how long?!

5 Return, Jahve, rescue my soul,
Save me for Thy mercy's sake.
6 For in death there is no remembrance of Thee,
In Sheôl who can give Thee thanks?
7 I am exhausted with my groaning,
Every night make I my bed to swim —
With my tears I flood my couch.
8 Sunken is mine eye with grief,
It is grown old because of all mine oppressors.

9 Depart from me all ye who deal wickedly!
For Jahve hath heard my loud weeping,
10 Jahve hath heard my supplication:
Jahve will accept my prayer.
11 All mine enemies shall be ashamed and affrighted exceedingly,
They shall turn away ashamed suddenly.

The morning prayer, Ps. v., is followed by a "*Psalm of David*", which, even if not composed in the morning, looks

back upon a sleepless, tearful night. It consists of three strophes. In the middle one, which is a third longer than the other two, the poet, by means of a calmer outpouring of his heart, struggles on from the cry of distress in the first strophe to the believing confidence of the last. The hostility of men seems to him as a punishment of divine wrath, and consequently (but this is not so clearly expressed as in Ps. xxxviii., which is its counterpart) as the result of his sin; and this persecution, which to him has God's wrath behind it and sin as the sting of its bitterness, makes him sorrowful and sick even unto death. Because the Psalm contains no confession of sin, one might be inclined to think that the church has wrongly reckoned it as the first of the seven (probably selected with reference to the seven days of the week) *Psalmi pœnitentiales* (vi. xxxii. xxxviii. li. cii. cxxx. cxliii.). A. H. Francke in his *Introductio in Psalterium* says, it is rather *Psalmus precatorius hominis gravissimi tentati a pœnitente probe distinguendi.* But this is a mistake. The man who is tempted is distinguished from a penitent man by this, that the feeling of wrath is with the one perfectly groundless and with the other well-grounded. Job was one who was tempted thus. Our psalmist, however, is a penitent, who accordingly seeks that the punitive chastisement of God, as the just God, may for him be changed into the loving chastisement of God, as the merciful One.

We recognise here the language of penitently believing prayer, which has been coined by David. Compare ver. 2 with xxxviii. 2; 3 with xli. 5; 5 with cix. 26; 6 with xxx. 10; 7 with lxix. 4; 8 with xxxi. 10; 11 with xxxv. 4. 26. The language of Heman's Psalm is perceptibly different, comp. ver. 6 with lxxxvii. 11—13; 8 with lxxxviii. 10. And the corresponding strains in Jeremiah (comp. ver. 2, xxxviii. 2 with Jer. x. 24; 3 and 5 with Jer. xvii. 14; 7 with Jer. xlv. 3) are echoes, which to us prove that the Psalm belongs to an earlier age, not that it was composed by the prophet (Hitzig). It is at once probable, from the almost anthological relationship in which Jeremiah stands to the earlier literature, that in the present instance also he is the reproducer. And this idea is confirmed by the fact that in ch. x. 25,

after language resembling the Psalm before us, he continues in words taken from Ps. lxxix. 6 sq. When Hitzig maintains that David could no more have composed this disconcertedly despondent Psalm than Isaiah could the words in Isa. xxi. 3, 4, we refer, in answer to him, to Isa. xxii. 4 and to the many attestations that David did weep, 2 Sam. i. 12, iii. 32, xii. 21, xv. 30, xix. 1.

The accompanying musical direction runs: *To the Precentor, with accompaniment of stringed instruments, upon the Octave.* The LXX. translates ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀγδόης, and the Fathers associate with it the thought of the octave of eternal happiness, ἡ ὀγδόη ἐκείνη, as Gregory of Nyssa says, ἥτίς ἐστιν ὁ ἐφεξῆς αἰών. But there is no doubt whatever that עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית has reference to music. It is also found by Ps. xii., and besides in 1 Chron. xv. 21. From this latter passage it is at least clear that it is not the name of an instrument. An instrument with eight strings could not have been called an *octave* instead of an *octachord.* In that passage they played upon nablas עַל־עֲלָמוֹת, and with citherns עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית. If עֲלָמוֹת denotes maidens = maidens' voices *i. e. soprano*, then, as it seems, הַשְּׁמִינִית is a designation of the bass, and על־השמינית equivalent to *all' ottava bassa.* The fact that Ps. xlvi., which is accompanied by the direction עַל־עֲלָמוֹת, is a joyous song, whereas Ps. vi. is a plaintive one and Ps. xii. not less gloomy and sad, accords with this. These two were to be played in the lower octave, that one in the higher.

Vers. 2—4. There is a chastisement which proceeds from God's love to the man as being pardoned and which is designed to purify or to prove him, and a chastisement which proceeds from God's wrath against the man as striving obstinately against, or as fallen away from, favour, and which satisfies divine justice. Ps. xciv. 12, cxviii. 17, Prov. iii. 11 sq. speak of this loving chastisement. The man who should decline it, would act against his own salvation. Accordingly David, like Jeremiah (ch. x. 24), does not pray for the removal of the chastisement but of the chastisement *in wrath*, or what is the same thing, of the judgment proceed-

ing from wrath [*Zorngericht*]. בְּאַפְּךָ and בַּחֲמָתְךָ stand in the middle, between אַל and the verbs, for the sake of emphasis. Hengstenberg indeed finds a different antithesis here. He says: "The contrast is not that of chastisement in love with chastisement in wrath, but that of loving rescue in contrast with chastisement, which always proceeds from the principle of wrath". If what is here meant is, that always when God chastens a man his wrath is the true and proper motive, it is an error, for the refutation of which one whole book of the Bible, viz. the Book of Job, has been written. For there the friends think that God is angry with Job; but we know from the prologue that, so far from being angry with him, he on the contrary glories in him. Here, in this Psalm, assuming David to be its author, and his adultery the occasion of it, it is certainly quite otherwise. The chastisement under which David is brought low, has God's wrath as its motive: it is punitive chastisement and remains such, so long as David remains fallen from favour. But if in sincere penitence he again struggles through to favour, then the punitive becomes a loving chastisement: God's relationship to him becomes an essentially different relationship. The evil, which is the result of his sin and as such indeed originates in the principle of wrath, becomes the means of discipline and purifying which love employs, and this it is that he here implores for himself. And thus Dante Alighieri* correctly and beautifully paraphrases the verse:

Signor, non mi riprender con furore,
E non voler correggermi con ira,
Ma con dolcezza e con perfetto amore.

In חָנֵּנִי David prays God to let him experience His loving-kindness and tender mercy in place of the punishment He has a right to inflict; for anguish of soul has already reduced him to the extreme even of bodily sickness: he is withered up and weary. אֻמְלַל has *Pathach*, and consequently seems to be the 3 *pers. Pul.* as in Joel i. 10, Nah. i. 4; but this

* Provided he is the author of *I sette Salmi Penitenziali trasportati alla volgar poesia, vid.* Dante Alighieri's Lyric poems, translated and annotated by Kannegiesser and Witte (1842) i. 203 sq., ii. 208 sq.

cannot be according to the rules of grammar. It is an adjective, like רָעֲנָן, שָׁאֲנָן, with the passive pointing. The formation אמלל (from אמל أَمِلَ with the primary meaning to stretch out lengthwise) is analogous to the IX. and XI. forms of the Arabic verb which serve especially to express colours and defects (Caspari § 59). The two words אֲנִי אֻמְלַל have the double accent *Mercha-Mahpach* together, and according to the exact mode of writing (*vid.* Baer in my *Psalter* ii. 492) the *Mahpach*, (the sign resembling *Mahpach* or rather *Jethib*), ought to stand between the two words, since it at the same time represents the *Makkeph*. The principal tone of the united pair, therefore, lies on *āni*; and accordingly the adj. אֻמְלַל is shortened to אֻמְלַל (cf. הַפַּכְפַּךְ, אֲדַמְדַּם, מְרַמָּס, and the like)—a contraction which proves that אמלל is not treated as *part. Pul.* (= מְאֻמְלָל), for its characteristic *ā* is unchangeable. The prayer for healing is based upon the plea that his bones (Job iv. 14, Isa. xxxviii. 13) are affrighted. We have no German word exactly corresponding to this נִבְהַל which (from the radical notion "to let go", cogn. בָּלַהּ) expresses a condition of outward overthrow and inward consternation, and is therefore the effect of fright which disconcerts one and of excitement that deprives one of self-control.* His soul is still more shaken than his body. The affliction is therefore not a merely bodily ailment in which only a timorous man loses heart. God's love is hidden from him. God's wrath seems as though it would wear him completely away. It is an affliction beyond all other afflictions. Hence he enquires: And Thou, O Jahve, how long?! Instead of אתה it is written את, which the *Kerî* says is to be read אַתָּה, while in three passages (Num. xi. 15, Deut. v. 24, Ezek. xxviii. 14) אַתְּ is admitted as *masc.*

Vers. 5—8. God has turned away from him, hence the prayer שׁוּבָה, viz. אֵלַי. The tone of שׁוּבָה is on the *ult.*, because it is assumed to be read שׁוּבָה אֲדֹנָי. The *ultima* accentuation is intended to secure its distinct pronunciation to the final syllable of שׁוּבה, which is liable to be drowned and

* We have translated Dr. Delitzsch's word *erschreckt* literally—the *vexed* of the Authorized Version seems hardly equal to the meaning.

escape notice in connection with the coming together of the two aspirates (*vid.* on iii. 8). May God turn to him again, rescue (חַלֵּץ from חָלַץ, which is transitive in Hebr. and Aram., to free, *expedire, exuere,* Arab. خَلَصَ to be pure, prop. to be loose, free) his soul, in which his affliction has taken deep root, from this affliction, and extend to him salvation on the ground of His mercy towards sinners. He founds this cry for help upon his yearning to be able still longer to praise God, — a happy employ, the possibility of which would be cut off from him if he should die. זֵכֶר, as frequently הוֹדִיר, is used of remembering one with reverence and honour; הוֹדָה (from יָדָה) has the *dat. honoris* after it. שְׁאוֹל, ver. 6*b*, ᾅδης (Apoc. xx. 13), alternates with מָוֶת. Such is the name of the underground abode of the dead, the gate of which is the grave, the yawning abyss, into which everything mortal descends (from שְׁאַל = שׁוּל سال, to be loose, relaxed, to hang down, sink down: a sinking in, that which is sunken in*, a depth). The writers of the Psalms all (which is no small objection against Maccabean Psalms) know only of one single gathering-place of the dead in the depth of the earth, where they indeed live, but it is only a *quasi* life, because they are secluded from the light of this world and, what is the most lamentable, from the light of God's presence. Hence the Christian can only join in the prayer of ver. 6 of this Psalm and similar passages (xxx. 10, lxxxviii. 11—13, cxv. 17, Isa. xxxviii. 18 sq.) so far as he transfers the notion of hades to that of gehenna.** In hell there is really no remembrance and no praising of God. David's fear of death as something in itself unhappy, is also, according to its

* The form corresponds to the Arabic form فِعَالٌ, which, though originally a verbal abstract, has carried over the passive meaning into the province of the concrete, *e. g. kitâb* = *maktûb* and *ilâh,* אֱלֹהַּ = *ma'lûh* = *ma'bûd* (the feared, revered One).

** An adumbration of this relationship of Christianity to the religion of the Old Testament is the relationship of Islam to the religion of the Arab wandering tribes, which is called the "religion of Abraham" (*Din Ibrâhîm),* and knows no life after death; while Islam has taken from the later Judaism and from Christianity the hope of a resurrection and heavenly blessedness.

ultimate ground, nothing but the fear of an unhappy death. In these "pains of hell" he is wearied with (בְּ as in lxix. 4) groaning, and bedews his couch every night with a river of tears. Just as the *Hiph.* הִשְׁחָה signifies to cause to swim from שָׁחָה to swim, so the *Hiph.* הֵמְסָה signifies to dissolve, cause to melt, from מָסָה (cogn. מָסַס) to melt. דְּמָעָה, in Arabic a *nom. unit.* a tear, is in Hebrew a flood of tears.

In ver. 8 עֵינִי does not signify my "appearance" (Num. xi. 7), but, as becomes clear from xxxi. 10, lxxxviii. 10, Job xvii. 7, "my eye"; the eye reflects the whole state of a man's health. The verb עָשַׁשׁ appears to be a denominative from עָשׁ: to be moth-eaten.* The signification *senescere* for the verb עָתַק is more certain. The closing words בְּכָל-צוֹרְרָי (cf. Num. x. 9 הַצָּר הַצֹּרֵר the oppressing oppressor, from the root צר סר to press, squeeze, and especially to bind together, *constringere, coartare***), in which the writer indicates, partially at least, the cause of his grief (בַּעַס, in Job xviii. 7 כַּעַשׂ), are as it were the socket into which the following strophe is inserted.

Vers. 9—11. Even before his plaintive prayer is ended the divine light and comfort come quickly into his heart, as Frisch says in his "*Neuklingende Harfe Davids*". His enemies mock him as one forsaken of God, but even in the face of his enemies he becomes conscious that this is not his condition. Thrice in vers. 9, 10 his confidence that God will answer him flashes forth: He hears his loud sobbing, the voice of his weeping that rises towards heaven, He hears his supplication, and He graciously accepts his prayer. The twofold שָׁמַע expresses the fact and יָקַח its consequence. That which he seems to have to suffer, shall in reality be the lot of his enemies, viz. the end of those who are rejected of God:

---

* Reuchlin in his grammatical analysis of the seven Penitential Psalms, which he published in 1512 after his *Ll. III de Rudimentis Hebraicis* (1506), explains it thus: עָשְׁשָׁה *Verminavit. Sic a vermibus dictum qui turbant res claras puras et nitidas*, and in the *Rudim.* p. 412: *Turbatus est a furore oculus meus, corrosus et obfuscatus, quasi vitro laternæ obductus.*

** In Arabic צִיר *ḍir* is the word for a step-mother as the oppressor of the step-children; and צָרַר *ḍirr*, a concubine as the oppressor of her rival.

they shall be put to shame. The בּוֹשׁ, Syr. ܒܫ, Chald. בְּהַת, בֶּהַת, which we meet with here for the first time, is not connected with the Arab. بهت but (since the Old Arabic as a rule has ث as a mediating vowel between ש and ز, ת) with باث which signifies "to turn up and scatter about things that lie together (either beside or upon each other)" *eruere et diruere, disturbare,* — a root which also appears in the reduplicated form בּשּׁשׁ: to root up and disperse, whence בֶּשֶׁת sorrow and anxiety, according to which therefore בּוֹשׁ (= בָּוַשׁ as בָּאַשׁ = בָּוַשׁ) prop. signifies *disturbare*, to be perplexed, lose one's self-control, and denotes shame according to a similar, but somewhat differently applied conception to *confundi*, συγχεῖσθαι, συγχύνεσθαι. וְיִבָּהֲלוּ points back to vers. 2, 3: the lot at which the malicious have rejoiced, shall come upon themselves. As is implied in יָשֻׁבוּ יֵבֹשׁוּ, a higher power turns back the assailants filled with shame (ix. 4, xxxv. 4).

What an impressive finish we have here in these three *Milels,jashûbu jebôshu rāgaʿ*, in relation to the tripping measure of the preceding words addressed to his enemies! And, if not intentional, yet how remarkable is the coincidence, that shame follows the involuntary reverse of the foes, and that יבשו in its letters and sound is the reverse of וישבו! What music there is in the Psalter! If composers could but understand it!!

PSALM VII.

APPEAL TO THE JUDGE OF THE WHOLE EARTH AGAINST SLANDER AND REQUITING GOOD WITH EVIL.

2 JAHVE, my God, in Thee do I hide myself;
Save me from all my persecutors, and deliver me!
3 Lest he tear my soul like a lion,
Rending it in pieces while there is none to deliver.

4 Jahve, my God, if I have done this,
If iniquity cling to my hands,
5 If I have rewarded evil to him that was at peace with me
And plundered mine enemy without cause:

6 Then let the enemy persecute my soul and take [it],
And tread down my life to the earth,
And lay my dignity in the dust. *(Sela.)*

7 Arise, Jahve, in Thine anger,
Lift up Thyself against the rage of mine oppressors,
And awake for me, Thou hast indeed arranged justice!
8 And let the host of the nations stand round about Thee
And over it do Thou return again on high!
9 Jahve shall judge the peoples —
Jahve, judge me according to my righteousness and my innocence in me!

10 Oh let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end, establish the righteous,
Thou art He who trieth the hearts and reins, a just God.
11 My shield is borne by Elohim,
The Saviour of the upright in heart.

12 Elohim is a righteous Judge
And a God threatening day by day.
13 If a man will not repent, He whetteth His sword,
He hath bent His bow and made it ready,
14 And against him He directeth the weapon of death,
His arrows He maketh burning arrows.

15 Behold, he travaileth with evil: he conceiveth trouble and bringeth forth falsehood.
16 He hath digged a pit and hollowed it out,
And falleth into the hollow that he is making.
17 His trouble cometh back upon his own head,
And his violent dealing cometh down upon his own pate.
18 I will give thanks to Jahve according to His righteousness,
And will sing praise to the name of Jahve, the Most High.

In the second part of Ps. vi. David meets his enemies with strong self-confidence in God. Ps. vii., which even Hitzig ascribes to David, continues this theme and exhibits to us, in a prominent example taken from the time of persecution under Saul, his purity of conscience and joyousness of faith. One need only read 1 Sam. xxiv.—xxvi. to see how this Psalm abounds in unmistakeable references to this por-

tion of David's life. The superscribed statement of the events that gave rise to its composition point to this. Such statements are found exclusively only by the Davidic Psalms.* The inscription runs: *Shiggajon of David, which he sang to Jahve on account of the sayings of Cush a Benjamite.* עַל־דִּבְרֵי is intentionally chosen instead of עַל which has other functions in these superscriptions. Although דָּבָר and דִּבְרֵי can mean a thing, business, affairs (Ex. xxii. 8, 1 Sam. x. 2, and freq.) and עַל־דִּבְרֵי "in reference to" (Deut. iv. 21, Jer. vii. 22) or "on occasion of" (Jer. xiv. 1), still we must here keep to the most natural signification: "on account of the words (speeches)". *Cûsh* (LXX. falsely Χουσί = כּוּשִׁי; Luther, likewise under misapprehension, "the Moor") must have been one of the many servants of Saul, his kinsman, one of the talebearers like Doeg and the Ziphites, who shamefully slandered David before Saul, and roused him against David. The epithet בֶּן־יְמִינִי (as in 1 Sam. ix. 1, 21, cf. אִישׁ־יְמִינִי 2 Sam. xx. 1) describes him as "a Benjamite" and does not assume any knowledge of him, as would be the case if it were הַבִּנְיָמִינִי, or rather (in accordance with biblical usage) בֶּן־הַיְמִינִי. And this accords with the actual fact, for there is no mention of him elsewhere in Scripture history. The statement עַל־דברי וגו׳ is hardly from David's hand, but written by some one else, whether from tradition or from the דברי הימים of David, where this Psalm may have been interwoven with the history of its occasion. Whereas there is nothing against our regarding שִׁגָּיוֹן לְדָוִד, or at least שִׁגָּיוֹן, as a note appended by David himself.

Since שִׁגָּיוֹן (after the form חִזָּיוֹן a vision) belongs to the same class as superscribed appellations like מִזְמוֹר and מַשְׂכִּיל, and the *Tephilla* of Habakkuk, ch. iii. 1 (*vid.* my *Commentary*), has the addition שִׁגְיוֹנוֹת עַל־, שִׁגָּיוֹן must be the name of a kind of lyric composition, and in fact a kind described according to the rhythm of its language or melody. Now since שָׁגָה means to go astray, wander, reel, and is cognate with שָׁגַע (whence comes שִׁגָּעוֹן madness, a word formed in the same manner)

* Viz. vii. lix. lvi. xxxiv. lii. lvii. cxlii. liv. (belonging to the time of the persecution under Saul), iii. lxiii (to the persecution under Absolom), li. (David's adultery), lx. (the Syro-Ammonitish war).

שִׁגָּיוֹן may mean in the language of prosody a reeling poem, *i. e.* one composed in a most excited movement and with a rapid change of the strongest emotions, therefore a dithyrambic poem, and שִׁגְיֹנוֹת dithyrambic rhythms, variously and violently mixed together. Thus Ewald and Rödiger understand it, and thus even Tarnov, Geier, and other old expositors who translate it *cantio erratica*. What we therefore look for is that this Psalm shall consist, as Ainsworth expresses it (1627), "of sundry variable and wandering verses", that it shall wander through the most diverse rhythms as in a state of intoxication — an expectation which is in fact realized. The musical accompaniment also had its part in the general effect produced. Moreover, the contents of the Psalm corresponds to this poetic musical style. It is the most solemn pathos of exalted self-consciousness which is expressed in it. And in common with Hab. iii. it gives expression to the joy which arises from zealous anger against the enemies of God and from the contemplation of their speedy overthrow. Painful unrest, defiant self-confidence, triumphant ecstacy, calm trust, prophetic certainty — all these states of mind find expression in the irregular arrangement of the strophes of this Davidic dithyramb, the ancient customary Psalm for the feast of Purim (*Sofrim* xviii. § 2).

Vers. 2—3. With this word of faith, love, and hope בְּךָ חָסִיתִי (as in cxli. 8), this holy *captatio benevolentiæ*, David also begins in xi. 1, xvi. 1, xxxi. 2, cf. lxxi. 1. The *perf.* is inchoative: in Thee have I taken my refuge, equivalent to: in Thee do I trust. The transition from the multitude of his persecutors to the *sing.* in ver. 3 is explained most naturally, as one looks at the inscription, thus: that of the many the one who is just at the time the worst of all comes prominently before his mind. The verb טָרַף from the primary signification *carpere* (which corresponds still more exactly to חרף) means both to tear off and to tear in pieces (whence טְרֵפָה that which is torn in pieces); and פָּרַק from its primary signification *frangere* means both to break loose and to break in pieces, therefore to liberate, *e. g.* in cxxxvi. 24. and to

break in small pieces, 1 Kings xix. 11. The persecutors are conceived of as wild animals, as lions which rend their prey and craunch its bones. Thus blood-thirsty are they for his soul, *i. e.* his life. After the painful unrest of this first strophe, the second begins the tone of defiant self-consciousness.

Vers. 4—6. According to the inscription זֹאת points to the substance of those slanderous sayings of the Benjamite. With אִם־יֵשׁ־עָוֶל בְּכַפָּי one may compare David's words to Saul אֵין בְּיָדִי רָעָה 1 Sam. xxiv. 12, xxvi. 18; and from this comparison one will at once see in a small compass the difference between poetical and prose expression. שִׁלְמִי (Targ. לְבָעֵל שִׁלְמִי) is the name he gives (with reference to Saul) to him who stands on a peaceful, friendly footing with him, cf. the adject. שָׁלוֹם, lv. 21, and אִישׁ שְׁלוֹם, xli. 10. The verb גָּמַל, cogn. גָּמַר, signifies originally to finish, complete, (root גם, גם, cf. כִּימָה to be or to make full, to gather into a heap). One says גָּמַל טוֹב and גָּמַל רָע, and also without a material object גָּמַל עָלַי or גְּמָלַנִי *benefecit* or *malefecit mihi*. But we join גָּמַלְתִּי with רָע according to the Targum and contrary to the accentuation, and not with שִׁלְמִי (Olsh., Böttch., Hitz.), although שָׁלֵם beside מְשַׁלֵּם, as *e. g.* הֹבֵר beside מָרַבֵּר might mean "requiting". The poet would then have written: אִם שִׁלַּמְתִּי גְּמָלִי רָע *i. e.* if I have retaliated upon him that hath done evil to me. In ver. 5 we do not render it according the meaning of חָלַץ which is usual elsewhere: but rather I rescued . . . (Louis de Dieu, Ewald § 345, *a*, and Hupfeld). Why cannot חָלַץ in accordance with its primary signification *expedire, exuere* (according to which even the signification of rescuing, taken exactly, does not proceed from the idea of drawing out, but of making loose, *exuere vinclis*) signify here *exuere* = *spoliare,* as it does in Aramaic? And how extremely appropriate it is as an allusion to the incident in the cave, when David did not rescue Saul, but, without indeed designing to take חֲלִיצָה, *exuviæ,* cut off the hem of his garment! As Hengstenberg observes, "He affirms his innocence in the most general terms, thereby shewing that his conduct towards Saul was not anything exceptional, but sprang from his whole disposition and mode of action". On the 1 *pers. fut. conv.* with *ah, vid.* on iii. 6. רִיקָם belongs to צָרַרְתִּי, like xxv. 3, lxix. 5.

In the apodosis, ver. 6, the *fut. Kal* of רָדַף is made into three syllables, in a way altogether without example, since, by first making the *Shebâ* audible, from יִרְדֹּף it is become יִרְדֹף (like יִצְחָק Gen. xxi. 6, תְּהַלֵּךְ Ps. lxxiii. 9, Ex. ix. 23, שְׁמֵעָה xxxix. 13), and this is then sharpened by an euphonic *Dag. forte.** Other ways of explaining it, as that by Chajug = יתרדף, or by Kimchi as a mixed form from *Kal* and *Piel*,** have been already refuted by Baer, *Thorath Emeth,* p. 33. This dactylic jussive form of *Kal* is followed by the regular jussives of *Hiph.* יַשֵּׂג and יַשְׁבֵּן. The rhythm is similar so that in the primary passage Ex. xv. 9, which also finds its echo in Ps. xviii. 38, — viz. iambic with anapæsts inspersed. By its parallelism with נַפְשִׁי and חַיַּי, כְּבוֹדִי acquires the signification "my soul", as Saadia, Gecatilia and Aben-Ezra have rendered it — a signification which is secured to it by xvi. 9, xxx. 13, lvii. 9, cviii. 2, Gen. xlix. 6. Man's soul is his *doxa*, and this it is as being the copy of the divine *doxa* (*Bibl. Psychol.* S. 98, [tr.p. 119], and frequently). Moreover, "let him lay in the dust" is at least quite as favourable to this sense of כבודי as to the sense of personal and official dignity (iii. 4, iv. 3). To lay down in the dust is equivalent to: to lay in the dust of death, xxii. 16. שְׁכְנֵי עָפָר, Isa. xxvi. 19, are the dead. According to the biblical conception the soul is capable of being killed (Num. xxxv. 11), and mortal (Num. xxiii. 10). It binds spirit and body together and this bond is cut asunder by death. David will submit willingly to death in case he has ever acted dishonourably.

Here the music is to strike up, in order to give intensity to the expression of this courageous confession. In the next strophe his affirmation of innocence rises to a challenging appeal to the judgment-seat of God and a prophetic certainty that that judgment is near at hand.

---

* The *Dag.* is of the same kind as the *Dag.* in גְּמַלִּים among nouns; Arabic popular dialect *farassi* (my horse), *vid.* Wetzstein's *Inschriften* S. 366.

** Pinsker's view, that the pointing יִרְדֹּף is designed to leave the reader at liberty to choose between the reading יִרְדֹּף and יִרְדֹף, cannot be supported. There are no safe examples for the supposition that the variations of tradition found expression in this way.

Vers. 7—9. In the consciousness of his own innocence he calls upon Jahve to sit in judgment and to do justice to His own. His vision widens and extends from the enemies immediately around to the whole world in its hostility towards Jahve and His anointed one. In the very same way special judgments and the judgment of the world are portrayed side by side, as it were on one canvas, in the prophets. The truth of this combination lies in the fact of the final judgment being only the finale of that judgment which is in constant execution in the world itself. The language here takes the highest and most majestic flight conceivable. By קוּמָה (*Milra*, as in iii. 8), which is one of David's words of prayer that he has taken from the lips of Moses (ix. 20, x. 12), he calls upon Jahve to interpose. The parallel is הִנָּשֵׂא lift Thyself up, shew Thyself in Thy majesty, xciv. 2, Isa. xxxiii. 10. The anger, in which He is to arise, is the principle of His judicial righteousness. With this His anger He is to gird Himself (lxxvi. 11) against the ragings of the oppressors of God's anointed one, *i. e.* taking vengeance on their many and manifold manifestations of hostility. עֲבְרוֹת is a shorter form of the construct (instead of עֶבְרוֹת Job xl. 11, cf. xxi. 31) of עֶבְרָה which describes the anger as running over, breaking forth from within and passing over into words and deeds (cf. Arab. فشّ used of water: it overflows the dam, of wrath: it breaks forth). It is contrary to the usage of the language to make מִשְׁפָּט the object to עוּרָה in opposition to the accents, and it is unnatural to regard it as the accus. of direction = לְמִשְׁפָּט (xxxv. 23), as Hitzig does. The accents rightly unite עוּרָה אֵלַי: awake (stir thyself) for me *i. e.* to help me (אֵלַי like לְקָרְאָתִי, lix. 5). The view, that צִוִּיתָ is then precative and equivalent to צַוֵּה: command judgment, is one that cannot be established according to syntax either here, or in lxxi. 3. It ought at least to have been וְצִוִּיתָ with *Waw consec.* On the other hand the relative rendering: Thou who hast ordered judgment (Maurer, Hengst.), is admissible, but unnecessary. We take it by itself in a confirmatory sense, not as a circumstantial clause: having commanded judgment (Ewald), but as a co-ordinate clause: Thou hast indeed enjoined the maintaining of right (Hupfeld).

The psalmist now, so to speak, arranges the judgment scene: the assembly of the nations is to form a circle round about Jahve, in the midst of which He will sit in judgment, and after the judgment He is to soar away (Gen. xvii. 22) aloft over it and return to the heights of heaven like a victor after the battle (see lxviii. 19). Although it strikes one as strange that the termination of the judgment itself is not definitely expressed, yet the rendering of Hupfeld and others: sit Thou again upon Thy heavenly judgment-seat to judge, is to be rejected on account of the שׁוּבָה (cf. on the other hand xxi. 14) which is not suited to it; שׁוּב לַמָּרוֹם can only mean Jahve's return to His rest after the execution of judgment. That which vers. 7 and 8 in the boldness of faith desire, the beginning of ver. 9 expresses as a prophetic hope, from which proceeds the prayer, that the Judge of the earth may also do justice to him (שָׁפְטֵנִי *vindica me,* as in xxvi. 1, xxxv. 24) according to his righteousness and the purity of which he is conscious, as dwelling in him. עָלַי is to be closely connected with תֻּמִּי, just as one says נַפְשִׁי עָלַי (*Psychol.* S. 152 [tr. p. 180]). That which the individual as ego, distinguishes from itself as being in it, as subject, it denotes by עָלַי. In explaining it elliptically: "come upon me" (Ew., Olsh., Hupf.) this psychologically intelligible usage of the language is not recognised. On תֹּם *vid.* on xxv. 21, xxvi. 1.

Vers. 10—11. In this strophe we hear the calm language of courageous trust, to which the rising and calmly subsiding cæsural schema is particularly adapted. He is now concerned about the cessation of evil: Oh let it come to an end (גָּמַר intransitive as in xii. 2, lxxvii. 9). . . His prayer is therefore not directed against the individuals as such but against the wickedness that is in them. This Psalm is the key to all Psalms which contain prayers against one's enemies. Just in the same manner וּתְכוֹנֵן is intended to express a wish; it is one of the comparatively rare voluntatives of the 2 *pers.* (Ew. § 229): and mayst Thou be pleased to establish. . . . To the termination of evil which is desired corresponds, in a positive form of expression, the desired security and establishment of the righteous, whom it had injured and whose continuance was endangered by it. וּכְוֹנֵן is the

beginning of a circumstantial clause, introduced by ו, but without the personal pronoun, which is not unfrequently omitted both in the leading participial clause, as in Isa. xxix. 8 (which see), and in the minor participial clause as here (cf. lv. 20): *cum sis* = *quoniam es*. The reins are the seat of the emotions, just as the heart is the seat of the thoughts and feelings. Reins and heart lie naked before God — a description of the only καρδιογνώστης, which is repeated in Jer. xi. 20, xx. 12, Apoc. ii. 23. In the thesis the adjective is used with אֱלֹהִים in the *sing.* as in lxxviii. 56, cf. lviii. 12. God is the righteous God, and by his knowledge of the inmost part He is fully capable of always shewing Himself both righteous in anger and righteous in mercy according to the requirements and necessity of the case. Therefore David can courageously add מָגִנִּי עַל־אֱלֹהִים, my shield doth God carry; לְ (lxxxix. 19) would signify: He has it, it (my shield) belongs to Him, עַל (1 Chron. xviii. 7) signifies: He bears it, or if one takes shield in the sense of protection: He has taken my protection upon Himself, has undertaken it (as in lxii. 8, cf. Judges xix. 20), as He is in general the Saviour of all who are devoted to Him with an upright heart, *i. e.* a heart sincere, guileless (cf. xxxii. with ver. 2). יְשָׁרֵי־לֵב is intentionally repeated at the end of the first two lines — the favourite palindrome, found more especially in Isa. xl.—lxvi. And to the mixed character of this Psalm belongs the fact of its being both Elohimic and Jehovic. From the calm language of heartfelt trust in God the next strophe passes over into the language of earnest warning, which is again more excited and somewhat after the style of didactic poetry.

Vers. 12—14. If God will in the end let His wrath break forth, He will not do it without having previously given threatenings thereof every day, viz. to the ungodly, cf. Isa. lxvi. 14, Mal. i. 4. He makes these feel His עֶבְרָה beforehand in order to strike a wholesome terror into them. The subject of the conditional clause אִם־לֹא יָשׁוּב is any ungodly person whatever; and the subject of the principal clause, as its continuation in ver. 14 shews, is God. If a man (any one) does not repent, then Jahve will whet His sword (cf. Deut. xxxii. 41). This sense of the words accords with the connec-

tion; whereas with the rendering: "forsooth He (Elohim) will again whet His sword" (Böttch., Ew., Hupf.) יָשׁוּב, which would moreover stand close by יִלְטוֹשׁ (cf. *e. g.* Gen. xxx. 31), is meaningless; and the אִם־לֹא of asseveration is devoid of purpose. Judgment is being gradually prepared, as the *fut.* implies; but, as the *perff.* imply, it is also on the other hand like a bow that is already strung against the sinner with the arrow pointed towards him, so that it can be executed at any moment. כּוֹנֵן of the making ready, and הֵכִין of the aiming, are used alternately. לוֹ, referring to the sinner, stands first by way of emphasis as in Gen. xlix. 10, 1 Sam. ii. 3, and is equivalent to אֵלָיו, Ezek. iv. 3. "Burning" arrows are fire-arrows (זִקִּים, זִיקוֹת, *malleoli*); and God's fire-arrows are the lightnings sent forth by Him, xviii. 15, Zech. ix. 14. The *fut.* יִפְעָל denotes the simultaneous charging of the arrows aimed at the sinner, with the fire of His wrath. The case illustrated by Cush is generalised: by the sword and arrow the manifold energy of the divine anger is symbolised, and it is only the divine forbearance that prevents it from immediately breaking forth. The conception is not coarsely material, but the vividness of the idea of itself suggests the form of its embodiment.

Vers. 15—18. This closing strophe foretells to the enemy of God, as if dictated by the judge, what awaits him; and concludes with a prospect of thanksgiving and praise. Man brings forth what he has conceived, he reaps what he has sown. Starting from this primary passage, we find the punishment which sin brings with it frequently represented under these figures of הֵרָה and יָלַד (חִיל, חָבַל, הוֹלִיד), and זָרַע and קָצַר, and first of all in Job xv. 35. The act, guilt, and punishment of sin appear in general as notions that run into one another. David sees in the sin of his enemies their self-destruction. It is singular, that travail is first spoken of, and then only afterwards pregnancy. For חָבַל signifies, as in Cant. viii. 5, ὠδίνειν, not: to conceive (Hitz.). The Arab. *ḥabila* (synonym of *ḥamala*) is not to conceive in distinction from being pregnant, but it is both: to be and to become pregnant. The accentuation indicates the correct relationship of the three members of the sentence. First of all comes

the general statement: Behold he shall travail with, *i. e.* bring forth with writhing as in the pains of labour, אָוֶן, evil, as the result which proceeds from his wickedness. Then, by this thought being divided into its two factors (Hupf.) it goes on to say: that is, he shall conceive *(concipere)* עָמַל, and bear שֶׁקֶר. The former signifies trouble, *molestia*, just as πονηρία signifies that which makes πόνον; the latter falsehood, viz. self-deception, delusion, vanity, inasmuch as the burden prepared for others, returns as a heavy and oppressive burden upon the sinner himself, as is said in ver. 17; cf. Isa. lix. 4, where אָוֶן instead of שֶׁקֶר denotes the accursed wages of sin which consist in the unmasking of its nothingness, and in the undeceiving of its self-delusion. He diggeth a pit for himself, is another turn of the same thought, lvii, 7, Eccl. x. 8. Ver. 16*a* mentions the digging, and 16*b* the subsequent falling into the pit; the aorist וַיִּפֹּל is, for instance, like ver. 13*b*, xvi. 9, xxix. 10. The attributive יִפְעָל is virtually a genitive to שַׁחַת, and is rightly taken by Ges. § 123, 3, *a* as present: in the midst of the execution of the work of destruction prepared for others it becomes his own. The trouble, עָמָל, prepared for others returns upon his own head (בְּרֹאשׁוֹ, clinging to it, just as עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ signifies descending and resting upon it), and the violence, חָמָס, done to others, being turned back by the Judge who dwells above (Mic. i. 12), descends upon his own pate (קָדְקָדוֹ with *ŏ* by *q*, as *e. g.* in Gen. ii. 23). Thus is the righteousness of God revealed in wrath upon the oppressor and in mercy upon him who is innocently oppressed. Then will the rescued one, then will David, give thanks unto Jahve, as is due to Him after the revelation of His righteousness, and will sing of the name of Jahve the Most High (עֶלְיוֹן as an appended name of God is always used without the *art., e. g.,* lvii. 3). In the revelation of Himself He has made Himself a name. He has, however, revealed Himself as the almighty Judge and Deliverer, as the God of salvation, who rules over everything that takes place here below. It is this name, which He has made by His acts, that David will then echo back to Him in his song of thanksgiving.

PSALM VIII.

THE PRAISE OF THE CREATOR'S GLORY SUNG BY THE STARRY HEAVENS TO PUNY MAN.

2 JAHVE, our Lord,
How excellent is Thy name in all the earth,
Who hast covered the heavens with Thy glory!
3 Out of the mouth of children and sucklings hast Thou founded a power,
Because of Thine adversaries,
To still the enemy and the revengeful.
4 When I see Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers,
The moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained:
5 What is mortal man, that Thou art mindful of him,
And the son of man that Thou carest for him!
6 And hast made him a little less than divine,
And crowned him with glory and honour.
7 Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands,
Thou hast put all things under his feet:
8 Sheep and oxen all together,
And also the beasts of the field,
9 The fowls of heaven and the fishes of the sea,
Whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea.
10 Jahve, our Lord,
How excellent is Thy name in all the earth!

Ps. vii. closed with a similar prospect of his enemies being undeceived by the execution of the divine judgments to Ps. vi. The former is the pendant or companion to the latter, and enters into detail, illustrating it by examples. Now if at the same time we call to mind the fact, that Ps. vi., if it be not a morning hymn, at any rate looks back upon sleepless nights of weeping, then the idea of the arrangement becomes at once clear, when we find a hymn of the night following Ps. vi. with its pendant, Ps. vii. David composes even at night; Jahve's song, as a Korahite psalmist says of himself in xlii. 9, was his companionship even in the loneli-

ness of the night. The omission of any reference to the sun in ver. 4 shews that Ps. viii. is a hymn of this kind composed in the night, or at least one in which the writer transfers himself in thought to the night season. The poet has the starry heavens before him, he begins with the glorious revelation of Jahve's power on earth and in the heavens, and then pauses at man, comparatively puny man, to whom Jahve condescends in love and whom He has made lord over His creation. This Psalm, like Ps. civ. and others, is a lyric echo of the Mosaic account of the creation. Ewald calls it a flash of lightning cast into the darkness of the creation.

Even Hitzig acknowledges David's authorship here; whereas Hupfeld is silent, and Olshausen says that nothing can be said about it. The idea, that David composed it when a shepherd boy on the plains of Judah, is rightly rejected again by Hitzig after he has been at the pains to support it. (This thought is pleasingly worked out by Nachtigal, *Psalmen gesungen vor David's Thronbesteigung,* 1797, after the opinion of E. G. von Bengel, *cum magna veri specie.*) For, just as the Gospels do not contain any discourses of our Lord belonging to the time prior to His baptism, and just as the New Testament canon does not contain any writings of the Apostles from the time prior to Pentecost, so the Old Testament canon contains no Psalms of David belonging to the time prior to his anointing. It is only from that time, when he is the anointed one of the God of Jacob, that he becomes the sweet singer of Israel, on whose tongue is the word of Jahve, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1 sq.

The inscription runs: *To the Precentor, on the Gittith, a Psalm of David.* The Targum translates it *super cithara, quam David de Gath attulit.* According to which it is a Philistine cithern, just as there was (according to Athenæus and Pollux) a peculiar Phœnician and Carian flute played at the festivals of Adonis, called γίγγρας, and also an Egyptian flute and a Doric lyre. All the Psalms bearing the inscription עַל־הַגִּתִּית (viii. lxxxi. lxxxiv.) are of a laudatory character. The gittith was, therefore, an instrument giving forth a joyous sound, or (what better accords with its occurring exclusively in the inscriptions of the Psalms), a joyous me-

lody, perhaps a march of the Gittite guard, 2 Sam. xv. 18 (Hitzig).

Kurtz makes this Psalm into four tetrastichic strophes, by taking ver. 2 *a b* and ver. 10 by themselves as the opening and close of the hymn, and putting ver. 2 *c* (Thou whose majesty . . .) to the first strophe. But אֲשֶׁר is not rightly adapted to begin a strophe; the poet, we think, would in this case have written אתה אשר תנה הודו.

Vers. 2—3. Here, for the first time, the subject speaking in the Psalm is not one individual, but a number of persons; and who should they be but the church of Jahve, which (as in Neh. x. 30) can call Jahve its Lord (אֲדֹנֵינוּ, like אֲדֹנִי, from אֲדֹנִים *plur. excellentiæ*, Ges. § 108, 2); but knowing also at the same time that what it has become by grace it is called to be for the good of the whole earth? The שֵׁם of God is the impress (cognate Arabic *wasm,* a sign, Greek σῆμα) of His nature, which we see in His works of creation and His acts of salvation, a nature which can only be known from this visible and comprehensible representation *(nomen = gnomen).** This name of God is certainly not yet so known and praised everywhere, as the church to which it has been made known by a positive revelation can know and praise it; but, nevertheless, it, viz. the divine name uttered in creation and its works, by which God has made Himself known and capable of being recognised and named, is אַדִּיר *amplum et gloriosum*, everywhere through out the earth, even if it were entirely without any echo. The clause with אֲשֶׁר must not be rendered: Who, do Thou be pleased to put Thy glory upon the heavens (Gesenius even: *quam tuam magnificentiam pone in cœlis*), for such a use of the *imperat.* after אשר is unheard of; and, moreover, although it is true a thought admissible in its connection with the redemptive history (lvii. 6, 12) is thus obtained, it is here, however, one that runs counter to the fundamental tone, and to the circumstances, of the Psalm. For the primary thought of the Psalm is this, that

* cf. Oehler's art. *Name* in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie.*

the God, whose glory the heavens reflect, has also glorified Himself in the earth and in man; and the situation of the poet is this, that he has the moon and stars before his eyes: how then could he wish that heaven to be made glorious whose glory is shining into his eyes! It is just as impracticable to take תְּנָה as a contraction of נָתְנָה, like תֵּתַּ 2 Sam. xxii. 41, = נָתַתָּה, as Ammonius and others, and last of all Böhl, have done, or with Thenius (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1860 S. 712 f.) to read it so at once. For even if the thought: "which (the earth) gives (announces) Thy glory all over the heavens" is not contrary to the connection, and if נָתַן עֹז, lxviii. 34, and נָתַן כָּבוֹד, Jer. xiii. 16, can be compared with this נָתַן הוֹד, still the phrase נָתַן הוֹד עַל means nothing but to lay majesty on any one, to clothe him with it, Num. xxvii. 20, 1 Chron. xxix. 25, Dan. xi. 21, cf. Ps. xxi. 6; and this is just the thought one looks for, viz., that the name of the God, who has put His glory upon the heavens (cxlviii. 13) is also glorious here below. We must, therefore, take תְּנָה, although it is always the form of the *imper.* elsewhere, as *infin.*, just as רְדָה occurs once in Gen. xlvi. 3 as *infin.* (like the Arab. *rĭda* a giving to drink, *lĭda* a bringing forth — forms to which לֶדֶת and the like in Hebrew certainly more exactly correspond). תְּנָה הוֹדְךָ signifies the setting of Thy glory (prop. τὸ τιθέναι τὴν δόξαν σου) just like דֵּעָה אֶת־יְ the the knowledge of Jahve, and Obad. ver. 5, שִׂים קִנֶּךָ, probably the setting of thy nest, Ges. § 133. 1. It may be interpreted: O Thou whose laying of Thy glory is upon the heavens, *i. e.* Thou who hast chosen this as the place on which Thou hast laid Thy glory (Hengst.). In accordance with this Jerome translates it: *qui posuisti gloriam tuam super cœlos.* Thus also the Syriac version with the Targum: *d^{e}jabt* (דיהבת) *shubhoch ʿal sh^{e}majo,* and Symmachus: ὃς ἔταξας τὸν ἔπαινόν σου ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν. This use of the *nomen verbale* and the genitival relation of אֲשֶׁר to תְּנָה הוֹדְךָ, which is taken as one notion, is still remarkable. Hitzig considers that no reasonable man would think and write thus; but thereby at the same time utterly condemns his own conjecture הַן הַהוֹדְךָ (whose extending of glory over the heavens). This, moreover, goes beyond the limits of the language, which is

only acquainted with תַּן as the name of an animal. All difficulty would vanish if one might, with Hupfeld, read נָתַתָּה. But תנה has not the slightest appearance of being a corruption of נתתה. It might be more readily supposed that תָּנָה is an erroneous pointing for תָּנָה (to stretch or extend, cf. Hos. viii. 10 to stretch forth, distribute): Thou whose glory stretches over the heavens, — an interpretation which is more probable than that it is, with Paulus and Kurtz, to be read תְּנָה: Thou whose glory is praised (*pass.* of the תְּנָה in Judges v. 11, xi. 40, which belongs to the dialect of Northern Palestine), instead of which one would more readily expect יִתְנֶה. The verbal notion, which is tacitly implied in cxiii. 4, cxlviii. 13, would then be expressed here. But perhaps the author wrote תְּנָה הוֹדְךָ instead of נָתַתָּ הוֹדְךָ, because he wishes to describe the setting out of the heavens with divine splendour* as being constantly repeated and not as done once for all.

There now follows, in ver. 3, the confirmation of ver. 2 *a*: also all over the earth, despite its distance from the heavens above, Jahve's name is glorious; for even children, yea even sucklings glorify him there, and in fact not mutely and passively by their mere existence, but with their mouth. עוֹלֵל (= מְעוֹלֵל) or עוֹלָל is a child that is more mature and capable of spontaneous action, from עוֹלַל (*Poel* of עָלַל *ludere*),** according to 1 Sam. xxii. 19, xv. 3, distinct from יוֹנֵק, *i. e.* a suckling, not, however, *infans,* but, — since the Hebrew

---

* In the first Sidonian inscription אַדִּיר occurs as a by-name of the heavens (שחם אדרם).

** According to this derivation עולל (cf. Beduin עאלול, *'âlûl* a young ox) is related to תֵּעָלּוּל; whereas עוּל as a synonym of יונק signifies one who is supported, sustained. For the radical signification of עול according to the Arabic عال *fut. o.* is "to weigh heavy, to be heavy, to lie upon; to have anything incumbent upon one's self, to carry, support, preserve", whence *'ajjil* the maintained child of the house, and *'ajjila* (Damascene *'êla*) he who is dependent upon one for support and the family depending upon the paterfamilias for sustenance. Neither عال *fut. o.*, nor غال *fut. i.* usually applied to a pregnant woman who still suckles, has the direct signification to suckle. Moreover, the demon *Ghul* does not receive its name from swallowing up or sucking out (Ges.), but from destroying (غال *fut. o.*)

women were accustomed to suckle their children for a long period, — a little child which is able to lisp and speak (*vid.* 2 Macc. vii. 27). Out of the mouth of beings such as these Jahve has founded for Himself עֹז. The LXX. translates it the utterance of praise, αἶνον; and עֹז certainly sometimes has the meaning of power ascribed to God in praise, and so a laudatory acknowledgment of His might; but this is only when connected with verbs of giving, xxix. 1, lxviii. 35, xcvi. 7. In itself, when standing alone, it cannot mean this. It is in this passage: might, or victorious power, which God creates for Himself out of the mouths of children that confess Him. This offensive and defensive power, as Luther has observed on this passage, is conceived of as a strong building, עֹז as מָעוֹז (Jer. xvi. 19) *i. e.* a fortress, refuge, bulwark, fortification, for the foundation of which He has taken the mouth, *i. e.* the stammering of children; and this He has done because of His enemies, to restrain (הַשְׁבִּית to cause any one to sit or lie down, rest, to put him to silence, *e. g.* Isa. xvi. 10, Ezek. vii. 24) such as are enraged against Him and His, and are inspired with a thirst for vengeance which expresses itself in curses (the same combination is found in xliv. 17). Those meant, are the fierce and calumniating opponents of revelation. Jahve has placed the mouth of children in opposition to these, as a strong defensive controversive power. He has chosen that which is foolish and weak in the eyes of the world to put to shame the wise and that which is strong (1 Cor. i. 27). It is by obscure and naturally feeble instruments that He makes His name glorious here below, and overcomes whatsoever is opposed to this glorifying.

Vers. 4—6. Stier wrongly translates: For I shall behold. The principal thought towards which the rest tends is ver. 5 (parallel are vers. 2*a*, 3), and consequently ver. 4 is the protasis (par., ver. 2*b*), and כִּי accordingly is = *quum, quando,* in the sense of *quoties*. As often as he gazes at the heavens which bear upon themselves the name of God in characters of light (wherefore he says שָׁמֶיךָ), the heavens with their boundless spaces (an idea which lies in the *plur.* שָׁמַיִם) extending beyond the reach of mortal eye, the moon (יָרֵחַ, dialectic ורח, perhaps, as Maurer derives it, from יָרַח = יָרַק *subflavum*

esse), and beyond this the innumerable stars which are lost in infinite space (כּוֹכָבִים = כַּבְכָּבִים prop. round, ball-shaped, spherical bodies) to which Jahvè appointed their fixed place on the vault of heaven which He has formed with all the skill of His creative wisdom (כּוּן to place and set up, in the sense of existence and duration): so often does the thought "what is mortal man....?" increase in power and intensity. The most natural thought would be: frail, puny man is as nothing before all this; but this thought is passed over in order to celebrate, with grateful emotion and astonished adoration, the divine love which appears in all the more glorious light, — a love which condescends to poor man, the dust of earth. Even if אֱנוֹשׁ does not come from אָנַשׁ to be fragile, nevertheless, according to the usage of the language, it describes man from the side of his impotence, frailty, and mortality (*vid.* ciii. 15, Isa. li. 12, and on Gen. iv. 26). בֶּן־אָדָם, also, is not without a similar collateral reference. With retrospective reference to עוֹלְלִים וְיוֹנְקִים, בֶּן־אָדָם is equivalent to יְלוּד־אִשָּׁה in Job xiv. 1: man, who is not, like the stars, God's directly creative work, but comes into being through human agency, born of woman. From both designations it follows that it is the existing generation of man that is spoken of. Man, as we see him in ourselves and others, this weak and dependent being is, nevertheless, not forgotten by God, God remembers him and looks about after him (פָּקַד of observing attentively, especially visitation, and with the *accus.* it is generally used of lovingly provident visitation, *e. g.* Jer. xv. 15). He does not leave him to himself, but enters into personal intercourse with him, he is the special and favoured object whither His eye turns (cf. cxliv. 3, and the parody of the tempted one in Job vii. 17 sq.)

It is not until ver. 6 that the writer glances back at creation. וַתְּחַסְּרֵהוּ (differing from the *fut. consec.* Job vii. 18) describes that which happened formerly. חָסַר מִן signifies to cause to be short of, wanting in something, to deprive any one of something (cf. Eccl. iv. 8). מִן is here neither comparative *(paullo inferiorem eum fecisti Deo),* nor negative *(paullum derogasti ei, ne esset Deus),* but partitive *(paullum*

derogasti ei divinæ naturæ); and, without אֱלֹהִים being on that account an abstract plural, *paullum Deorum,* = *Dei* (*vid. Genesis* S. 66 sq.), is equivalent to *paullum numinis Deorum.* According to Gen. i. 27 man is created בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים, he is a being in the image of God, and, therefore, nearly a divine being. But when God says: "let us make man in our image after our likeness", He there connects Himself with the angels. The translation of the LXX. ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους, with which the Targum and the prevailing Jewish interpretations also harmonize, is, therefore, not unwarranted. Because in the biblical mode of conception the angels are so closely connected with God as the nearest creaturely effulgence of His nature, it is really possible that in מֵאֱלֹהִים David may have thought of God including the angels. Since man is in the image of God, he is at the same time in the likeness of an angel, and since he is only a little less than divine, he is also only a little less than angelic. The position, somewhat exalted above the angels, which he occupies by being the bond between all created things, in so far as mind and matter are united in him, is here left out of consideration. The writer has only this one thing in his mind, that man is inferior to God, who is רוּחַ, and to the angels who are רוּחוֹת (Isa. xxxi. 3, Heb. i. 14) in this respect, that he is a material being, and on this very account a finite and mortal being; as Theodoret well and briefly observes: τῷ θνητῷ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἠλάττωται. This is the מְעַט in which whatever is wanting to him to make him a divine being is concentrated. But it is nothing more than מְעַט. The assertion in ver. 6*a* refers to the fact of the nature of man being in the image of God, and especially to the spirit breathed into him from God; ver. 6*b*, to his godlike position as ruler in accordance with this his participation in the divine nature: *honore ac decore coronasti eum.* כָּבוֹד is the manifestation of glory described from the side of its weightiness and fulness; הוֹד (cf. הֵד, הֵידַד) from the side of its far resounding announcement of itself (*vid.* on Job xxxix. 20); הָדָר from the side of its brilliancy, majesty, and beauty. הוֹד וְהָדָר, xcvi. 6, or also הָדַר כְּבוֹד הוֹד ה׳, cxlv. 5, is the appellation of the divine *doxa*, with the image of

which man is adorned as with a regal crown. The preceding *fut. consec.* also stamps תְּעַטְּרֵהוּ and תַּמְשִׁילֵהוּ as historical retrospects. The next strophe unfolds the regal glory of man: he is the lord of all things, the lord of all earthly creatures.

Vers. 7—9. Man is a king, and not a king without territory; the world around, with the works of creative wisdom which fill it, is his kingdom. The words "put under his feet" sound like a paraphrase of the רָדָה in Gen. i. 26, 28. כֹּל is unlimited, as in Job xiii. 1, xlii. 2, Isa. xliv. 24. But the expansion of the expression in vers. 8, 9 extends only to the earth, and is limited even there to the different classes of creatures in the regions of land, air, and water. The poet is enthusiastic in his survey of this province of man's dominion. And his lofty poetic language corresponds to this enthusiasm. The enumeration begins with the domestic animals and passes on from these to the wild beasts — together the creatures that dwell on *terra firma*. צֹנָה (צנא Num. xxxii. 24) from צָנָה (צָנָא) ضنى (ضنًا), as also ضأن *fut. o., proliferum esse* is, in poetry, equivalent to צאן, which is otherwise the usual name for small cattle. אֲלָפִים (in Aramaic, as the name of the letter shews, a prose word) is in Hebrew poetically equivalent to בָּקָר; the oxen which willingly accommodate themselves to the service of man, especially of the husbandman, are so called from אָלַף to yield to. Wild animals, which in prose are called חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ, (הַשָּׂדֶה) here bear the poetical name שְׁדֵי בְהֵמוֹת, as in Joel ii. 22, cf. i. 20, 1 Sam. xvii. 44. שְׁדֵי (in pause שָׁדַי) is the primitive form of שָׂדֶה, which is not declined, and has thereby obtained a collective signification. From the land animals the description passes on to the fowls of the air and the fishes of the water. צִפּוֹר is the softer word, instead of עוֹף; and שָׁמַיִם is used without the *art.* according to poetical usage, whereas הַיָּם without the *art.* would have sounded too scanty and not sufficiently measured. In connection with יַמִּים the article may be again omitted, just as with שָׁמַיִם. עֹבֵר is a collective participle. If the following were intended: he (or: since he), viz. man, passes through the paths of the sea

(Böttcher, Cassel, and even Aben-Ezra and Kimchi), then it would not have been expressed in such a monostich, and in a form so liable to lead one astray. The words may be a comprehensive designation of that portion of the animal kingdom which is found in the sea; and this also intended to include all from the smallest worm to the gigantic leviathan: ὁππόσα ποντοπόρους παρεπιστείβουσι κελεύθους (Apollinaris). If man thus rules over every living thing that is round about him from the nearest to the most remote, even that which is apparently the most untameable: then it is clear that every lifeless created thing in his vicinity must serve him as its king. The poet regards man in the light of the purpose for which he was created.

Ver. 10. He has now demonstrated what he expressed in ver. 2, that the name of Jahve whose glory is reflected by the heavens, is also glorious on earth. Thus, then, he can as a conclusion repeat the thought with which he began, in a wider and more comprehensive meaning, and weave his Psalm together, as it were, into a wreath.

It is just this Psalm, of which one would have least expected it, that is frequently quoted in the New Testament and applied to the Messiah. Indeed Jesus' designation of Himself by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, however far it may refer back to the Old Testament Scriptures, leans no less upon this Psalm than upon Dan. vii. 13. The use the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch. ii. 6—8) makes of vers. 5—7 of this Psalm shews us how the New Testament application to the Messiah is effected. The psalmist regards man as one who glorifies God and as a prince created of God. The deformation of this position by sin he leaves unheeded. But both sides of the mode of regarding it are warranted. On the one hand, we see that which man has become by creation still in operation even in his present state; on the other hand, we see it distorted and stunted. If we compare what the Psalm says with this shady side of the reality, from which side it is incongruous with the end of man's creation, then the song which treats of the man of the present becomes a prophecy of the man of the future. The

Psalm undergoes this metamorphosis in the New Testament consciousness, which looks more to the loss than to that which remains of the original. In fact, the centre of the New Testament consciousness is Jesus the Restorer of that which is lost. The dominion of the world lost to fallen man, and only retained by him in a ruined condition, is allotted to mankind, when redeemed by Him, in fuller and more perfect reality. This dominion is not yet in the actual possession of mankind, but in the person of Jesus it now sits enthroned at the right hand of God. In Him the idea of humanity is transcendently realised, *i. e.* according to a very much higher standard than that laid down when the world was founded. He has entered into the state — only a little (βραχύ τι) beneath the angels — of created humanity for a little while (βραχύ τι), in order to raise redeemed humanity above the angels. Everything (כֹּל) is really put under Him with just as little limitation as is expressed in this Psalm: not merely the animal kindom, not merely the world itself, but the universe with all the ruling powers in it, whether they be in subjection or in hostility to God, yea even the power of death (1 Cor. xv. 27, cf. Ephes. i. 22). Moreover, by redemption, more than heretofore, the confession which comes from the mouth of little children is become a bulwark founded of God, in order that against it the resistance of the opponents of revelation may be broken. We have an example of this in Mat. xxi. 16, where our Lord points the pharisees and scribes, who are enraged at the Hosanna of the children, to Ps. viii. 3. Redemption demands of man, before everything else, that he should become as a little child, and reveals its mysteries to infants, which are hidden from the wise and intelligent. Thus, therefore, it is μικροὶ καὶ νήπιοι, whose tongue is loosed by the Spirit of God, who are to put to shame the unbelieving; and all that this Psalm says of the man of the present becomes in the light of the New Testament in its relation to the history of redemption, a prophecy of the Son of man κατ' ἐξοχήν, and of the new humanity.

PSALM IX.

HYMN TO THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGE AFTER A DEFEAT OF HOSTILE PEOPLES.

2 א I WILL give thanks to Jahve with my whole heart,
א I will recount all Thy marvellous works —
3 א I will be glad and rejoice in Thee,
א I will sing praise to Thy name, O Most High!

4 ב When mine enemies turned back,
When they fell and perished before Thine angry face.
5 For Thou hast maintained my right and my cause,
Thou hast sat down on the throne, a righteous Judge.

6 ג Thou didst rebuke peoples, Thou didst destroy the wicked,
Their name didst Thou blot out for ever and ever.
7 ד The enemy are perished, perpetual ruins;
And cities hast Thou rooted out, effaced is their very memory.

8 ו But Jahve sits enthroned for ever,
He hath set His throne for judgment.
9 And He shall judge the earth in righteousness,
He shall minister judgment to the nations in uprightness.

10 ו So will Jahve be a stronghold to the oppressed,
A stronghold in times of trouble;
11 Thus shall they trust in Thee who know Thy name,
Because Thou hast not forsaken them who ask after Thee, Jahve!

12 ז Sing praises to Jahve, who dwelleth in Zion,
Declare among the peoples His deeds;
13 That the Avenger of blood hath remembered them,
He hath not forgotten the cry of the sufferer.

14 ח "Have mercy upon me, O Jahve; behold mine affliction from them that hate me,
"My lifter-up from the gates of death,

15 "That I may tell all Thy praise,
"That in the gates of the daughter of Zion I may rejoice in Thy salvation!"

16 ט The peoples have sunk down in the pit they have made,
In the net, that they hid, were their own feet taken.
17 Jahve hath made Himself known: He hath executed judgment,
Snaring the wicked in the work of his own hands.
(Stringed Instruments, Sela.)

18 י Yea back to Hades must the wicked return,
All the heathen, that forget God.
19 For the poor shall not always be forgotten,
The hope of the afflicted is (not) perished for ever.

20 ק Arise, Jahve, let not mortal man be defiant,
Let the heathen be judged in Thy sight!
21 Put them in fear, O Jahve,
Let the heathen know they are mortals! *(Sela)*.

Just as Ps. vii. is placed after Ps. vi. as exemplifying it, so Ps. ix. follows Ps. viii. as an illustration of the glorifying of the divine name on earth. And what a beautiful idea it is that Ps. viii., the Psalm which celebrates Jahve's name as being glorious in the earth, is introduced between a Psalm that closes with the words "I will sing of the name of Jahve, the Most High" (vii. 18) and one which begins: "I will sing of Thy name, O Most High!" (ix. 3).

The LXX. translates the inscription עַל־מוּת לַבֵּן by ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ (Vulg. *pro occultis filii*) as though it were עַל־עֲלֻמוֹת. Luther's rendering is still bolder: of beautiful (perhaps properly: lily-white) youth. Both renderings are opposed to the text, in which עַל occurs only once. The Targum understands בן of the duellist Goliath (= אִישׁ הַבְּנַיִם); and some of the Rabbis regard לבן even as a transposition of נבל: on the death of Nabal. Hengstenberg has revived this view, regarding נבל as a collective designation of all Nabal-like fools. All these and other curious conceits arise from the erroneous idea that these words are an inscription

referring to the contents of the Psalm. But, on the contrary, they indicate the tune or melody, and that by means of the familiar words of the song, — perhaps some popular song, — with which this air had become most intimately associated. At the end of Ps. xlviii. this indication of the air is simply expressed by עַל־מוּת. The view of the Jewish expositors, who refer לַבֵּן to the musician בֵּן mentioned in 1 Chron. xv. 18, has, therefore, some probability in its favour. But this name excites critical suspicion. Why may not a well-known song have begun מוּת לַבֵּן "dying (is) to the son" . . ., or (if one is inclined to depart from the pointing, although there is nothing to render this suspicious) מָוֶת לְבֵן "Death makes white"?

Even Hitzig does not allow himself to be misled as to the ancient Davidic origin of Ps. ix. and x. by the fact of their having an alphabetical arrangement. These two Psalms have the honour of being ranked among the thirteen Psalms which are acknowledged by him to be genuine Davidic Psalms. Thus, therefore, the alphabetical arrangement found in other Psalms cannot, in itself, bring us down to "the times of poetic trifling and degenerated taste." Nor can the freedom, with which the alphabetical arrangement is handled in Ps. ix. and x. be regarded as an indication of an earlier antiquity than these times. For the Old Testament poets, even in other instances, do not allow themselves to be fettered by forms of this character (*vid.* on Ps. cxlv., cf. on xlii. 2); and the fact, that in Ps. ix. x. the alphabetical arrangement is not fully carried out, is accounted for otherwise than by the license in which David, in distinction from later poets, indulged. In reality this pair of Psalms shews, that even David was given to acrostic composition. And why should he not be? Even among the Romans, Ennius (Cicero, *De Divin.* ii. 54 § 111), who belongs not to the leaden, but to the iron age, out of which the golden age first developed itself, composed in acrostics. And our oldest Germanic epics are clothed in the garb of alliteration, which Vilmar calls the most characteristic and most elevated style that the poetic spirit of our nation has created. Moreover, the alphabetical form is adapted to the common people,

as is evident from Augustine's *Retract.* i. 20. It is not a paltry substitute for the departed poetic spirit, not merely an accessory to please the eye, an outward embellishment — it is in itself indicative of mental power. The didactic poet regards the array of the linguistic elements as the steps by which he leads his pupils up into the sanctuary of wisdom, or as the many-celled casket in which he stores the pearls of the teachings of his wisdom. The lyric writer regards it as the keys on which he strikes every note, in order to give the fullest expression to his feelings. Even the prophet does not disdain to allow the order of the letters to exert an influence over the course of his thoughts, as we see from Nah. i. 3—7.* Therefore, when among the nine** alphabetical Psalms (ix. x. xxv. xxxiv. xxxvii. cxi. cxii. cxix. cxlv.) four bear the inscription לדוד (ix. xxv. xxxiv. cxlv.), we shall not at once regard them as non-Davidic just because they indicate an alphabetical plan which is more or less fully carried out.

This is not the place to speak of the relation of the anonymous Ps. x. to Ps. ix., since Ps. ix. is not in any way wanting in internal roundness and finish. It is thoroughly hymnic. The idea that ver. 14 passes from thanksgiving into supplication rests on a misinterpretation, as we shall presently see. This Psalm is a thoroughly national song of thanksgiving for victory by David, belonging to the time when Jahve was already enthroned on Zion, and therefore, to the time after the ark was brought home. Was it composed after the triumphant termination of the Syro-Ammonitish war? — The judgment of extermination already executed, ix. 8 sq., harmonises with what is recorded in 2 Sam. xii. 31; and the גוים, who are actually living within the borders of Israel, appear to be Philistines according to the annalistic passage about the Philistine feuds, 2 Sam. xxi. 15 sqq., cf. viii. 1 in connection with 1 Sam. xiii. 6.

---

* This observation is due to Pastor Frohnmeyer of Würtemberg.

** The *Psalterium Brunonis* (ed. by Cochleus, 1533) overlooks Ps. ix. x., reckoning only seven alphabetical Psalms.

Vers. 2—3. In this first strophe of the Psalm, which is laid out in tetrastichs, — the normative strophe, — the alphabetical form is carried out in the fullest possible way: we have four lines, each of which begins with א. It is the prelude of the song. The poet rouses himself up to a joyful utterance of Jahve's praise. With his whole heart (cxxxviii. 1), *i. e.* all his powers of mind and soul as centred in his heart taking part in the act, will he thankfully andintelligently confess God, and declare His wondrous acts which exceed human desire and comprehension (xxvi. 7); he will rejoice and be glad in Jahve, as the ground of his rejoicing and as the sphere of his joy; and with voice and with harp he will sing of the name of the Most High. עֶלְיוֹן is not an attributive of the name of God (Hitz.: Thine exalted name), but, as it is everywhere from Gen. xiv. 18—22 onward (*e. g.* xcvii. 9), an attributive name of God. As an attributive to שִׁמְךָ one would expect to find הָעֶלְיוֹן.

Vers. 4—5. The call upon himself to thanksgiving sounds forth, and the ב-strophe continues it by expressing the ground of it. The preposition בְּ in this instance expresses both the time and the reason together (as in lxxvi. 10, 2 Chron. xxviii. 6); in Latin it is *recedentibus hostibus meis retro*. אָחוֹר serves to strengthen the notion of being driven back, as in lvi. 10, cf. xliv. 11; and just as, in Latin, verbs compounded of *re* are strengthened by *retro*. In ver. 4*b* finite verbs take the place of the infinitive construct; here we have *futt.* with a present signification, just as in 2 Chron. xvi. 7 we find a *præt.* intended as perfect. For the rendering which Hitzig adopts: When mine enemies retreat backwards, they stumble . . . is opposed both by the absence of any syntactic indication in ver. 4*b* of an apodosis (cf. xxvii. 2); and also by the fact that יִכָּשְׁלוּ is well adapted to be a continuation of the description of שׁוּב אָחוֹר (cf. John xviii. 6), but is tame as a principal clause to the definitive clause בשוב אויבי אחור. Moreover, אָחוֹר does not signify backwards (which would rather be אֲחֹרַנִּית [Gen. ix. 23, 1 Sam. iv. 18]), but back, or into the rear. The מִן of מִפָּנֶיךָ is the מִן of the cause, whence the action proceeds. What is intended is God's angry countenance, the look of which sets his enemies on fire as

if they were fuel (xxi. 10), in antithesis to God's countenance as beaming with the light of His love. Now, while this is taking place, and because of its taking place, will he sing praise to God. From ver. 2 we see that the Psalm is composed directly after the victory and while the destructive consequences of it to the vanquished are still in operation. David sees in it all an act of Jahve's judicial power. To execute any one's right, מִשְׁפָּט (Mic. vii. 9), to bring to an issue any one's suit or lawful demand, דִּין (cxl. 13), is equivalent to: to assist him and his good cause in securing their right. The phrases are also used in a judicial sense without the suffix. The genitive object after these principal words never denotes the person against whom, but the person on whose behalf, the third party steps forward with his judicial authority. Jahve has seated Himself upon His judgment-seat as a judge of righteousness (as in Jer. xi. 20), *i. e.* as a judge whose judicial mode of procedure is righteousness, justice,* and has decided in his favour. In יָשַׁב לְ (as in cxxxii. 11), which is distinguished in this respect from יָשַׁב עַל (xlvii. 9), the idea of motion, *considĕre*, comes prominently forward.

Vers. 6—7. The strophe with ג, which is perhaps intended to represent ד and ה as well, continues the confirmation of the cause for thanksgiving laid down in ver. 4. He does not celebrate the judicial act of God on his behalf, which he has just experienced, alone, but in connection with, and, as it were, as the sum of many others which have preceded it. If this is the case, then in ver. 6 beside the Ammonites one may at the same time (with Hengstenb.) think of the Amalekites (1 Sam. viii. 12), who had been threatened since the time of Moses with a "blotting out of their remembrance" (Ex. xvii. 14, Deut. xxv. 19, cf. Num. xxiv. 20). The divine threatening is the word of omnipotence which detroys in distinction from the word of omnipotence that

---

* Also Prov. viii. 16 is probably to be read כָּל־שֹׁרְטֵי צֶדֶק, with Norzi, according to the Targum, Syriac version, and old Codices; at any rate this is an old various reading, and one in accordance with the sense, side by side with כל־שׁפטי ארץ.

creates. רָשָׁע in close connection with גּוֹיִם is individualising, cf. ver. 18 with vers. 16, 17. וָעֶד is a sharpened pausal form for וָעַד, the *Pathach* going into a *Segol* (פתח קטן); perhaps it is in order to avoid the threefold *a*-sound in לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד (Nägelsbach § 8 *extr.*). In ver. 7 הָאוֹיֵב (with *Azla legarme*) appears to be a vocative. In that case נַתַּשְׁתָּ ought also to be addressed to the enemy. But if it be interpreted: "Thou hast destroyed thine own cities, their memorial is perished", destroyed, viz. at the challenge of Israel, then the thought is forced; and if we render it: "the cities, which thou hast destroyed, perished is the remembrance of them", *i. e.* one no longer thinks of thine acts of conquest, then we have a thought that is in itself awkward and one that finds no support in any of the numerous parallels which speak of a blotting out and leaving no trace behind. But, moreover, in both these interpretations the fact that זִכְרָם is strengthened by הֵמָּה is lost sight of, and the twofold masculine זִכְרָם הֵמָּה is referred to עָרִים (which is carelessly done by most expositors), whereas עִיר, with but few exceptions, is feminine; consequently זכרם המה, so far as this is not absolutely impossible, must be referred to the enemies themselves (cf. xxxiv. 17, cix. 15). האויב might more readily be *nom. absol.*: "the enemy — it is at end for ever with his destructions", but חָרְבָה never has an active but always only a neuter signification; or: "the enemy — ruins are finished for ever", but the signification to be destroyed is more natural for תָּמַם than to be completed, when it is used of *ruinæ*. Moreover, in connection with both these renderings the retrospective pronoun (חָרְבֹתָיו) is wanting, and this is also the case with the reading חָרְבוֹת (LXX., Vulg., Syr.), which leaves it uncertain whose swords are meant. But why may we not rather connect האויב at once with תַּמּוּ as subject? In other instances תַּמּוּ is also joined to a singular collective subject, *e. g.* Isa. xvi. 4; here it precedes, like הָאָרֵב in Judg. xx. 37. חָרְבוֹת לָנֶצַח is a nominative of the product, corresponding to the factitive object with verbs of making: the enemies are destroyed as ruins for ever, *i. e.* so that they are become ruins; or, more in accordance with the accentuation: the enemy, destroyed as ruins are they for ever. With respect to what follows the accen-

tuation also contains hints worthy of our attention. It does not take נָתַשְׁתָּ (with the regular *Pathach* by *Athnach* after *Olewejored, vid.* on ii. 7) as a relative clause, and consequently does not require זכרם המה to be referred back to ערים.

We interpret the passage thus: and cities (viz. such as were hostile) thou hast destroyed (נָתַשׁ *evellere, exstirpare*), perished is their (the enemies') memorial. Thus it also now becomes intelligible, why זִכְרָם, according to the rule Ges. § 121, 3, is so remarkably strengthened by the addition of הֵמָּה (cf. Num. xiv. 32, 1 Sam. xx. 42, Prov. xxii. 19, xxiii. 15, Ezek. xxxiv. 11). Hupfeld, whose interpretation is exactly the same as ours, thinks it might perhaps be the enemies themselves and the cities set over against one another. But the contrast follows in ver. 8: their, even their memorial is perished, while on the contrary Jahve endures for ever and is enthroned as judge. This contrast also retrospectively gives support to the explanation, that זכרם refers not to the cities, but to האויב as a collective. With this interpretation of ver. 7 we have no occasion to read זִכְרָם מֵהֵמָּה (Targ.), nor זִכֹר מֵהֵמָּה (Paul., Hitz.). The latter is strongly commended by Job xi. 20, cf. Jer. x. 2; but still it is not quite admissible, since זֵכֶר here is not subjective (their own remembrance) but objective (remembrance of them). But may not עָרִים perhaps here, as in cxxxix. 20, mean zealots = adversaries (from עִיר *fervere, zelare*)? We reply in the negative, because the Psalm bears neither an Aramaising nor a North Palestinian impress. Even in connection with this meaning, the harshness of the ערים without any suffix would still remain. But, that the cities that are, as it were, plucked up by the root are cities of the enemy, is evident from the context.

Vers. 8—9. Without a trace even of the remembrance of them the enemies are destroyed, while on the other hand Jahve endureth for ever. This strophe is the continuation of the preceding with the most intimate connection of contrast (just as the ב-strophe expresses the ground for what is said in the preceding strophe). The verb יֵשֵׁב has not the general signification "to remain" here (like עָמַד to endure), but just the same meaning as in xxix. 10. Everything that is opposed to Him comes to a terrible end, whereas He sits,

or (which the *fut.* implies) abides, enthroned for ever, and that as Judge: He hath prepared His throne for the purpose of judgment. This same God, who has just given proof that He lives and reigns, will by and bye judge the nations still more comprehensively, strictly, and impartially. תֵּבֵל, a word exclusively poetic and always without the article, signifies first (in distinction from אֶרֶץ the body of the earth and אֲדָמָה the covering or soil of the earth) the fertile (from יָבֵל) surface of the globe, the οἰκουμένη. It is the last Judgment, of which all preceding judgments are harbingers and pledges, that is intended. In later Psalms this Davidic utterance concerning the future is repeated.

Vers. 10—11. Thus judging the nations Jahve shews Himself to be, as a second ו-strophe says, the refuge and help of His own. The voluntative with *Waw* of sequence expresses that which the poet desires for his own sake and for the sake of the result mentioned in ver. 11. מִשְׂגָּב, a high, steep place, where one is removed from danger, is a figure familiar to David from the experiences of his time of persecution. דַּךְ (in pause דָּךְ) is properly one who is crushed (from דְּכָךְ = דָּכָא, דָּכָה to crush, break in pieces, דָּקַק to pulverize), therefore one who is overwhelmed to the extreme, even to being completely crushed. The parallel is לְעִתּוֹת בַּצָּרָה with the dativ al לְ (as probably also in x. 1). עִתִּים from עֵת (time, and then both continuance, lxxxi. 16, and condition) signifies the public relations of the time, or even the vicissitudes of private life, xxxi. 16; and בַּצָּרָה is not הַצָּרָה with בְּ (Böttch.), which gives an expression that is meaninglessly minute ("for times in the need"), but one word, formed from בָּצַר (to cut off, Arab. to see, prop. to discern keenly), just like בַּקָּשָׁה from בָּקַשׁ, prop. a cutting off, or being cut off, *i. e.* either restraint, especially motionlessness (= בַּצֶּרֶת, Jer. xvii. 8, *plur.* בַּצָּרוֹת Jer. xiv. 1), or distress, in which the prospect of deliverance is cut off. Since God is a final refuge for such circumstances of hopelessness in life, *i. e.* for those who are in such circumstances, the confidence of His people is strengthened, refreshed, and quickened. They who know His name, to them He has now revealed its character fully, and that by His acts; and they who inquire after Him, or

trouble and concern themselves about Him (this is what דָּרַשׁ signifies in distinction from בִּקֵּשׁ), have now experienced that He also does not forget them, but makes Himself known to them in the fulness of His power and mercy.

Vers. 12—13. Thus then the ז-strophe summons to the praise of this God who has done, and will still do, such things. The summons contains a moral claim, and therefore applies to all, and to each one individually. Jahve, who is to be praised everywhere and by every one, is called יֹשֵׁב צִיּוֹן, which does not mean: He who sits enthroned in Zion, but He who inhabiteth Zion, Ges. § 138, 1. Such is the name by which He is called since the time when His earthly throne, the ark, was fixed on the castle hill of Jerusalem, lxxvi. 3. It is the epithet applied to Him during the period of the typical kingship of promise. That Jahve's salvation shall be proclaimed from Zion to all the world, even outside Israel, for their salvation, is, as we see here and elsewhere, an idea which throbs with life even in the Davidic Psalms; later prophecy beholds its realisation in its wider connections with the history of the future. That which shall be proclaimed to the nations is called עֲלִילוֹתָיו, a designation which the *magnalia Dei* have obtained in the Psalms and the prophets since the time of Hannah's song, 1 Sam. ii. 3 (from עֲלָלָה, root עלל, to come over or upon anything, to influence a person or a thing, as it were, from above, to subject them to one's energy, to act upon them).

With כִּי, *quod*, in ver. 13, the subject of the proclamation of salvation is unfolded as to its substance. The *præt.* state that which is really past; for that which God has done is the assumption that forms the basis of the discourse in praise of God on account of His mighty acts. They consist in avenging and rescuing His persecuted church, — persecuted even to martyrdom. The אוֹתָם, standing by way of emphasis before its verb, refers to those who are mentioned afterwards (cf. ver. 21): the *Chethîb* calls them עֲנִיִּים, the *Kerî* עֲנָוִים. Both words alternate elsewhere also, the *Kerî* at one time placing the latter, at another the former, in the place of the one that stands in the text. They are both referable to עָנָה to bend (to bring low, Isa. xxv. 5). The neuter signification

of the verb עָנָה = עָנַו, عنا *fut. o.*, underlies the noun עָנָו (cf. שָׁלוֹ), for which in Num. xii. 3 there is a *Kerî* עָנִיו with an incorrect *Jod* (like שָׁלֵיו Job xxi. 23). This is manifest from the substantive עֲנָוָה, which does not signify affliction, but passiveness, *i. e.* humility and gentleness; and the noun עָנִי is passive, and therefore does not, like עָנָו, signify one who is lowly-minded, in a state of עֲנָוָה, but one who is bowed down by afflictions, עָנִי. But because the twin virtues denoted by עֲנָוָה are acquired in the school of affliction, there comes to be connected with עָנִי — but only secondarily — the notion of that moral and spiritual condition which is aimed at by dispensations of affliction, and is joined with a suffering life, rather than with one of worldly happiness and prosperity, — a condition which, as Num. xii. 3 shews, is properly described by עָנָו (ταπεινός and πραΰς). It shall be proclaimed beyond Israel, even among the nations, that the Avenger of blood, דֹּרֵשׁ דָּמִים, thinks of them (His דְּרָשִׁים), and has been as earnest in His concern for them as they in theirs for Him. דָּמִים always signifies human blood that is shed by violence and unnaturally; the *plur.* is the plural of the product discussed by Dietrich, *Abhandl.* S. 40. דָּרַשׁ to demand back from any one that which he has destroyed, and therefore to demand a reckoning, indemnification, satisfaction for it, Gen. ix. 5, then absolutely to punish, 2 Chron. xxiv. 22.

Vers. 14—15. To take this strophe as a prayer of David at the present time, is to destroy the unity and hymnic character of the Psalm, since that which is here put in the form of prayer appears in what has preceded and in what follows as something he has experienced. The strophe represents to us how the עֲנָיִים (עֲנָוִים) cried to Jahve before the deliverance now experienced. Instead of the form חָנֵּנִי used everywhere else the resolved, and as it were tremulous, form חָנְנֵנִי is designedly chosen. According to a better attested reading it is חָנֵנִי (*Pathach* with *Gaja* in the first syllable), which is regarded by Chajug and others as the *imper. Piel*, but more correctly (Ewald § 251, *c*) as the *imper. Kal* from the intransitive imperative form חָנַן. מְרוֹמְמִי is the vocative, cf. xvii. 7. The gates of death, *i. e.* the gates of the realm

of the dead (שְׁאוֹל, Isa. xxxviii. 10), are in the deep; he who is in peril of death is said to have sunk down to them; he who is snatched from peril of death is lifted up, so that they do not swallow him up and close behind him. The church, already very near to the gates of death, cried to the God who can snatch from death. Its final purpose in connection with such deliverance is that it may glorify God. The form תְּהַלָּתֶיהָ is *sing.* with a plural suffix just like שְׂנֵאתֶיהָ Ezek. xxxv. 11, אֲשְׁמָתֵינוּ Ezra ix. 15. The punctuists maintained (as עֲצָתֶיהָ in Isa. xlvii. 13 shews) the possibility of a plural inflexion of a collective singular. In antithesis to the gates of death, which are represented as beneath the ground, we have the gates of the daughter of Zion standing on high. צִיּוֹן is *gen. appositionis* (Ges. § 116, 5). The daughter of Zion (Zion itself) is the church in its childlike, bride-like, and conjugal relation to Jahve. In the gates of the daughter of Zion is equivalent to: before all God's people, cxvi. 14. For the gates are the places of public resort and business. At this period the Old Testament mind knew nothing of the songs of praise of the redeemed in heaven. On the other side of the grave is the silence of death. If the church desires to praise God, it must continue in life and not die.

Vers. 16—17. And, as this ט-strophe says, the church is able to praise God; for it is rescued from death, and those who desired that death might overtake it, have fallen a prey to death themselves. Having interpreted the ח-strophe as the representation of the earlier צַעֲקַת עֲנִיִּים we have no need to supply *dicendo* or *dicturus*, as Seb. Schmidt does, before this strophe, but it continues the *prætt.* preceding the ח-strophe, which celebrate that which has just been experienced. The verb טָבַע (root טב, whence also טֶבֶל) signifies originally to press upon anything with anything flat, to be pressed into, then, as here and in lxix. 3, 15, to sink in. זוּ טָמְנוּ (pausal form in connection with *Mugrash*) in the parallel member of the verse corresponds to the attributive עָשׂוּ (cf. וְפָעַל, vii. 16). The union of the epicene זוּ with רֶשֶׁת by *Makkeph* proceeds from the view, that זוּ is demonstrative as in xii. 8: the net there (which they have hidden). The punctuation, it is true, recognises a relative זוּ, xvii. 9, lxviii. 29,

but it mostly takes it as demonstrative, inasmuch as it connects it closely with the preceding noun, either by *Makkeph* (xxxii. 8, lxii. 12, cxlii. 4, cxliii. 8) or by marking the noun with a conjunctive accent (x. 2, xxxi. 5, cxxxii. 12). The verb לָבַד (Arabic to hang on, adhere to, IV. to hold fast to) has the signification of seizing and catching in Hebrew.

In ver. 17 Ben Naphtali points נוֹדַע with *ā*: Jahve is known (*part. Niph.*); Ben Asher נוֹדַע, Jahve has made Himself known (3 *pers. præt. Niph.* in a reflexive signification, as in Ezek. xxxviii. 23). The readings of Ben Asher have become the *textus receptus*. That by which Jahve has made Himself known is stated immediately: He has executed judgment or right, by ensnaring the evil-doer (רָשָׁע, as in ver. 6) in his own craftily planned work designed for the destruction of Israel. Thus Gussetius has already interpreted it. נוֹקֵשׁ is *part. Kal* from נָקַשׁ. If it were *part. Niph.* from יָקֵשׁ the *ē*, which occurs elsewhere only in a few עי verbs, as נָמֵס *liquefactus*, would be without an example. But it is not to be translated, with Ges. and Hengst.: "the wicked is snared in the work of his own hands", in which case it would have to be pointed נוֹקַשׁ (3 *præt. Niph.*), as in the old versions. Jahve is the subject, and the suffix refers to the evil-doer. The thought is the same as in Job xxxiv. 11, Isa. i. 31. This figure of the net, רֶשֶׁת (from יָרַשׁ *capere*), is peculiar to the Psalms that are inscribed לְדָוִד. The music, and in fact, as the combination הגיון סלה indicates, the playing of the stringed instruments (xcii. 4), increases here; or the music is increased after a solo of the stringed instruments. The song here soars aloft to the climax of triumph.

Vers. 18—19. Just as in vers. 8 sqq. the prospect of a final universal judgment was opened up by Jahve's act of judgment experienced in the present, so here the grateful restrospect of what has just happened passes over into a confident contemplation of the future, which is thereby guaranteed. The LXX. translates יָשׁוּבוּ by ἀποστραφήτωσαν, Jer. *convertantur*, a meaning which it may have (cf. *e. g.* 2 Chron. xviii. 25); but why should it not be ἀναστραφήτωσαν, or rather: ἀναστραφήσονται, since ver. 19 shews that ver. 18 is not a wish but a prospect of that which is sure to come to pass? To

be resolved into dust again, to sink away into nothing (*redactio in pulverem, in nihilum*) is man's return to his original condition, — man who was formed from the dust, who was called into being out of nothing. To die is to return to the dust, civ. 29, cf. Gen. iii. 19, and here it is called the return to Sheôl, as in Job xxx. 23 to death, and in xc. 3 to atoms, inasmuch as the state of shadowy existence in Hades, the condition of worn out life, the state of decay is to a certain extent the renewal (*Repristination*) of that which man was before he came into being. As to outward form לִשְׁאוֹלָה may be compared with לִישֻׁעָתָה in lxxx. 3; the ל in both instances is that of the direction or aim, and might very well come before שְׁאוֹלָה, because this form of the word may signify both ἐν ᾅδου and εἰς ᾅδου (cf. מְכֻבָּלָה Jer. xxvii. 16). R. Abba ben Zabda, in *Genesis Rabba* cap. 50, explains the double sign of the direction as giving intensity to it: *in imum ambitum orci.* The heathen receive the epithet of שְׁכֵחֵי אֱלֹהִים (which is more neuter than שֹׁכְחֵי, l. 22); for God has not left them without a witness of Himself, that they could not know of Him, their alienation from God is a forgetfulness of Him, the guilt of which they have incurred themselves, and from which they are to turn to God (Isa. xix. 22). But because they do not do this, and even rise up in hostility against the nation and the God of the revelation that unfolds the plan of redemption, they will be obliged to return to the earth, and in fact to Hades, in order that the persecuted church may obtain its longed for peace and its promised dominion. Jahve will at last acknowledge this *ecclesia pressa*; and although its hope seems likely to perish, inasmuch as it remains again and again unfulfilled, nevertheless it will not always continue thus. The strongly accented לֹא rules both members of ver. 19, as in xxxv. 19, xxxviii. 2, and also frequently elsewhere (Ewald § 351, *a*). אֶבְיוֹן, from אָבָה to wish, is one eager to obtain anything = a needy person. The Arabic أَبِيّ, which means the very opposite, and according to which it would mean "one who restrains himself", viz. because he is obliged to, must be left out of consideration.

Vers. 20—21. By reason of the act of judgment already

witnessed the prayer now becomes all the more confident in respect of the state of things which is still continually threatened. From י the poet takes a leap to ק which, however, seems to be a substitute for the כ which one would expect to find, since the following Psalm begins with ל. David's קוּמָה (iii. 8, vii. 7) is taken from the lips of Moses, Num. x. 35. "Jahve arises, comes, appears" are kindred expressions in the Old Testament, all of which point to a final personal appearing of God to take part in human history from which He has now, as it were, retired into a state of repose becoming invisible to human eyes. Hupfeld and others wrongly translate "let not man become strong". The verb עָזַז does not only mean to be or become strong, but also to feel strong, powerful, possessed of power, and to act accordingly, therefore: to defy, lii. 9, like עַז defiant, impudent (post-biblical עַזּוּת shamelessness). אֱנוֹשׁ, as in 2 Chron. xiv. 10, is man, impotent in comparison with God, and frail in himself. The enemies of the church of God are not unfrequently designated by this name, which indicates the impotence of their pretended power (Isa. li. 7, 12). David prays that God may repress the arrogance of these defiant ones, by arising and manifesting Himself in all the greatness of His omnipotence, after His forbearance with them so long has seemed to them to be the result of impotence. He is to arise as the Judge of the world, judging the heathen, while they are compelled to appear before Him, and, as it were, defile before Him (עַל־פָּנֶיךָ), He is to lay מוֹרָה on them. If "razor" be the meaning it is equivocally expressed; and if, according to Isa. vii. 20, we associate with it the idea of an ignominious rasure, or of throat-cutting, it is a figure unworthy of the passage. The signification master (LXX., Syr., Vulg., and Luther) rests upon the reading מוֹרֶה, which we do not with Thenius and others prefer to the traditional reading (even Jerome translates: *pone, Domine, terrorem eis*); for מוֹרָה, which according to the Masora is instead of מוֹרָא (like מְכֻלָּה Hab. iii. 17 for מְכֻלָּא), is perfectly appropriate. Hitzig objects that fear is not a thing which one lays upon any one; but מורא means not merely fear, but an object, or as Hitzig himself explains it in Mal. ii. 5 a "lever", of fear. It is not meant

that God is to cause them to be overcome with terror (עַל), nor that He is to put terror into them (בְּ), but that He is to make them (לְ in no way differing from xxi. 4, cxl. 6, Job xiv. 13) an object of terror, from which to their dismay, as the wish is further expressed in ver. 21*b*, they shall come to know (Hos. ix. 7) that they are mortal men. As in x. 12, xlix. 12, l. 21, lxiv. 6, Gen. xii. 13, Job xxxv. 14, Amos v. 12, Hos. vii. 2, יֵדְעוּ is followed by an only half indirect speech, without כִּי or אֲשֶׁר. סֶלָה has *Dag. forte conj.* according to the rule of the אתי מרחיק (concerning which *vid.* on lii. 5), because it is erroneously regarded as an essential part of the text.

PSALM X.

PLAINTIVE AND SUPPLICATORY PRAYER UNDER THE PRESSURE OF HEATHENISH FOES AT HOME AND ABROAD.

1 ל WHY, Jahve, standest Thou afar off,
Why hidest Thou Thyself in times of trouble!?
2 Through the pride of the evil-doer the afflicted burneth with fear,
They are taken in the plots which they have devised.

3 For the evil-doer boasteth of his soul's desire,
And the covetous renounceth [and] despiseth Jahve.
4 The evil-doer in his scornfulness —: "With nothing will He punish!
There is no God!" is the sum of his thoughts.

5 Sure are his ways at all times;
Far above are Thy judgments, out of his sight;
All his adversaries, he puffeth at them.

6 He saith in his heart: with nothing shall I be moved,
From one generation to another I am he to whom no misfortune comes.
7 Of cursing is his mouth full, and of deceit and oppression,
Under his tongue is trouble and evil.

8 He sitteth in the lurking-places of the villages,
In the secret corners doth he slay the innocent;
His eyes, they lie in wait for the weak.

9 He lieth in wait in the secret corner as a lion in his lair,
He lieth in wait to carry off the afflicted,
He carrieth off the afflicted, drawing him away in his net.

10 He croucheth, he cowereth and there fall into his claws — the weak.

11 He saith in his heart: "God hath forgotten,
He hath hidden His face, He hath never seen."

12 ק Arise, Jahve; O God lift up Thine hand,
Forget not the sufferer!

13 Wherefore should the evil-doer blaspheme the Deity,
Saying in his heart: Thou dost not punish?!

14 ר Thou dost indeed see it; for Thou beholdest trouble and grief, to lay it in Thy hand;
The weak committeth himself to Thee,
Thou art the helper of the orphan.

15 ש Break Thou the arm of the evil-doer;
And the wicked man — punish his evil-doing, that it may vanish before Thee!

16 Jahve is King for ever and ever,
The heathen are perished out of His land.

17 ת The desire of the sufferers hast Thou heard, Jahve,
Thou didst establish their heart, didst cause Thine ear to hear,

18 To obtain justice for the orphan and the oppressed,
That man of the earth may no more terrify.

This Psalm and Ps. xxxiii. are the only ones that are anonymous in the First book of the Psalms. But Ps. x. has something peculiar about it. The LXX. gives it with Ps. ix. as one Psalm, and not without a certain amount of warrant

for so doing. Both are laid out in tetrastichs; only in the middle portion of Ps. x. some three line strophes are mixed with the four line. And assuming that the ק-strophe, with which Ps. ix. closes, stands in the place of a כ-strophe which one would look for after the י-strophe, then Ps. x., beginning with ל, continues the order of the letters. At any rate it begins in the middle of the alphabet, whereas Ps. ix. begins at the beginning. It is true the ל-strophe is then followed by strophes without the letters that come next in order; but their number exactly corresponds to the letters between ל and ק, ר, שׁ, ת with which the last four strophes of the Psalm begin, viz. six, corresponding to the letters מ, נ, ס, ע, פ, צ, which are not introduced acrostically. In addition to this it is to be remarked that Ps. ix. and x. are most intimately related to one another by the occurrence of rare expressions, as לָעֶתּוֹת בַּצָּרָה and דַּךְ; by the use of words in the same sense, as אֱנוֹשׁ and גּוֹיִם; by striking thoughts, as "Jahve doth not forget" and "Arise"; and by similarities of style, as the use of the *oratio directa* instead of *obliqua*, ix. 21, x. 13. And yet it is impossible that the two Psalms should be only one. Notwithstanding all their community of character they are also radically different. Ps. ix. is a thanksgiving Psalm, Ps. x. is a supplicatory Psalm. In the latter the personality of the psalmist, which is prominent in the former, keeps entirely in the background. The enemies whose defeat Ps. ix. celebrates with thanksgiving and towards whose final removal it looks forward are גּוֹיִם, therefore foreign foes; whereas in Ps. x. apostates and persecutors of his own nation stand in the foreground, and the גּוֹיִם are only mentioned in the last two strophes. In their form also the two Psalms differ insofar as Ps. x. has no musical mark defining its use, and the tetrastich strophe structure of Ps. ix., as we have already observed, it not carried out with the same consistency in Ps. x. And is anything really wanting to the perfect unity of Ps. ix.? If it is connected with Ps. x. and they are read together *uno tenore*, then the latter becomes a tail-piece which disfigures the whole. There are only two things possible: Ps. x. is a pendant to Ps. ix. composed either by David himself, or by some other poet, and

closely allied to it by its continuance of the alphabetical order. But the possibility of the latter becomes very slight when we consider that Ps. x. is not inferior to Ps. ix. in the antiquity of the language and the characteristic nature of the thoughts. Accordingly the mutual coincidences point to the same author, and the two Psalms must be regarded as "two co-ordinate halves of one whole, which make a higher unity" (Hitz.). That hard, dull, and tersely laconic language of deep-seated indignation at moral abominations for which the language has, as it were, no one word, we detect also elsewhere in some Psalms of David and of his time, those Psalms, which we are accustomed to designate as Psalms written in the indignant style (*in grollendem Stil*).

Vers. 1—2. The Psalm opens with the plaintive inquiry, why Jahve tarries in the deliverance of His oppressed people. It is not a complaining murmuring at the delay that is expressed by the question, but an ardent desire that God may not delay to act as it becomes His nature and His promise. לָמָּה, which belongs to both members of the sentence, has the accent on the *ultima*, as *e. g.* before עֲזַבְתָּנִי in xxii. 2, and before הֲרֵעֹתָה in Ex. v. 22, in order that neither of the two gutturals, pointed with *a*, should be lost to the ear in rapid speaking (*vid.* on iii. 8, and Luzzatto on Isa. xi. 2, נָחָה עָלָיו).* For according to the primitive pronunciation (even before the Masoretic) it is to be read: *lamáh Adonaj*; so that consequently ה and א are coincident. The poet asks why in the present hopeless condition of affairs (on בַּצָּרָה *vid.* on ix. 10) Jahve stands in the distance (בְּרָחוֹק, only here, instead of מֵרָחוֹק), as an idle spectator, and why does He cover (הַעְלִים

* According to the Masora לָמָּה without *Dag.* is always *Milra* with the single exception of Job vii. 20, and יָמָּה with *Dag.* is *Milel*; but, when the following closely connected word begins with one of the letters אהע it becomes *Milra*, with five exceptions, viz. xlix. 6, 1 Sam. xxviii. 15, 2 Sam, xiv. 31 (three instances in which the guttural of the second word has the vowel *i*), and 2 Sam. ii. 22, and Jer. xv. 18. In the Babylonian system of pointing, למה is always written without *Dag.* and with the accent on the penultimate, *vid.* Pinsker, *Einleitung in das Babylonisch-hebräische Punktationssystem*, S. 182—184.

with orthophonic *Dagesh*, in order that it may not be pronounced תְּעַלִּים), viz. His eyes, so as not to see the desperate condition of His people, or also His ears (Lam. iii. 56) so as not to hear their supplication. For by the insolent treatment of the ungodly the poor burns with fear (Ges., Stier, Hupf.), not vexation (Hengst.). The assault is a πύρωσις, 1 Pet. iv, 12. The verb דָּלַק which calls to mind דַּלֶּקֶת, πυρετός, is perhaps chosen with reference to the heat of feeling under oppression, which is the result of the persecution, of the דְּלֵק אֲחָרָיו (בּוֹ) of the ungodly. There is no harshness in the transition from the singular to the plural, because עָנִי and רָשָׁע are individualising designations of two different classes of men. The subject to יִתְפָּשׂוּ is the עֲנִיִּים, and the subject to חָשְׁבוּ is the רְשָׁעִים. The futures describe what usually takes place. Those who, apart from this, are afflicted are held ensnared in the crafty and malicious devices which the ungodly have contrived and plotted against them, without being able to disentangle themselves. The punctuation, which places *Tarcha* by זִמָּה, mistakes the relative and interprets it: "in the plots there, which they have devised".

Vers. 3—4. The prominent features of the situation are supported by a detailed description. The *prætt.* express those features of their character that have become a matter of actual experience. הִלֵּל, to praise aloud, generally with the *accus.*, is here used with עַל of the thing which calls forth praise. Far from hiding the shameful desire or passion (cxii. 10) of his soul, he makes it an object and ground of high and sounding praise, imagining himself to be above all restraint human or divine. Hupfeld translates wrongly: "and he blesses the plunderer, he blasphemes Jahve". But the רָשָׁע who persecutes the godly, is himself a בֹּצֵעַ, a covetous or rapacious person; for such is the designation (elsewhere with בֶּצַע Prov. i. 19, or בֶּצַע רַע Hab. ii. 9) not merely of one who "cuts off" (בִּצַּע), *i. e.* obtains unjust gain, by trading, but also by plunder, πλεονέκτης. The verb בֵּרַךְ (here in connection with *Mugrash,* as in Num. xxiii. 20 with *Tiphcha* בֵּרֵךְ) never directly signifies *maledicere* in biblical Hebrew as it does in the later Talmudic (whence בִּרְכַּת הַשֵּׁם blasphemy, *B. Sanhedrin* 56*a*, and frequently), but to take leave of any one with a benediction, and then to bid farewell, to dismiss,

to decline and abandon generally, Job i. 5, and frequently (cf. the word *remercier, abdanken;* and the phrase "*das Zeitliche segnen*" = to depart this life). The declaration without a conjunction is climactic, like Isa. i. 4, Amos iv. 5, Jer. xv. 7. נָאַץ, properly to prick, sting, is used of utter rejection by word and deed.* In ver. 4, "the evil-doer according to his haughtiness" (cf. Prov. xvi. 18) is *nom. absol.,* and בַּל־יִדְרֹשׁ אֵין אֱלֹהִים (contrary to the accentuation) is virtually the predicate to בָּל־מְזִמֹּתָיו. This word, which denotes the intrigues of the ungodly, in ver. 2, has in this verse, the general meaning: thoughts (from זמם, זָמַם, to join, combine), but not without being easily associated with the secondary idea of that which is subtly devised. The whole texture of his thoughts is, *i. e.* proceeds from and tends towards the thought, that he (viz. Jahve, whom he does not like to name) will punish with nothing (בַּל the strongest form of subjective negation), that in fact there is no God at all. This second follows from the first; for to deny the existence of a living, acting, all-punishing (in one word: a personal) God, is equivalent to denying the existence of any real and true God whatever (Ewald).

Ver. 5. This strophe, consisting of only three lines, describes his happiness which he allows nothing to disturb. The signification: to be lasting (prop. stiff, strong) is secured to the verb חִיל (whence חַיִל) by Job xx. 21. He takes whatever ways he choses, they always lead to the desired end; he stands fast, he neither stumbles nor goes astray, cf. Jer. xii. 1. The *Chethîb* דרכו (דְּרָכָו) has no other meaning than that given to it by the *Kerî* (cf. xxiv. 6, lviii. 8). Whatever might cast a cloud over his happiness does not trouble him: neither the judgments of God, which are removed high as the heavens out of his sight, and consequently do not disturb his conscience (cf. xxviii. 5, Isa. v. 12; and the opposite, xviii. 23), nor his adversaries whom he bloweth upon contemptuously. מָרוֹם is the predicate: *altissime remota.* And הָפִיחַ בְּ, to breathe upon, does not in any case signify:

Pasek stands between נאץ and יהוה, because to blaspheme God is a terrible thought and not to be spoken of without hesitancy, cf. the *Pasek* in lxxiv. 18, lxxxix. 52, Isa. xxxvii. 24 (2 Kings xix. 23).

actually to blow away or down (to express which נָשַׁב or נָשַׁף would be used), but either to "snub", or, what is more appropriate to ver. 5*b*, to blow upon them disdainfully, to puff at them, like הָפִיחַ in Mal. i. 13, and *flare rosas* (to despise the roses) in Prudentius. The meaning is not that he drives his enemies away without much difficulty, but that by his proud and haughty bearing he gives them to understand how little they interfere with him.

Vers. 6—7. Then in his boundless carnal security he gives free course to his wicked tongue. That which the believer can say by reason of his fellowship with God, בַּל־אֶמּוֹט (xxx. 7, xvi. 8), is said by him in godless self-confidence. He looks upon himself in age after age, *i. e.* in the endless future, as אֲשֶׁר לֹא בְרָע, *i. e.* as one who (אֲשֶׁר as in Isa. viii. 20) will never be in evil case (בְּרָע as in Ex. v. 19, 2 Sam. xvi. 8). It might perhaps also be interpreted according to Zech. viii. 20, 23 (*vid.* Köhler, *in loc.*): in all time to come (it will come to pass) that I am not in misfortune. But then the personal pronoun (אֲנִי or הוּא) ought not be omitted; whereas with our interpretation it is supplied from אֶמּוֹט, and there is no need to supply anything if the clause is taken as an apposition: in all time to come he who... In connection with such unbounded self-confidence his mouth is full of אָלָה, cursing, *execratio* (not perjury, *perjurium*, a meaning the word never has), מִרְמוֹת, deceit and craft of every kind, and תּוֹךְ, oppression, violence. And that which he has under his tongue, and consequently always in readiness for being put forth (cxl. 4, cf. lxvi. 17), is trouble for others, and in itself matured wickedness. Paul has made use of this ver. 7 in his contemplative description of the corruptness of mankind, Rom. iii. 14.

Ver. 8. The ungodly is described as a lier in wait; and one is reminded by it of such a state of anarchy, as that described in Hos. vi. 9 for instance. The picture fixes upon one simple feature in which the meanness of the ungodly culminates; and it is possible that it is intended to be taken as emblematical rather than literally. חָצֵר (from חָצַר to surround, cf. حظر, حصر, and especially حضر) is a farm premises walled in (Arab. *ḥaḍar, ḥaḍâr, ḥaḍâra*), then losing the special characteristic of being walled round it

comes to mean generally a settled abode (with a house of clay or stone) in opposition to a roaming life in tents (cf. Lev. xxv. 31, Gen. xxv. 16). In such a place where men are more sure of falling into his hands than in the open plain, he lies in wait (יָשַׁב, like ڤعد *subsedit = insidiatus est ei*), murders unobserved him who had never provoked his vengeance, and his eyes יִצְפְּנוּ לַחֲלָכָה. צָפָה to spie, xxxvii. 32, might have been used instead of צָפַן; but צָפַן also obtains the meaning, to lie in ambush (lvi. 7, Prov. i. 11, 18) from the primary notion of restraining one's self (ضفن *fut. i.* in Beduin Arabic: to keep still, to be immoveably lost in thought, *vid.* on Job xxiv. 1), which takes a transitive turn in צָפַן "to conceal". חֲלָכָה, the dative of the object, is pointed just as though it came from חֵיל: Thy host, *i. e.* Thy church, O Jahve. The pausal form accordingly is חֲלָכָה with *Segol*, in ver. 14, not with *Tsere* as in incorrect editions. And the appeal against this interpretation, which is found in the *plur.* חלכאים ver. 10, is set aside by the fact that this plural is taken as a double word: host (חֲל = חֵיל = חַיִל as in Obad. ver. 20) of the troubled ones (כָּאִים, not as Ben-Labrat supposes, for נָכְאִים, but from כָּאָה weary, and mellow and decayed), as the *Kerî* (which is followed by the Syriac version) and the Masora direct, and accordingly it is pointed חֲלָכָאִים with *Tsere*. The punctuation therefore sets aside a word which was unintelligible to it, and cannot be binding on us. There is a verb חָלַךְ, which, it is true, does not occur in the Old Testament, but in the Arabic, from the root حلك *firmus fuit, firmum fecit* (whence also حكل intrans. to be firm, *fermé*, *i. e.* closed), it gains the signification in reference to colour: to be dark (cognate with חָכַל, whence חַכְלִילִי) and is also transferred to the gloom and blackness of misfortune.* From this an abstract is formed חֶלֶךְ or חֹלֶךְ (like חֹפֶשׁ):

---

*Cf. Samachschari's *Golden Necklaces*, Proverb 67, which Fleischer translates: "Which is blacker: the plumage of the raven, which is black as coal, or thy life, O stranger among strangers?" The word "blacker" is here expressed by أَحْلَكُ, just as the verb حَلِكَ with its infinitives حَلَك or حُلْكَة and its derivatives is applied to sorrow and misery.

blackness, misfortune, or also of a defective development of the senses: imbecility; and from this an adjective חֶלְבָּה = חֶלְבִי, or also (cf. חָפְשִׁי, עֶלְפָּה Ezek. xxxi. 15 = one in a condition of languishing, עֶלֶף) חֶלְכָּה = חֶלְבִי, *plur.* חֶלְכָּאִים, after the form הוֹדָאִים, from הוֹדִי, Ew. § 189,*g*.

Ver. 9. The picture of the רָשָׁע, who is become as it were a beast of prey, is now worked out further. The *lustrum* of the lion is called סֻכָּה Jer. xxv. 38, or סֻבָּה Job xxxviii. 40: a thicket, from סָבַךְ, which means both to interweave and to plait over = to cover (without any connection with שֵׂךְ a thorn, Arab. *shôk*, a thistle). The figure of the lion is reversed in the second line, the עָנִי himself being compared to the beast of prey and the רָשָׁע to a hunter who drives him into the pit-fall and when he has fallen in hastens to drag him away (מָשַׁךְ, as in xxviii. 3, Job xxiv. 22) in, or by means of (Hos. xi. 4, Job xl. 25), his net, in which he has become entangled.

Vers. 10—11. The comparison to the lion is still in force here and the description recurs to its commencement in the second strophe, by tracing back the persecution of the ungodly to its final cause. Instead of the *Chethîb* ודכה (וְדָכָה *perf. consec.*), the *Keri* reads יְדֻכֶּה more in accordance with the Hebrew use of the tenses. Job xxxviii. 40 is the rule for the interpretation. The two futures depict the settled and familiar lying in wait of the plunderer. True, the *Kal* דָּכָה in the signification "to crouch down" finds no support elsewhere; but the Arab. *dakka* to make even (cf. دصّ *firmiter inhæsit loco,* of the crouching down of beasts of prey, of hunters, and of foes) and the Arab. *daǵǵa,* compared by Hitzig, to move stealthily along, to creep, and *duǵǵeh* a hunter's hiding-place exhibit synonymous significations. The ταπεινώσει αὐτόν of the LXX. is not far out of the way. And one can still discern in it the assumption that the text is to be read וְדָכֶה יִשַּׁח: and crushed he sinks (Aquila: ὁ δὲ λασθεὶς καμφθήσεται); but even דָּכָה is not found elsewhere, and if the poet meant that, why could he not have written נִדְכָּה? (cf. moreover Judges v. 27). If דָּכָה is taken in the sense of a position in which one is the least likely to be seen, then the first two verbs refer to the sculker, but the third according to the usual *schema* (as *e. g.* cxxiv. 5) is the

predicate to חֲלָכָאִים (חֲלָכָאִים) going before it. Crouching down as low as possible he lies on the watch, and the feeble and defenceless fall into his strong ones, עֲצוּמָיו, *i. e.* claws. Thus the ungodly slays the righteous, thinking within himself: God has forgotten, He has hidden His face, *i. e.* He does not concern Himself about these poor creatures and does not wish to know anything about them (the denial of the truth expressed in ix. 13, 19.); He has in fact never been one who sees, and never will be. These two thoughts are blended; בַּל with the *perf.* as in xxi. 3, and the addition of לָנֶצַח (cf. xciv. 7) denies the possibility of God seeing now any more than formerly, as being an absolute absurdity. The thought of a personal God would disturb the ungodly in his doings, he therefore prefers to deny His existence, and thinks: there is only fate and fate is blind, only an absolute and it has no eyes, only a notion and that cannot interfere in the affairs of men.

Vers. 12—13. The six strophes, in which the consecutive letters from מ to צ are wanting, are completed, and now the acrostic strophes begin again with ק. In contrast to those who have no God, or only a lifeless idol, the psalmist calls upon his God, the living God, to destroy the appearance that He is not an omniscient Being, by arising to action. We have more than one name of God used here; אֵל is a vocative just as in xvi. 1, lxxxiii, 2, cxxxix. 17, 23. He is to lift up His hand in order to help and to punish (נְשָׂא יָד, whence comes the *imperat.* נְשָׂא = שָׂא, cf. נָשָׂה iv. 7, like שָׁלַח יָד cxxxviii. 7 and נָטָה יָד Ex. vii. 5 elsewhere). Forget not is equivalent to: fulfil the לֹא שָׁכַח of ix. 13, put to shame the שָׁכַח אֵל of the ungodly, ver. 11! Our translation follows the *Kerî* עֲנָיִים. That which is complained of in vers. 3, 4 is put in the form of a question to God in ver. 13: wherefore (עַל־מָה, instead of which we find עַל־מָה in Num. xxii. 32, Jer. ix. 11, because the following words begin with letters of a different class) does it come to pass, *i. e.* is it permitted to come to pass? On the *perf.* in this interrogative clause *vid.* xi. 3. מַדּוּעַ inquires the cause, לָמָּה the aim, and עַל־מַה the motive, or in general the reason: on what ground, since God's holiness can suffer no injury to His honour?

On לֹא תִדְרֹשׁ with כִּי, the *oratio directa* instead of *obliqua*, *vid.* on ix. 21.

Ver. 14. Now comes the confirmation of his cry to God: It is with Him entirely different from what the ungodly imagine. They think that He will not punish; but He does see (cf. 2 Chron. xxiv. 22), and the psalmist knows and confesses it: רָאִתָה (defective = רָאִיתָה xxxv. 22), Thou hast seen and dost see what is done to Thine own, what is done to the innocent. This he supports by a conclusion *a genere ad speciem* thus: the trouble which is prepared for others, and the sorrow (כַּעַס, as in Eccl. vii. 3) which they cause them, does not escape the all-seeing eye of God, He notes it all, to give it into (lay it in) His hand. "To give anything into any one's hand" is equivalent to, into his power (1 Kings xx. 28, and frequently), or into any one's care (Gen. xxxii. 17, and frequently); but here God gives (lays) the things which are not to be administered, but requited, into His own hand. The expression is meant to be understood according to lvi. 9, cf. Isa. xlix. 16: He is observant of the afflictions of His saints, laying them up in His hand and preserving them there in order, in His own time, to restore them to His saints in joy, and to their enemies in punishment. Thus, therefore, the feeble and helpless (read חֶלְכָּה or חֶלְבָּה; according to the Masoretic text חֶלְכָּה Thy host, not חֶלְבָּה, which is contrary to the character of the form, as pausal form for חֶלְבָּה) can leave to Him, viz. all his burden (יָהֲבוֹ, lv. 23), everything that vexes and disquiets him. Jahve has been and will be the Helper of the fatherless. יָתוֹם stands prominent by way of emphasis, like אוֹתָם ix. 13, and Bakius rightly remarks *in voce pupilli synecdoche est, complectens omnes illos, qui humanis præsidiis destituuntur.*

Vers. 15—16. The desire for Jahve's interposition now rises again with fresh earnestness. It is a mistake to regard דָּרַשׁ and מָצָא as correlative notions. In the phrase to seek and not find, when used of that which has totally disappeared, we never have דָּרַשׁ, but always בָּקַשׁ, xxxvii. 36, Isa. xli. 12, Jer. l. 20, and frequently. The verb דָּרַשׁ signifies here exactly the same as in vers. 4, 13, and ix. 13: "and the wicked (*nom. absol.* as in ver. 4) — mayst Thou punish his

wickedness, mayst Thou find nothing more of it". It is not without a meaning that, instead of the form of expression usual elsewhere (xxxvii. 36, Job xx. 8), the address to Jahve is retained: that which is no longer visible to the eye of God, not merely of man, has absolutely vanished out of existence. This absolute conquest of evil is to be as surely looked for, as that Jahve's universal kingship, which has been an element of the creed of God's people ever since the call and redemption of Israel (Ex. xv. 18), cannot remain without being perfectly and visibly realised. His absolute and eternal kingship must at length be realised, even in all the universality and endless duration foretold in Zech. xiv. 9, Dan. vii. 14, Apoc. xi. 15. Losing himself in the contemplation of this kingship, and beholding the kingdom of God, the kingdom of good, as realised, the psalmist's vision stretches beyond the foes of the church at home to its foes in general; and, inasmuch as the heathen in Israel and the heathen world outside of Israel are blended together into one to his mind, he comprehends them all in the collective name of גּוֹיִם, and sees the land of Jahve (Lev. xxv. 23), the holy land, purified of all oppressors hostile to the church and its God. It is the same that is foretold by Isaiah (lii. 1), Nahum (ii. 1), and in other passages, which, by the anticipation of faith, here stands before the mind of the suppliant as an accomplished fact — viz. the consummation of the judgment, which has been celebrated in the hymnic half (Ps. ix.) of this double Psalm as a judgment already executed in part.

Vers. 17—18. Still standing on this eminence from which he seems to behold the end, the poet basks in the realisation of that which has been obtained in answer to prayer. The ardent longing of the meek and lowly sufferers for the arising, the *parusia* of Jahve (Isa. xxvi. 8), has now been heard by Him, and that under circumstances which find expression in the following *futt.*, which have a past signification: God has given and preserved to their hearts the right disposition towards Himself (הֵכִין, as in lxxviii. 8, Job xi, 13, Sir. ii. 17 ἑτοιμάζειν καρδίας, post-biblical כִּוֵּן* and to be

* *B. Berachoth* 31*a*: the man who prays must direct his heart steadfastly towards God (יְכַוֵּן לִבּוֹ לַשָּׁמַיִם).

understood according to 1 Sam. vii. 3, 2 Chron. xx. 33, cf. לֵב נָכוֹן li. 12, lxxviii. 37; it is equivalent to "the single eye" in the language of the New Testament), just as, on the other hand, He has set His ear in the attitude of close attention to their prayer, and even to their most secret sighings (הַקְשִׁיב with אָזֶן, as in Prov. ii. 2; to stiffen the ear, from קָשַׁב, قَسُبَ, root קש to be hard, rigid, firm, from which we also have קָשָׁה, قسا, קָשַׁח, قسح, قسن, cf. on Isa. xxi. 7). It was a mutual relation, the design of which was finally and speedily to obtain justice for the fatherless and oppressed, yea crushed, few, in order that mortal man of the earth may no longer (בַּל, as in Isa. xiv. 21, and in post-biblical Hebrew בַּל and לְבַל instead of פֶּן) terrify. From the parallel conclusion, ix. 20, 21, it is to be inferred that אֱנוֹשׁ does not refer to the oppressed but to the oppressor, and is therefore intended as the subject; and then the phrase מִן־הָאָרֶץ also belongs to it, as in xvii. 14, people of the world, lxxx. 14 boar of the woods, whereas in Prov. xxx. 14 מֵאָרֶץ belongs to the verb (to devour from off the earth). It is only in this combination that אֱנוֹשׁ מִן־הָאָרֶץ forms with לְעָרֵץ a significant paronomasia, by contrasting the conduct of the tyrant with his true nature: a mortal of the earth, *i. e.* a being who, far removed from any possibility of vying with the God who is in heaven, has the earth as his birth-place. It is not מִן־הָאֲדָמָה, for the earth is not referred to as the material out of which man is formed, but as his ancestral house, his home, his bound, just as in the expression of John ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, iii. 31 (Lat. *ut non amplius terreat homo terrenus*). A similar play of words was attempted before in ix. 20 אַל־יֵעֹז אֱנוֹשׁ. The Hebrew verb עָרַץ signifies both to give way to fear, Deut. vii. 21, and to put in fear, Isa. ii. 19, 21, xlvii. 12. It does mean "to defy, rebel against", although it might have this meaning according to the Arabic عرض (to come in the way, withstand, according to which Wetzstein explains עָרוּץ Job xxx. 6, like عِرْض, "a valley that runs slantwise across a district, a gorge that blocks up the traveller's way".*). It is related to عرص to vibrate, tremble (*e.g.* of lightning).

* *Zeitschrift für Allgem. Erdkunde* xviii (1865) 1, S. 30.

PSALM XI.

REFUSAL TO FLEE WHEN IN A PERILOUS SITUATION.

1 IN Jahve put I my trust — how say ye to my soul:
"Flee to your mountain [as] a bird!

2 "For, lo, the wicked have bent the bow,
"They have made ready their arrow upon the string,
"To shoot the upright in heart in the dark.

3 "When the pillars are pulled down,
"The righteous — what will he do?!"

4 Jahve in His holy temple,
Jahve, who hath His throne in heaven —
His eyes behold, His eyelids try the children of men.

5 Jahve, He trieth the righteous,
And the wicked and him that loveth violence His soul hateth.

6 Upon the wicked He shall rain snares;
Fire, brimstone, and burning wind is the portion of their cup.

7 For Jahve is righteous, loving righteousness:
The upright shall behold His countenance.

Ps. xi., which likewise confidently sets the all-seeing eye of Jahve before the ungodly who carry out their murderous designs under cover of the darkness, is placed after Ps. x. The life of David (to whom even Hitzig and Ewald ascribe this Psalm) is threatened, the pillars of the state are shaken, they counsel the king to flee to the mountains. These are indications of the time when the rebellion of Absolom was secretly preparing, but still clearly discernible. Although hurrying on with a swift measure and clear in the principal thoughts, still this Psalm is not free from difficult points, just as it is with all the Psalms which contain similar dark passages from the internal condition of Israel. The gloomy condition of the nation seems to be reflected in the very language. The strophic plan is not easily discernible; nevertheless we cannot go far wrong in dividing the Psalm into two seven line strophes with a two line *epiphonema*.

Vers. 1—3. David rejects the advice of his friends to save his life by flight. Hidden in Jahve (xvi. 1, xxxvi. 8) he needs no other refuge. However well-meant and well-grounded the advice, he considers it too full of fear and is himself too confident in God, to follow it. David also introduces his friends as speaking in other passages in the Psalms belonging to the period of the Absolom persecution, iii. 3, iv. 7. Their want of courage, which he afterwards had to reprove and endeavour to restore, shewed itself even before the storm had burst, as we see here. With the words "how can you say" he rejects their proposal as unreasonable, and turns it as a reproach against them. If the *Chethîb*, נודו, is adopted, then those who are well-disposed, say to David, including with him his nearest subjects who are faithful to him: retreat to your mountain, (ye) birds (צִפּוֹר collective as in viii. 9, cxlviii. 10); or, since this address sounds too derisive to be appropriate to the lips of those who are supposed to be speaking here: like birds (*comparatio decurtata* as in xxii. 14, lviii. 9, Job xxiv. 5, Isa. xxi. 8). הֲרֻכֶם which seems more natural in connection with the vocative rendering of צִפּוֹר (cf. Isa. xviii. 6 with Ezek. xxxix. 4) may also be explained, with the comparative rendering, without any need for the conjecture הר כמו צפור (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 19), as a retrospective glance at the time of the persecution under Saul: to the mountains, which formerly so effectually protected you (cf. 1 Sam. xxvi. 20, xxiii. 14). But the *Kerî*, which is followed by the ancient versions, exchanges נודו for נוּדִי, cf. שְׁחִי Isa. li. 23. Even reading it thus we should not take צִפּוֹר, which certainly is epicœne, as vocative: flee to your mountain, O bird (Hitz.); and for this reason, that this form of address is not appropriate to the idea of those who profer their counsel. But we should take it as an equation instead of a comparison: fly to your mountain (which gave you shelter formerly), a bird, *i. e.* after the manner of a bird that flies away to its mountain home when it is chased in the plain. But this *Kerî* appears to be a needless correction, which removes the difficulty of נודו coming after לנפשי, by putting another in the place of this *synallage numeri.**

* According to the above rendering: "Flee ye to your mountain,

In ver. 2 the faint-hearted ones give as the ground of their advice, the fearful peril which threatens from the side of crafty and malicious foes. As הִנֵּה implies, this danger is imminent. The perfect overrides the future: they are not only already in the act of bending the bow, they have made ready their arrow, *i. e.* their deadly weapon, upon the string (יֶתֶר = מֵיתָר, xxi. 13, Arab. *watar,* from יָתַר, *watara,* to stretch tight, extend, so that the thing is continued in one straight line) and even taken aim, in order to discharge it (יָרָה with לְ of the aim, as in lxiv. 5, with *acc.* of the object) in the dark (*i. e.* secretly, like an assassin) at the upright (those who by their character are opposed to them). In ver. 3 the faint-hearted still further support their advice from the present total subversion of justice. הַשָּׁתוֹת are either the highest ranks, who support the edifice of the state, according to Isa. xix. 10, or, according to lxxxii. 5, Ezek. xxx. 4, the foundations of the state, upon whom the existence and well-being of the land depends. We prefer the latter, since the king and those who are loyal to him, who are associated in thought with צַדִּיק, are compared to the שתות. The construction of the clause beginning with כִּי is like Job xxxviii. 41. The *fut.* has a present signification. The *perf.* in the principal clause, as it frequently does elsewhere (*e. g.* xxxix. 8, lx. 11, Gen. xxi. 7, Num. xxiii. 10, Job xii. 9, 2 Kings xx. 9) in interrogative sentences, corresponds to the Latin conjunctive (here *quid fecerit*), and is to be expressed in English by the auxiliary verbs: when the bases of the state are shattered, what can the righteous do? he can do nothing. And all counter-effort is so useless that it is well to be as far from danger as possible.

Vers. 4—6. The words of David's counsellors who fear for him are now ended. And David justifies his confidence in God with which he began his song. Jahve sits enthroned

---

a bird" it would require to be accented נוֹדוֹ הַרְכֶם צִפּוֹר (as a transformation from נוֹדוֹ הַר־כֶּם צִפּוֹר, *vid.* Baer's *Accentssystem* XVIII. 2). The interpunction as we have it, נֹדוֹ הַרְכֶם צִפּוֹר, harmonises with the interpretation of Varenius as of Löb Spira (*Pentateuch-Comm.* 1815): *Fugite (o socii Davidis), mons vester (h. e. præsidium vestrum,* Ps. xxx. 8, *cui innitimini) est avis errans.*

above all that takes place on earth that disheartens those of little faith. At an infinite distance above the earth, and also above Jerusalem, now in rebellion, is a הֵיכַל קָדְשׁ, xviii. 7, xxix. 9, and in this holy temple is Jahve, the Holy One. Above the earth are the heavens, and in heaven is the throne of Jahve, the King of kings. And this temple, this palace in the heavens, is the place whence issues the final decision of all earthly matters, Hab. ii. 20, Mic. i. 2. For His throne above is also the super-terrestrial judgment-seat, ix. 8, ciii. 19. Jahve who sits thereon is the all-seeing and omniscient One. חָזָה prop. to split, cf. *cernere,* is used here according to its radical meaning, of a sharp piercing glance. בָּחַן prop. to try metals by fire, of a fixed and penetrating look that sees into a thing to the foundation of its inmost nature. The mention of the eyelids is intentional. When we observe a thing closely or ponder over it, we draw the eyelids together, in order that our vision may be more concentrated and direct, and become, as it were, one ray piercing through the object. Thus are men open to the all-seeing eyes, the all-searching looks of Jahve: the just and the unjust alike. He tries the righteous, *i. e.* He knows that in the depth of his soul there is an upright nature that will abide all testing (xvii. 3, Job xxiii. 10), so that He lovingly protects him, just as the righteous lovingly depends upon Him. And His soul hates (*i. e.* He hates him with all the energy of His perfectly and essentially holy nature) the evil-doer and him that delights in the violence of the strong towards the weak. And the more intense this hatred, the more fearful will be the judgments in which it bursts forth.

Ver. 7, which assumes a declaration of something that is near at hand, is opposed to our rendering the voluntative form of the *fut.,* יַמְטֵר, as expressive of a wish. The shorter form of the future is frequently indicative in the sense of the future, *e. g.* lxxii. 13, or of the present, *e. g.* lviii. 5, or of the past, xviii. 12. Thus it here affirms a fact of the future which follows as a necessity from vers. 4, 5. Assuming that פַּחִים might be equivalent to פַּחֲמִים, even then the Hebrew פֶּחָם, according to the general usage of the language, in distinction from גַּחֶלֶת, does not denote burning, but black coals. It ought therefore to have been פַּחֲמֵי אֵשׁ. Hitzig

reads פֶּחָם from פִּיחַ ashes; but a rain of ashes is no medium of punishment. Böttcher translates it "lumps" according to Ex. xxxix. 3, Num. xvii. 3; but in these passages the word means thin plates. We adhere to the signification snares, Job xxii. 10, cf. xxi. 17, Prov. xxii. 5; and following the accentuation, we understand it to be a means of punishment by itself. First of all descends a whole discharge of missiles which render all attempt at flight impossible, viz. lightnings; for the lightning striking out its course and travelling from one point in the distance, bending itself like a serpent, may really be compared to a snare, or noose, thrown down from above. In addition to fire and brimstone (Gen. xix. 24) we have also רוּחַ זְלָעָפוֹת. The LXX. renders it πνεῦμα καταιγίδος, and the Targum וְעַפָּא עֲלָעוּלָא, *procella turbinea.* The root is not לעף, which cannot be sustained as a cognate form of לאב, להב to burn, but זעף, which (as Sam. v. 10 shews) exactly corresponds to the Latin *æstuare* which combines in itself the characteristics of heat and violent motion, therefore perhaps: a wind of flames, *i. e.* the deadly simoom, which, according to the present division of the verse is represented in connection with אֵשׁ וְגָפְרִית, as the breath of the divine wrath pouring itself forth like a stream of brimstone, Isa. xxx. 33. It thus also becomes clear how this can be called the portion of their cup, *i. e.* what is adjudged to them as the contents of their cup which they must drain off. מְנָת (only found in the Davidic Psalms, with the exception of 2 Chron. xxxi. 4) is both *absolutivus* and *constructivus* according to Olshausen (§§ 108, *c*, 165, *i*), and is derived from *manajath,* or *manawath,* with the original feminine termination *ath*, the final weak radical being blended with it. According to Hupfeld it is *constr.,* springing from מָנָה, like קְצָה (in Dan. and Neh.) from קָצוֹת. But probably it is best to regard it as = מְנוֹת or מְנִיָּת, like גְּלוֹת = גִּלּוֹת.

Ver. 7. Thus then Jahve is in covenant with David. Even though he cannot defend himself against his enemies, still, when Jahve gives free course to His hatred in judgment, they will then have to do with the powers of wrath and death, which they will not be able to escape. When the closing distich bases this different relation of God towards the righteous and the unrighteous and this judgment of the

latter on the righteousness of God, we at once perceive what a totally different and blessed end awaits the righteous. As Jahve Himself is righteous, so also on His part (1 Sam. xii. 7, Mic. vi. 5, and frequently) and on the part of man (Isa. xxxiii. 15) He loves צְדָקוֹת, the works of righteousness. The object of אָהֵב (= אֹהֵב) stands at the head of the sentence, as in xcix. 4, cf. x. 14. In ver. 7*b* יְשָׁרִים designates the upright as a class, hence it is the more natural for the predicate to follow in the *plur.* (cf. ix. 7, Job viii. 19) than to precede as elsewhere (Prov. xxviii. 1, Isa. xvi. 4). The rendering: "His countenance looks upon the upright man" (Hengst. and others) is not a probable one, just because one expects to find something respecting the end of the upright in contrast to that of the ungodly. This rendering is also contrary to the general usage of the language, according to which פנים is always used only as that which is to be seen, not as that which itself sees. It ought to have been עֵינָיו, xxxiii. 18, xxxiv. 16, Job xxxvi. 7. It must therefore be translated according to xvii. 15, cxl. 13: the upright (*quisquis probus est*) shall behold His countenance. The pathetic form פָּנִימוֹ instead of פָּנָיו was specially admissible here, where God is spoken of (as in Deut. xxxiii. 2, cf. Isa. xliv. 15). It ought not to be denied any longer that *mo* is sometimes (*e. g.* Job xx. 23, cf. xxii. 2, xxvii. 23) a dignified singular suffix. To behold the face of God is in itself impossible to mortals without dying. But when God reveals Himself in love, then He makes His countenance bearable to the creature. And to enjoy this vision of God softened by love is the highest honour God in His mercy can confer on a man; it is the blessedness itself that is reserved for the upright, cxl. 14. It is not possible to say that what is intended is a future vision of God; but it is just as little possible to say that it is exclusively a vision in this world. To the Old Testament conception the future עולם is certainly lost in the night of Sheôl. But faith broke through this night, and consoled itself with a future beholding of God, Job xix. 26. The redemption of the New Testament has realised this aspiration of faith, since the Redeemer has broken through the night of the realm of the dead, has borne on high with Him the

Old Testament saints, and translated them into the sphere of the divine love revealed in heaven.

PSALM XII.

LAMENT AND CONSOLATION IN THE MIDST OF PREVAILING FALSEHOOD.

2 HELP, Jahve, for the godly man ceaseth,
For the faithful have vanished from among the children of men!
3 They speak falsehood one with another,
Flattering lips with a double heart, they speak.

4 May Jahve root out all flattering lips,
The tongue that speaketh great swelling words,
5 Which say: to our tongue we impart strength,
Our lips are with us, who is lord over us?!

6 "Because of the desolation of the afflicted, the sighing of the poor,
"Will I now arise — saith Jahve —
"In safety will I set him who languisheth for it." —
7 The words of Jahve are pure words,
Silver melted down in the furnace, to the earth,
Purified seven times.

8 Thou, O Jahve, wilt defend them,
Thou wilt preserve him from this generation for ever;
9 The wicked strut about on every side,
When vileness among the children of men is exalted.

Ps. xi. is appropriately followed by Ps. xii., which is of a kindred character: a prayer for the deliverance of the poor and miserable in a time of universal moral corruption, and more particularly of prevailing faithlessness and boasting. The inscription: *To the Precentor, on the Octave, a Psalm of David* points us to the time when the Temple music was being established, *i. e.* the time of David — incomparably the best age in the history of Israel, and yet, viewed in the light of the

spirit of holiness, an age so radically corrupt. The true people of Jahve were even then, as ever, a church of confessors and martyrs, and the sighing for the coming of Jahve was then not less deep than the cry "Come, Lord Jesus!" at the present time.

This Ps. xii. together with Ps. ii. is a second example of the way in which the psalmist, when under great excitement of spirit, passes over into the tone of one who directly hears God's words, and therefore into the tone of an inspired prophet. Just as lyric poetry in general, as being a direct and solemn expression of strong inward feeling, is the earliest form of poetry: so psalm-poetry contains in itself not only the *mashal,* the epos, and the drama in their preformative stages, but prophecy also, as we have it in the prophetic writings of its most flourishing period, has, as it were, sprung from the bosom of psalm-poetry. It is throughout a blending of prophetical epic and subjective lyric elements, and is in many respects the echo of earlier psalms, and even in some instances (as *e.g.* Isa. xii., Hab. iii.) transforms itself into the strain of a psalm. Hence Asaph is called הַחוֹזֶה in 2 Chron. xxix. 30, not from the special character of his Psalms, but from his being a psalmist in general; for Jeduthun has the same name given to him in 2 Chron. xxxv. 15, and נָבָא in 1 Chron. xxv. 2 sq. (cf. προφητεύειν, Luke i. 67) is used directly as an epithet for psalm-singing with accompaniment — a clear proof that in prophecy the co-operation of a human element is no less to be acknowledged, than the influence of a divine element in psalm-poesy.

The direct words of Jahve, and the psalmist's Amen to them, form the middle portion of this Psalm — a six line strophe, which is surrounded by four line strophes.

Vers. 2—3. The sigh of supplication, הוֹשִׁיעָה, has its object within itself: work deliverance, give help; and the motive is expressed by the complaint which follows. The verb גָּמַר to complete, means here, as in vii. 10, to have an end; and the ἅπ. λεγ. פָּסַם is equivalent to אָפַס in lxxvii. 9, to come to the extremity, to cease. It is at once clear from the predicate being placed first in the *plur.*, that אֱמוּנִים in this passage is not an *abstractum,* as *e. g.* in Prov. xiii. 17.; moreover the parallelism is against it, just as in xxxi. 24.

חָסִיד is the pious man, as one who practises חֶסֶד towards God and man. אֱמוּן, primary form אֱמֶן (plur. אֱמוּנִים; whereas from אָמֵן we should expect אֲמֵנִים), — used as an adjective (cf. on the contrary Deut. xxxii. 20) here just as in xxxi. 24, 2 Sam. xx. 19, — is the reliable, faithful, conscientious man, literally one who is firm, *i. e.* whose word and meaning is firm, so that one can rely upon it and be certain in relation to it.* We find similar complaints of the universal prevalence of wickedness in Mic. vii. 2, Isa. lvii. 1, Jer. vii. 28, and elsewhere. They contain their own limitation. For although those who complain thus without pharisaic self-righteousness would convict themselves of being affected by the prevailing corruption, they are still, in their penitence, in their sufferings for righteousness' sake, and in their cry for help, a standing proof that humanity has not yet, without exception, become a *massa perdita.* That which the writer especially laments, is the prevailing untruthfulness. Men speak שָׁוְא (= שָׁוְא from שׁוא), desolation and emptiness under a disguise that conceals its true nature, falsehood (xli. 7), and hypocrisy (Job xxxv. 13), ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ (LXX., cf. Ephes. iv. 25, where the greatness of the sin finds its confirmation according to the teaching of the New Testament: ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη). They speak lips of smoothnesses (חֲלָקוֹת, plural from חֲלָקָה, *lævitates,* or from חֶלֶק, *lævia*), *i. e.* the smoothest, most deceitful language (accusative of the object as in Isa. xix. 18) with a double heart, inasmuch, namely, as the meaning they deceitfully express to others, and even to themselves, differs from the purpose they actually cherish, or even (cf. 1 Chron. xii. 33 בְּלֹא לֵב ולֵב, and James i. 8 δίψυχος, wavering) inasmuch as the purpose they now so flatteringly put forth quickly changes to the very opposite.

Vers. 4—5. In this instance the voluntative has its own proper signification: may He root out (cf. cix. 15, and the oppositive xi. 6). Flattering lips and a vaunting tongue are

---

*The Aryan root *man* to remain, abide (Neo-Persic *mânden*), also takes a similar course, signifying usually "to continue in any course, wait, hope." So the old Persic *man*, Zend *upaman*, cf. μένειν with its derivatives which are applied in several ways in the New Testament to characterise πίστις.

one, insofar as the braggart becomes a flatterer when it serves his own selfish interest. אֲשֶׁר refers to lips and tongue, which are put for their possessors. The *Hiph.* הַגְבִּיר may mean either to impart strength, or to give proof of strength. The combination with לְ, not בְּ, favours the former: we will give emphasis to our tongue (this is their self-confident declaration). Hupfeld renders it, contrary to the meaning of the *Hiph.*: over our tongue we have power, and Ewald and Olshausen, on the ground of an erroneous interpretation of Dan. ix. 27, render: we make or have a firm covenant with our tongue. They describe their lips as being their confederates (אֵת as in 2 Kings ix. 32), and by the expression "who is lord over us" they declare themselves to be absolutely free, and exalted above all authority. If any authority were to assert itself over them, their mouth would put it down and their tongue would thrash it into submission. But Jahve, whom this making of themselves into gods challenges, will not always suffer His own people to be thus enslaved.

Vers. 6—7. In ver. 6 the psalmist hears Jahve Himself speak; and in ver. 7 he adds his Amen. The two מִן in ver. 6 denote the motive, עַתָּה the decisive turning-point from forebearance to the execution of judgment, and יֹאמַר the divine determination, which has just now made itself audible; cf. Isaiah's echo of it, Isa. xxxiii. 10. Jahve has hitherto looked on with seeming inactivity and indifference, now He will arise and place in יֵשַׁע, *i. e* a condition of safety (cf. יְשִׁים בַּחַיִּים; lxvi. 9), him who languishes for deliverance. It is not to be explained: him whom he, *i. e.* the boaster, blows upon, which would be expressed by יָפִיחַ בּוֹ, cf. x, 5; but, with Ewald, Hengstenberg, Olshausen, and Böttcher, according to Hab. ii. 3, where הֻפַּח לְ occurs in the sense of panting after an object: him who longs for it. יָפִיחַ is, however, not a participial adjective = יָפֵחַ, but the *fut.*, and יָפִיחַ לוֹ is therefore a relative clause occupying the place of the object, just as we find the same thing occurring in Job xxiv. 19, Isa. xli. 2, 25, and frequently. Hupfeld's rendering: "in order that he may gain breath (*respiret*)" leaves אשית without an object, and accords more with Aramaic and Arabic than with

Hebrew usage, which would express this idea by נָוֹחַ לוֹ or יָרַוַח לוֹ.

In ver. 7 the announcement of Jahve is followed by its echo in the heart of the seer: the words (אֲמָרוֹת instead of אִמְרוֹת by changing the *Shebâ* which closes the syllable into an audible one, as *e.g.* in אֲשֶׁרִי) of Jahve are pure words, *i. e.* intended, and to be fulfilled, absolutely as they run without any admixture whatever of untruthfulness. The poetical אִמְרָה (after the form וְזֵרָה) serves pre-eminently as the designation of the divine power-words of promise. The figure, which is indicated in other instances, when God's word is said to be צְרוּפָה (xviii. 31, cxix. 140, Prov. xxx. 5), is here worked out: silver melted and thus purified בָּעֲלִיל לָאָרֶץ. עֲלִיל signifies either a smelting-pot from עָלַל, גל, *immittere*, whence also עוֹל (Hitz.); or, what is more probable since the language has the epithets כּוּר and מַצְרֵף for this: a workshop, from עָלַל, גל, *operari* (prop. to set about a thing), first that which is wrought at (after the form מְעִיל, כְּסִיל, שְׁבִיל), then the place where the work is carried on. From this also comes the Talm. בָּעֲלִיל = בְּגָלוּי *manifeste*, occurring in the Mishna *Rosh ha-Shana* i. 5 and elsewhere, and which in its first meaning corresponds to the French *en effet*.* According to this, the ל in לָאָרֶץ is not the ל of property: in a fining-pot built into the earth, for which לארץ without anything further would be an inadequate and colourless expression. But in accordance with the usual meaning of לארץ as a collateral definition it is: smelted (purified) down to the earth. As Olshausen observes on this subject, "Silver that is purified in the furnace and flows down to the ground can be seen in every smelting hut; the pure liquid silver flows down out of the smelting furnace, in which the ore is piled up." For it cannot be ל of reference: "purified with respect to the earth", since ארץ does not denote the earth as a material and cannot therefore mean an earthy element. We ought then to read לָאֲבֶץ, which would not mean "to a white brilliancy", *i. e.* to a pure bright mass (Böttch.), but "with

* On this word with reference to this passage of the Psalm *vid.* Steinschneider's *Hebr. Bibliographie* 1861, S. 83.

respect to the *stannum,* lead" (*vid.* on Isa. i. 25). The verb זָקַק to strain, filter, cause to ooze through, corresponds to the German *seihen, seigen,* old High German *sihan,* Greek σαχχεῖν (σαχχίζειν), to clean by passing through a cloth as a strainer, שׂק. God's word is solid silver smelted and leaving all impurity behind, and, as it were, having passed seven times through the smelting furnace, *i. e.* the purest silver, entirely purged from dross. Silver is the emblem of everything precious and pure (*vid.* Bähr, *Symbol.* i, 284); and seven is the number indicating the completion of any process (*Bibl. Psychol.* S. 57., transl. p. 71).

Vers. 8—9. The supplicatory complaint contained in the first strophe has passed into an ardent wish in the second; and now in the fourth there arises a consolatory hope based upon the divine utterance which was heard in the third strophe. The suffix *ēm* in ver. 8*a* refers to the miserable and poor; the suffix *ennu* in ver. 8*b* (him, not: us, which would be pointed תִּצְרֵנוּ, and more especially since it is not preceded by תִּשְׁמְרֵנוּ) refers back to the man who yearns for deliverance mentioned in the divine utterance, ver. 6. The "preserving for ever" is so constant, that neither now nor at any future time will they succumb to this generation. The oppression shall not become a thorough depression, the trial shall not exceed their power of endurance. What follows in ver. 9 is a more minute description of this depraved generation. דּוֹר is the generation whole and entire bearing one general character and doing homage to the one spirit of the age (cf. *e. g.* Prov. xxx. 11—14, where the characteristics of a corrupt age are portrayed). זוּ (always without the article, Ew. § 293, *a*) points to the present and the character it has assumed, which is again described here finally in a few outlines of a more general kind than in vers. 3—5. The wicked march about on every side (הִתְהַלֵּךְ used of going about unopposed with an arrogant and vaunting mien), when (while) vileness among (ל) the children of men rises to eminence (רוּם as in Prov. xi. 11, cf. מָשָׁל Prov. xxix. 2), so that they come to be under its dominion. Vileness is called זְלוּת from זָלַל (cogn. דָּלַל) to be supple and lax, narrow, low, weak and worthless. The form is passive just as is the Talm. זִילוּת (from זִיל = זָלִיל), and it

is the epithet applied to that which is depreciated, despised, and to be despised; here it is the opposite of the disposition and conduct of the noble man, נָדִיב, Isa. xxxii. 8, — a baseness which is utterly devoid not only of all nobler principles and motives, but also of all nobler feelings and impulses. The כְּ of כְּרֹם is not the expression of simultaneousness (as *e. g.* in Prov. x. 25): immediately it is exalted — for then ver. 9 would give expression to a general observation, instead of being descriptive — but כְּרֹם is equivalent to בָּרֹם, only it is intentionally used instead of the latter, to express a coincidence that is based upon an intimate relation of cause and effect, and is not merely accidental. The wicked are puffed up on all sides, and encompass the better disposed on every side as their enemies. Such is the state of things, and it cannot be otherwise at a time when men allow meanness to gain the ascendency among and over them, as is the case at the present moment. Thus even at last the depressing view of the present prevails in the amidst of the confession of a more consolatory hope. The present is gloomy. But in the central hexastich the future is lighted up as a consolation against this gloominess. The Psalm is a ring and this central oracle is its jewel.

PSALM XIII.

SUPPLIANT CRY OF ONE WHO IS UTTERLY UNDONE.

2 HOW long, Jahve, wilt Thou forget me,
How long wilt Thou veil Thy face from me?!
3 How long shall I cherish cares in my soul,
Sorrow in my heart by day?!
How long shall mine enemy be exalted over me?!

4 Look, answer me, Jahve, my God,
Lighten mine eyes, that I fall not asleep in death,
5 That mine enemy may not say: "I have prevailed against him",
That mine oppressors may not rejoice, when I stumble.

6 And as for me, in Thy mercy do I trust,
My heart shall rejoice at Thy salvation;
I will sing of Jahve, because He hath dealt bountifully with me.

The יָרוּם of the personal cry with which David opens Ps. xiii. harmonizes with כָּרַם of the general lament which he introduces into Ps. xii.; and for this reason the collector has coupled these two Psalms together. Hitzig assigns Ps. xiii. to the time when Saul posted watchers to hunt David from place to place, and when, having been long and unceasingly persecuted, David dared to cherish a hope of escaping death only by indefatigable vigilance and endurance. Perhaps this view is correct. The Psalm consists of three strophes, or if it be preferred, three groups of decreasing magnitude. A long deep sigh is followed, as from a relieved breast, by an already much more gentle and half calm prayer; and this again by the believing joy which anticipates the certainty of being answered. This song as it were casts up constantly lessening waves, until it becomes still as the sea when smooth as a mirror, and the only motion discernible at last is that of the joyous ripple of calm repose.

Vers. 2—3. The complicated question: till when, how long . . . for ever (as in lxxiv. 10, lxxix. 5, lxxxix. 47), is the expression of a complicated condition of soul, in which, as Luther briefly and forcibly describes it, amidst the feeling of anguish under divine wrath "hope itself despairs and despair nevertheless begins to hope". The self-contradiction of the question is to be explained by the conflict which is going on within between the flesh and the spirit. The dejected heart thinks: God has forgotten me for ever. But the spirit, which thrusts away this thought, changes it into a question which sets upon it the mark of a mere appearance not a reality: how long shall it seem as though Thou forgettest me for ever? It is in the nature of the divine wrath, that the feeling of it is always accompanied by an impression that it will last for ever; and consequently it becomes a foretaste of hell itself. But faith holds fast the love that

is behind the wrath; it sees in the display of anger only a self-masking of the loving countenance of the God of love, and longs for the time when this loving countenance shall be again unveiled to it. Thrice does David send forth this cry of faith out of the inmost depths of his spirit. To place or set up contrivances, plans, or proposals in his soul, viz. as to the means by which he may be able to escape from this painful condition, is equivalent to, to make the soul the place of such thoughts, or the place where such thoughts are fabricated (cf. Prov. xxvi. 24). One such עֵצָה chases the other in his soul, because he recognises the vanity of one after another as soon us they spring up. With respect to the יוֹמָם which follows, we must think of these cares as taking possession of his soul in the night time; for the night leaves a man alone with his affliction and makes it doubly felt by him. It cannot be proved from Ezek. xxx. 16 (cf. Zeph. ii. 4 בַּצָּהֳרָיִם), that יוֹמָם like יום (Jer. vii. 25, short for יום יום) may mean "daily" (Ew. § 313, *a*). יומם does not mean this here, but is the antithesis to לַיְלָה which is to be supplied in thought in ver. 3*a*. By night he proposes plan after plan, each one as worthless as the other; and by day, or all the day through, when he sees his distress with open eyes, sorrow (יָגוֹן) is in his heart, as it were, as the feeling the night leaves behind it and as the direct reflex of his helpless and hopeless condition. He is persecuted, and his foe is in the ascendant. רום is both to be exalted and to rise, raise one's self, *i. e.* to rise to position and arrogantly to assume dignity to one's self (*sich brüsten*). The strophe closes with *'ad-āna* which is used for the fourth time.

Vers. 4—5. In contrast to God's seeming to have forgotten him and to wish neither to see nor know anything of his need, he prays: הַבִּיטָה (cf. Isa. lxiii. 15). In contrast to his being in perplexity what course to take and unable to help himself, he prays: עֲנֵנִי, answer me, who cry for help, viz. by the fulfilment of my prayer as a real, actual answer. In contrast to the triumphing of his foe: הָאִירָה עֵינַי, in order that the triumph of his enemy may not be made complete by his dying. To lighten the eyes that are dimmed with sorrow and ready to break, is equivalent to, to impart new life (Ezra ix. 8), which is reflected in the fresh clear

brightness of the eye (1 Sam. xiv. 27, 29). The lightening light, to which הָאִיר points, is the light of love beaming from the divine countenance, xxxi. 17. Light, love, and life are closely allied notions in the Scriptures. He, upon whom God looks down in love, continues in life, new powers of life are imparted to him, it is not his lot to sleep the death, *i. e.* the sleep of death, Jer. li. 39, 57, cf. Ps. lxxvi. 6. הַמָּוֶת is the accusative of effect or sequence: to sleep so that the sleep becomes death (LXX. εἰς θάνατον), Ew. § 281, *e*. Such is the light of life for which he prays, in order that his foe may not be able at last to say יְכָלְתִּיו (with accusative object, as in Jer. xxxviii. 5) = יָכֹלְתִּי לוֹ, cxxix. 2, Gen. xxxii. 26, I am able for him, a match for him, I am superior to him, have gained the mastery over him. כִּי, on account of the future which follows, had better be taken as temporal (*quum*) than as expressing the reason (*quod*), cf. בְּמוֹט רַגְלִי, xxxviii. 17.

Ver. 6. Three lines of joyous anticipation now follow the five of lament and four of prayer. By וַאֲנִי he sets himself in opposition to his foes. The latter desire his death, but he trusts in the mercy of God, who will turn and terminate his affliction. בָּטַח בְּ denotes faith as clinging fast to God, just as חָסָה בְּ denotes it as confidence which hides itself in Him. The voluntative יָגֵל pre-supposes the sure realisation of the hope. The perfect in ver. 6*c* is to be properly understood thus: the celebration follows the fact that inspires him to song. גָּמַל עַל to do good to any one, as in cxvi. 7, cxix. 17, cf. the radically cognate (עַל) גָּמַר lvii. 3. With the two iambics *gamál ʿaláj* the song sinks to rest. In the storm-tossed soul of the suppliant all has now become calm. Though it rage without as much now as ever — peace reigns in the depth of his heart.

PSALM XIV.

THE PREVAILING CORRUPTION AND THE REDEMPTION DESIRED

1 THE fool hath said in his heart: "There is no God";
Corrupt, abominable are their doings,
There is none that doeth good.

2 Jahve looketh down from heaven upon the children of men
To see if there be any that have understanding,
If any that seek after God.

3 They are all fallen away, altogether they are corrupt,
There is none that doeth good,
Not even one.

4 "Are they so utterly devoid of understanding, all the workers of iniquity,
Who eating up my people, eat up bread,
They call not on Jahve?"

5 Then were they in great fear,
For God is in the righteous generation.

6 Would ye bring to shame the counsel of the afflicted,
For Jahve is indeed his refuge!

7 Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion!
When Jahve turneth the captivity of His people,
Jacob shall rejoice, Israel shall be glad.

Just as the general lamentation of Ps. xii. assumes a personal character in Ps. xiii., so in Ps. xiv. it becomes again general; and the personal desire יָגֵל לִבִּי, xiii. 6, so full of hope, corresponds to יָגֵל יַעֲקֹב, which is extended to the whole people of God in xiv. 7. Moreover, Ps. xiv., as being a gloomy picture of the times in which the dawn of the divine day is discernible in the background, is more closely allied to Ps. xii. than to Ps. xiii., although this latter is not inserted between them without some recognised reason. In the reprobation of the moral and religious character of the men of the age, which Ps. xiv. has in common with Ps. xii., we at once have a confirmation of the לְדוֹר. But xiv. 7 does not necessitate our coming down to the time of the Exile.

In Ps. liii. we find this Psalm which is Jehovic, occurring again as Elohimic. The position of Ps. xiv. in the primary collection favours the presumption, that it is the earlier and more original composition. And since this presumption will bear the test of a critical comparison of

the two Psalms, we may leave the treatment of Ps. liii. to its proper place, without bringing it forward here. It is not as though Ps. xiv. were intact. It is marked out as seven three-line verses, but vers. 5 and 6, which ought to be the fifth and sixth three lines, are only two; and the original form appears to be destroyed by some deficiency. The difficulty is got over in Ps. liii., by making the two two-line verses into one three-line verse, so that it consists only of six three-line verses. And in that Psalm the announcement of judgment is applied to foreign enemies, a circumstance which has influenced some critics and led them astray in the interpretation of Ps. xiv.

Ver. 1. The perfect אָמַר, as in i. 1, x. 3, is the so-called abstract present (Ges. § 126, 3), expressing a fact of universal experience, inferred from a number of single instances. The Old Testament language is unusually rich in epithets for the unwise. The simple, פֶּתִי, and the silly, כְּסִיל, for the lowest branches of this scale; the fool, אֱוִיל, and the madman, הוֹלֵל, the uppermost. In the middle comes the notion of the simpleton or maniac, נָבָל, — a word from the verbal stem נָבַל which, according as that which forms the centre of the group of consonants lies either in נב (*Genesis* S. 636), or in בל (comp. אבל, אול, אמל, קמל), signifies either to be extended, to relax, to become frail, to wither, or to be prominent, *eminere*, Arab. *nabula;* so that consequently נָבָל means the relaxed, powerless, expressed in New Testament language: πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔχοντα. Thus Isaiah (ch. xxxii. 6) describes the נָבָל: "a simpleton speaks simpleness and his heart does godless things, to practice tricks and to say foolish things against Jahve, to leave the soul of the hungry empty, and to refuse drink to the thirsty." Accordingly נָבָל is the synonym of לֵץ the scoffer (*vid.* the definition in Prov. xxi. 24). A free spirit of this class is reckoned according to the Scriptures among the empty, hollow, and devoid of mind. The thought, אֵין אֱלֹהִים, which is the root of the thought and action of such a man, is the climax of imbecility. It is not merely practical atheism, that is intended by this maxim of the נָבָל. The heart according to Scripture language is not only the seat of volition, but also of thought. The נָבָל is

not content with acting as though there were no God, but directly denies that there is a God, *i.e.* a personal God. The psalmist makes this prominent as the very extreme and depth of human depravity, that there can be among men those who deny the existence of a God. The subject of what follows are, then, not these atheists but men in general, among whom such characters are to be found: they make the mode of action, (their) doings, corrupt, they make it abominable. עָלִילָה, a poetical brevity of expression for עֲלִילוֹתָם, belongs to both verbs, which have *Tarcha* and *Mercha* (the two usual conjunctives of *Mugrash*) in correct texts; and is in fact not used as an adverbial accusative (Hengstenberg and others), but as an object, since הִשְׁחִית is just the word that is generally used in this combination with עֲלִילָה Zeph. iii. 7 or, what is the same thing, דֶּרֶךְ Gen. vi. 12; and הֵתֵעִיב (cf. 1 Kings xxi. 26) is only added to give a superlative intensity to the expression. The negative: "there is none that doeth good" is just as unrestricted as in xii. 2. But further on the psalmist distinguishes between a דור צדיק, which experiences this corruption in the form of persecution, and the corrupt mass of mankind. He means what he says of mankind as κόσμος, in which, at first the few rescued by grace from the mass of corruption are lost sight of by him, just as in the words of God, Gen. vi. 5, 12. Since it is only grace that frees any from the general corruption, it may also be said, that men are described just as they are by nature; although, be it admitted, it is not hereditary sin but actual sin, which springs up from it, and grows apace if grace do not interpose, that is here spoken of.

Ver. 2. The second tristich appeals to the infallible decision of God Himself. The verb הִשְׁקִיף means to look forth, by bending one's self forward. It is the proper word for looking out of a window, 2 Kings ix. 30 (cf. *Niph.* Judges v. 28, and frequently), and for God's looking down from heaven upon the earth, cii. 20, and frequently; and it is cognate and synonymous with הִשְׁגִּיחַ, xxxiii. 13, 14; cf., moreover, Cant. ii. 9. The *perf.* is used in the sense of the perfect only insofar as the divine survey is antecedent to its result as given in ver. 3. Just as הִשְׁחִיתוּ reminds one of the history of the Flood, so does לִרְאוֹת of the history of the

building of the tower of Babel, Gen. xi. 5, cf. xviii. 21. God's judgment rests upon a knowledge of the matter of fact, which is represented in such passages after the manner of men. God's all-seeing, all-piercing eyes scrutinise the whole human race. Is there one who shews discernment in thought and act, one to whom fellowship with God is the highest good, and consequently that after which he strives? — this is God's question, and He delights in such persons, and certainly none such would escape His longing search. On אֶת־אֱלֹהִים, τὸν Θεόν, *vid.*, Ges. § 117. 2.

Ver. 3. The third tristich bewails the condition in which He finds humanity. The universality of corruption is expressed in as strong terms as possible. הַכֹּל they all (*lit.* the totality); יַחְדָּו with one another (*lit.* in its or their unions, *i. e.*, *universi*); אֵין גַּם־אֶחָד not a single one who might form an exception. סָר (probably not 3 *præt.* but *partic.*, which passes at once into the finite verb) signifies to depart, viz. from the ways of God, therefore to fall away (ἀποστάτης). נֶאֱלָח, as in Job xv. 16, denotes the moral corruptness as a becoming sour, putrefaction, and suppuration. Instead of אֵין גַּם־אֶחָד, the LXX. translates οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός (as though it were עַד־אֶחָד, which is the more familiar form of expression). Paul quotes the first three verses of this Psalm (Rom. iii. 10—12) in order to shew how the assertion, that Jews and heathen all are included under sin, is in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. What the psalmist says, applies primarily to Israel, his immediate neighbours, but at the same time to the heathen, as is self-evident. What is lamented is neither the pseudo-Israelitish corruption in particular, nor that of the heathen, but the universal corruption of man which prevails not less in Israel than in the heathen world. The citations of the apostle which follow his quotation of the Psalm, from τάφος ἀνεῳγμένος to ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν were early incorporated in the Psalm in the Κοινή of the LXX. They appear as an integral part of it in the *Cod. Alex.*, in the Greco-Latin *Psalterium Veronense*, and in the Syriac *Psalterium Mediolanense*. They are also found in Apollinaris' paraphrase of the Psalms as a later interpolation; the *Cod. Vat.* has them in the margin; and the words σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν have found admit-

tance in the translation, which is more Rabbinical than Old Hebrew, מָזֶל רַע וּפֶגַע רַע בְּדַרְכֵיהֶם even in a Hebrew codex (Kennicott 649). Origen rightly excluded this apostolic Mosaic work of Old Testament testimonies from his text of the Psalm; and the true representation of the matter is to be found in Jerome, in the preface to the xvi. book of his commentary on Isaiah.*

Ver. 4. Thus utterly cheerless is the issue of the divine scrutiny. It ought at least to have been different in Israel, the nation of the positive revelation. But even there wickedness prevails and makes God's purpose of mercy of none effect. The divine outburst of indignation which the psalmist hears here, is applicable to the sinners in Israel. Also in Isa. iii. 13 — 15 the Judge of the world addresses Himself to the heads of Israel in particular. This one feature of the Psalm before us is raised to the consistency of a special prophetic picture in the Psalm of Asaph, lxxxii. That which is here clothed in the form of a question, הֲלֹא יָדְעוּ, is reversed into an assertion in ver. 5 of that Psalm. It is not to be translated: will they not have to feel (which ought to be יֵדְעוּ); but also not as Hupfeld renders it: have they not experienced. "Not to know" is intended to be used as absolutely in the signification *non sapere,* and consequently *insipientem esse,* as it is in lxxxii. 5, lxxiii. 22, xcii. 7, Isa. xliv. 18, cf. 9, xlv. 20, and frequently. The perfect is to be judged after the analogy of *novisse* (Ges. § 126, 3), therefore it is to be rendered: have they attained to no knowledge, are they devoid of all knowledge, and therefore like the brutes, yea, according to Isa. i. 2, 3 even worse than the brutes, all the workers of iniquity? The two clauses which follow are, logically at least, attributive clauses. The subordination of אָכְלוּ לֶחֶם to the participle as a circumstantial clause in the sense of כַּאֲכֹל לֶחֶם is syntactically inadmissible; neither can אכלו לחם, with Hupfeld, be understood of a brutish and secure passing away of life; for, as Olshausen, rightly observes אָכַל לֶחֶם does not signify to feast and carouse, but simply to eat, take a meal. Hengstenberg correctly translates it

* Cf. Plüschke's Monograph on the Milanese *Psalterium Syriacum,* 1835, p. 28—39.

„who eating my people, eat bread", *i. e.* who think that they are not doing anything more sinful, — indeed rather what is justifiable, irreproachable and lawful to them, — than when they are eating bread; cf. the further carrying out of this thought in Mic. iii. 1—3 (especially ver. 3 *extr.*: "just as in the pot and as flesh within the caldron."). Instead of לֹא קָרְאוּ ה׳ Jeremiah says in ch. x. 21 (cf., however, x. 25): וְאֶת־ה׳ לֹא דָרָשׁוּ. The meaning is like that in Hos. vii. 7. They do not pray as it becomes man who is endowed with mind, therefore they are like cattle, and act like beasts of prey.

Ver. 5. When Jahve thus bursts forth in scorn His word, which never fails in its working, smites down these brutish men, who are without knowledge and conscience. The local demonstrative שָׁם is used as temporal in this passage just as in lxvi, 6, Hos. ii. 17, Zeph. i. 14, Job xxiii. 7, xxxv. 12, and is joined with the perfect of certainty, as in xxxvi. 13, where it has not so much a temporal as a local sense. It does not mean "there = at a future time", as pointing into the indefinite future, but "there = then", when God shall thus speak to them in His anger. Intensity is here given to the verb פָּחַד by the addition of a substantival object of the same root, just as is frequently the case in the more elevated style, *e. g.* Hab. iii. 9; and as is done in other cases by the addition of the adverbial infinitive. Then, when God's long-suffering changes into wrath, terror at His judgment seizes them and they tremble through and through. This judgment of wrath, however, is on the other hand a revelation of love. Jahve avenges and thus delivers those whom He calls עַמִּי (My people); and who are here called דּוֹר צַדִּיק, the generation of the righteous, in opposition to the corrupted humanity of the time (xii. 8), as being conformed to the will of God and held together by a superior spirit to the prevailing spirit of the age. They are so called inasmuch as דּוֹר passes over from the signification *generatio* to that of *genus hominum* here and also elsewhere, when it is not merely a temporal, but a moral notion; cf. xxiv. 6, lxxiii. 15, cxii. 2, where it uniformly denotes the whole of the children of God who are in bondage in the world and longing for deliverance, not Israel collectively in antithesis to the Scythians and the heathen in general (Hitzig).

Ver. 6. The psalmist himself meets the oppressed full of joyous confidence, by reason of the self-manifestation of God in judgment, of which he is now become so confident and which so fills him with comfort. Instead of the sixth tristich, which we expected, we have another distich. The *Hiph.* הֵבִישׁ with a personal object signifies: to put any one to shame, *i. e.* to bring it about that any one must be ashamed, *e. g.* xliv. 8 (cf. liii. 6, where the accusative of the person has to be supplied), or absolutely: to act shamefully, as in the phrase used in Proverbs, בֵּן מֵבִישׁ (a prodigal son). It appears only here with a neuter accusative of the object, not in the signification to defame (Hitz.), — a meaning it never has (not even in Prov. xiii. 5, where it is blended with הֵבְאִישׁ to make stinking, *i. e.* a reproach, Gen. xxxiv. 30), — but to confound, put to shame = to frustrate (Hupf.), which is at once the most natural meaning in connection with עֵצַת. But it is not to be rendered: ye put to shame, because . . ., for to what purpose is this statement with this inapplicable reason in support of it? The *fut.* תָּבִישׁוּ is used with a like shade of meaning as in Lev. xix. 17, and the imperative elsewhere; and כִּי gives the reason for the tacitly implied clause, or if a line is really lost from the strophe, the lost clause (cf. Isa. viii. 9 sq.): ye will not accomplish it. עֵצָה is whatsoever the pious man, who as such suffers reproach, plans to do for the glory of his God, or even in accordance with the will of his God. All this the children of the world, who are in possession of worldly power, seek to frustrate; but viewed in the light of the final decision their attempt is futile: Jahve is his refuge, or, literally the place whither he flees to hide himself and finds a hiding or concealment (צֵל, חֹסֶה, מַחְסֶה, סֵתֶר, סֶתֶר, Arabic also ذَرًى). מַחְסֵהוּ has an orthophonic *Dag.*, which obviates the necessity for the reading מַחְסֵהוּ (cf. תַּעֲלֻמִים x. 1, טַעֲמוּ xxxiv. 1, לֶאֱסֹר cv. 22, and similar instances).

Ver. 7. This tristich sounds like a liturgical addition belonging to the time of the Exile, unless one is disposed to assign the whole Psalm to this period on account of it. For elsewhere in a similar connection, as *e. g.* in Ps. cxxvi., שׁוּב שְׁבוּת means to turn the captivity, or to bring back the

captives. שׁוּב has here, — as in cxxvi. 4, Nah. ii. 3 (followed by אֶת), cf. Ezek xlvii. 7, the *Kal* being preferred to the *Hiph.* הֵשִׁיב (Jer. xxxii. 44, xxxiii. 11) in favour ot the alliteration with שְׁבוּת (from שָׁבָה to make any one a prisoner of war), — a transitive signification, which Hengstenberg (who interprets it: to turn back, to turn to the captivity, of God's merciful visitation), vainly hesitates to admit. But Isa. lxvi. 6, for instance, shews that the exiles also never looked for redemption anywhere but from Zion. Not as though they had thought, that Jahve still dwelt among the ruins of His habitation, which indeed on the contrary was become a ruin because He had forsaken it (as we read in Ezekiel); but the moment of His return to His people is also the moment when He entered again upon the occupation of His sanctuary, and His sanctuary, again appropriated by Jahve even before it was actually reared, is the spot whence issues the kindling of the divine judgment on the enemies of Israel, as well as the spot whence issues the brightness of the reverse side of this judgment, viz. the final deliverance, hence even during the Exile, Jerusalem is the point (the *kibla*) whither the eye of the praying captive was directed, Dan. vi. 11. There would therefore be nothing strange if a psalm-writer belonging to the Exile should express his longing for deliverance in these words: who gives = oh that one would give = oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion! But since שׁוּב שְׁבוּת also signifies metaphorically to turn misfortune, as in Job xlii. 10, Ezek. xvi. 53 (perhaps also in Ps. lxxxv. 2, cf. ver. 5), inasmuch as the idea of שְׁבוּת has been generalised exactly like the German "*Elend*", exile (Old High German *elilenti* = sojourn in another country, banishment, homelessness), therefore the inscribed לדוד cannot be called in question from this quarter. Even Hitzig renders: "if Jahve would but turn the misfortune of His people", regarding this Psalm as composed by Jeremiah during the time the Scythians were in the land. If this rendering is possible, and that it is is undeniable, then we retain the inscription לדוד. And we do so the more readily, as Jeremiah's supposed authorship rests upon a non-recognition of his reproductive character, and the history of the

prophet's times makes no allusion to any incursion by the Scythians.

The condition of the true people of God in the time of Absolom was really a שְׁבוּת in more than a figurative sense. But we require no such comparison with cotemporary history, since in these closing words we have only the gathering up into a brief form of the view which prevails in other parts of the Psalm, viz. that the "righteous generation" in the midst of the world, and even of the so-called Israel, finds itself in a state of oppression, imprisonment, and bondage. If God will turn this condition of His people, who are His people indeed and of a truth, then shall Jacob rejoice and Israel be glad. It is the grateful duty of the redeemed to rejoice. — And how could they do otherwise!

PSALM XV.

THE CONDITIONS OF ACCESS TO GOD.

1 JAHVE, who may sojourn in Thy tabernacle,
Who may dwell on Thy holy mountain?

2 He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness,
And speaketh truth in his heart.

3 That taketh not slander upon his tongue,
Nor doeth evil to his companion,
Nor bringeth a reproach upon his neighbour;

4 That is displeasing in his own eyes, to be despised,
But those who fear Jahve he honoureth;
He sweareth to [his own] hurt — he changeth not.

5 He putteth not out his money to usury,
And taketh not a bribe against the innocent —
He that doeth these things shall never be moved.

The preceeding Psalm distinguished דור צדיק, a righteous generation, from the mass of the universal corruption, and closed with a longing for the salvation out of Zion. Ps. xv. answers the question: who belongs to this דור צדיק, and whom

shall the future salvation avail? Ps. xxiv., composed in connection with the removal of the Ark to Zion, is very similar. The state of mind expressed in this Psalm exactly corresponds to the unhypocritical piety and genuine lowliness which were manifest in David in their most beauteous light on that occasion; cf. ver. 4*b* with 2 Sam. vi. 19; ver. 4*a* with 2 Sam. vi. 21 sq. The fact, however, that Zion (Moriah) is called simply הַר הַקֹּדֶשׁ in ver. 1, rather favours the time of the Absolomic exile, when David was cut off from the sanctuary of his God, whilst it was in the possession of men the very opposite of those described in this Psalm (*vid.* iv. 6). Nothing can be maintained with any certainty except that the Psalm assumes the elevation of Zion to the special designation of "the holy mountain" and the removal of the Ark to the אֹהֶל erected there (2 Sam. vi. 17). Isa. xxxiii. 13—16 is a fine variation of this Psalm.

Vers. 1—2. That which is expanded in the tristichic portion of the Psalm, is all contained in this distichic portion *in nuce*. The address to God is not merely a favourite form (Hupfeld), but the question is really, as its words imply, directed to God. The answer, however, is not therefore to be taken as a direct answer from God, as it might be in a prophetical connection: the psalmist addresses himself to God in prayer, he as it were reads the heart of God, and answers to himself the question just asked, in accordance with the mind of God. גּוּר and שָׁכַן which are usually distinguished from each other like παροικεῖν and κατοικεῖν in Hellenistic Greek, are alike in meaning in this instance. It is not a merely temporary גּוּר (lxi. 5), but for ever, that is intended. The only difference between the two interchangeable notions is this, the one denotes the finding of an abiding place of rest starting from the idea of a wandering life, the other the possession of an abiding place of rest starting from the idea of settled family life.* The holy

* In the Arabic جار الله is "one under the protection of God, dwelling as it were in the fortress of God." *vid.* Fleischer's Samachschari, S. 1, Anm. 1.

tabernacle and the holy mountain are here thought of in their spiritual character as the places of the divine presence and of the church of God assembled round the symbol of it; and accordingly the sojourning and dwelling there is not to be understood literally, but in a spiritual sense. This spiritual depth of view, first of all with local limitations, is also to be found in xxvii. 4, 5, lxi. 5. This is present even where the idea of earnestness and regularity in attending the sanctuary rises in intensity to that of constantly dwelling therein, lxv. 5, lxxxiv. 4—5; while elsewhere, as in xxiv. 3, the outward materiality of the Old Testament is not exceeded. Thus we see the idea of the sanctuary at one time contracting itself within the Old Testament limits, and at another expanding more in accordance with the spirit of the New Testament; since in this matter, as in the matter of sacrifice, the spirit of the New Testament already shews signs of life, and works powerfully through its cosmical veil, without that veil being as yet rent. The answer to the question, so like the spirit of the New Testament in its intention, is also itself no less New Testament in its character: Not every one who saith Lord, Lord, but they who do the will of God, shall enjoy the rights of friendship with Him. But His will concerns the very substance of the Law, viz. our duties towards all men, and the inward state of the heart towards God.

In the expression הוֹלֵךְ תְּמִים (here and in Prov. xxviii. 18), תמים is either a closer definition of the subject: one walking as an upright man, like הֹלֵךְ רָכִיל one going about as a slanderer, cf. הַיָּשָׁר־הוֹלֵךְ Mic. ii. 7 "the upright as one walking"; or it is an accusative of the object, as in הוֹלֵךְ צְדָקוֹת Isa. xxxiii. 15: one who walks uprightness, *i. e.* one who makes uprightness his way, his mode of action; since תמים may mean *integrum = integritas,* and this is strongly favoured by הֹלְכִים בְּתָמִים, which is used interchangeably with it in Ps. lxxxiv. 12 (those who walk in uprightness). Instead of עֹשֵׂה צְדָקָה we have the poetical form of expression פֹּעֵל צֶדֶק. The characterising of the outward walk and action is followed in ver. 2*b* by the characterising of the inward nature: speaking truth in his heart, not: with his heart (not merely

with his mouth); for in the phrase אָמַר בְּלִבּוֹ, בְּ is always the *Beth* of the place, not of the instrument — the meaning therefore is: it is not falsehood and deceit that he thinks and plans inwardly, but truth (Hitz.). We have three characteristics here: a spotless walk, conduct ordered according to God's will, and a truth-loving mode of thought.

Vers. 3—5. The distich which contains the question and that containing the general answer are now followed by three tristichs, which work the answer out in detail. The description is continued in independent clauses, which, however, have logically the value of relative clauses. The *perff.* have the signification of abstract presents, for they are the expression of tried qualities, of the habitual mode of action, of that which the man, who is the subject of the question, never did and what consequently it is not his wont to do. רָגַל means to go about, whether in order to spie out (which is it usual meaning), or to gossip and slander (here, and the *Piel* in 2 Sam. xix. 28; cf. רָכַל, רָכִיל). Instead בִּלְשֹׁנוֹ we have עַל־לְשֹׁנוֹ (with *Dag.* in the second ל, in order that it may be read with emphasis and not slurred over*), because a word lies upon the tongue ere it is uttered, the speaker brings it up as it were from within on to his tongue or lips, xvi. 4, l. 16, Ezek. xxxvi. 3. The assonance of לְרֵעֵהוּ רָעָה is well conceived. To do evil to him who is bound to us by the ties of kindred and friendship, is a sin which will bring its own punishment. קָרוֹב is also the parallel word to רֵעַ in Exod. xxxii. 27. Both are here intended to refer not merely to persons of the same nation; for whatever is sinful in itself and under any circumstances whatever, is also sinful in relation to every man according to the morality of the Old Testament. The assertion of Hupfeld and others that נָשָׂא in conjunction with חֶרְפָּה means *efferre* = *effari*, is opposed by its combination with עַל and its use elsewhere in the phrase נשׂא חרפה "to bear reproach" (lxix. 8). It means (since נשׂא is just as much *tollere* as *ferre*) to bring reproach on any one, or load any one with reproach. Re-

* *vid.* the rule for this orthophonic *Dag.* in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1863, S. 413.

proach is a burden which is more easily put on than cast off; *audacter calumniare, semper aliquid hæret.*

In ver. 4*a* the interpretation "he is little in his own eyes, despised," of which Hupfeld, rejecting it, says that Hitzig has picked it up out of the dust, is to be retained. Even the Targ., Saad., Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Urbino (in his Grammar, אהל מועד) take נִבְזֶה בְּעֵינָיו together, even though explaining it differently, and it is accordingly accented by Baer נִבְזֶה בְּעֵינָיו וְנֶמְאָס (*Mahpach, Asla Legarme, Rebia magnum*).* God exalts him who is קָטָן בְּעֵינָיו, 1 Sam. xv. 17. David, when he brought up the ark of his God, could not sufficiently degrade himself (נָקַל), and appeared שָׁפָל בְּעֵינָיו, 2 Sam. vi. 22. This lowliness, which David also confesses in Ps. cxxxi., is noted here and throughout the whole of the Old Testament, *e. g.,* Isa. lvii. 15, as a condition of being well-pleasing before God; just as it is in reality the chief of all virtues. On the other hand, it is mostly translated either, according to the usual accentuation, with which the *Beth* of בעיניו is dageshed: the reprobate is despised in his eyes (Rashi, Hupf.), or in accordance with the above accentuation: despised in his eyes is the reprobate (Maurer, Hengst., Olsh., Luzzatto); but this would say but little, and be badly expressed. For the placing together of two participles without an article, and moreover of similar meaning, with the design of the one being taken as subject and the other as predicate, is to be repudiated simply on the ground of style; and the difference among expositors shews how equivocal the expression is.

On the other hand, when we translate it: "despicable is he in his own eyes, worthy to be despised" (Ges. § 134, 1), we can appeal to xiv. 1, where הִשְׁחִיתוּ is intensified just in the same way by הִתְעִיבוּ, as נִבְזֶה is here by נֶמְאָס; cf. also Gen. xxx. 31, Job xxxi. 23, Isa. xliii. 4. The antithesis of

* The usual accentuation נבזה ובעיניו נמאס forcibly separates בעיניו from נבזה to which according to its position it belongs. And Heidenheim's accentuation נבזה בעיניו נמאס is to be rejected on accentuological grounds, because of two like distinctives the second has always a less distinctive value than the first. We are consequently only left to the one given above. The MSS. vary.

ver. 4*b* to ver. 4*a* is also thus fully met: he himself seems to himself unworthy of any respect, whereas he constantly shews respect to others; and the standard by which he judges is the fear of God. His own fear of Jahve is manifest from the self-denying strictness with which he performs his vows. This sense of נִשְׁבַּע לָהָרַע is entirely misapprehended when it is rendered: he swears to his neighbour (רֵע = רַע), which ought to be לְרֵעֵהוּ, or: he swears to the wicked (and keeps to what he has thus solemnly promised), which ought to be לָרָע; for to what purpose would be the omission of the elision of the article, which is extremely rarely (xxxvi. 6) not attended to in the classic style of the period before the Exile? The words have reference to Lev. v. 4: if any one swear, thoughtlessly pronouncing לָהָרַע אוֹ לְהֵיטִיב, to do evil or to do good, etc. The subject spoken of is oaths which are forgotten, and the forgetting of which must be atoned for by an *asham,* whether the nature of the oath be something unpleasant and injurious, or agreeable and profitable, to the person making the vow. The retrospective reference of להרע to the subject is self-evident; for to injure another is indeed a sin, the vowing and performance of which, not its omission, would require to be expiated. On לְהָרֵעַ = לְהָרַע *vid.* Ges. § 67, rem. 6. The hypothetical antecedent (cf. *e. g.,* 2 Kings v. 13) is followed by וְלֹא יָמֵר as an apodosis. The verb הֵמִיר is native to the law of vows, which, if any one has vowed an animal in sacrifice, forbids both changing it for its money value (הֶחֱלִיף) and exchanging it for another, be it טוֹב בְּרָע אוֹ־רָע בְּטוֹב, Lev. xxvii. 10, 33. The psalmist of course does not use these words in the technical sense in which they are used in the Law. Swearing includes making a vow, and לֹא יָמֵר disavows not merely any exchanging of that which was solemnly promised, but also any alteration of that which was sworn: he does not misuse the name of God in anywise, לַשָּׁוְא.

In ver. 5*a* the psalmist also has a passage of the Tôra before his mind, viz. Lev. xxv. 37, cf. Exod. xxii. 24, Deut. xxiii. 20, Ezek. xviii. 8. נָתַן בְּנֶשֶׁךְ signifies to give a thing away in order to take usury (נֶשֶׁךְ from נָשַׁךְ to bite, δάκνειν) for it. The receiver or demander of interest is מַשִּׁיךְ, the

one who pays interest נֹשֶׁךְ, the interest itself נֶשֶׁךְ. The trait of character described in ver. 5*b* also recalls the language of the Mosaic law: שֹׁחַד לֹא יִקָּח, the prohibition Exod. xxiii. 8, Deut. xvi. 19; and עָלֶיהָ נָקִי, the curse Deut. xxvii. 25: on account of the innocent, *i. e.* against him, to condemn him. Whether it be as a loan or as a gift, he gives without conditions, and if he attain the dignity of a judge he is proof against bribery, especially with reference to the destruction of the innocent. And now instead of closing in conformity with the description of character already given: such a man shall dwell, etc., the concluding sentence takes a different form, moulded in accordance with the spiritual meaning of the opening question: he who doeth these things shall never be moved (יִמּוֹט *fut. Niph.*), he stands fast, being upheld by Jahve, hidden in His fellowship; nothing from without, no misfortune, can cause his overthrow.

PSALM XVI.

REFUGE IN GOD, THE HIGHEST GOOD, IN THE PRESENCE OF DISTRESS AND OF DEATH.

1 PRESERVE me, O God, for in Thee do I hide myself
2 I say unto Jahve: "Thou art my Lord,
Besides Thee I have no good",
3 And to the saints who are in the earth:
"These are the excellent, in whom is all my delight".

4 Their sorrows shall be multiplied who have bartered for an idol —
I will not pour out their drink-offerings of blood,
Nor take their names upon my lips.
5 Jahve is the portion of my land and of my cup,
Thou makest my lot illustrious.

6 The lines have fallen unto me in pleasant places,
Yea, the heritage appears fair to me.
7 I will bless Jahve, who hath given me counsel;
In the night-seasons also my reins instruct me.

8 I have set Jahve always before me,
For He is at my right hand — therefore I shall not be moved.

9 Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory exulteth,
My flesh also shall dwell free of care.
10 For Thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades,
Nor give up Thy Holy One to see the pit;
11 Thou wilt make me know the path of life —
Fulness of joy is in Thy countenance,
Pleasures are in Thy right hand for evermore.

The preceding Psalm closed with the words לֹא יִמּוֹט; this word of promise is repeated in xvi. 8 as an utterance of faith in the mouth of David. We are here confronted by a pattern of the unchangeable believing confidence of a friend of God; for the writer of Ps. xvi. is in danger of death, as is to be inferred from the prayer expressed in ver. 1 and the expectation in ver. 10. But there is no trace of anything like bitter complaint, gloomy conflict, or hard struggle: the cry for help is immediately swallowed up by an overpowering and blessed consciousness and a bright hope. There reigns in the whole Psalm, a settled calm, an inward joy, and a joyous confidence, which is certain that everything that it can desire for the present and for the future it possesses in its God.

The Psalm is inscribed לְדָוִד; and Hitzig also confesses that "David may be inferred from its language". Whatever can mark a Psalm as Davidic we find combined in this Psalm: thoughts crowding together in compressed language, which becomes in ver. 4 bold even to harshness, but then becomes clear and moves more rapidly; an antiquated, peculiar, and highly poetic impress (אֲדֹנָי, *my Lord*, מָנָת, נַחֲלַת, שָׁפַר, תּוֹמִיךְ); and a well-devised grouping of the strophes. In addition to all these, there are manifold points of contact with indisputably genuine Davidic Psalms (comp. *e. g.*, ver. 5 with xi. 6; ver. 10 with iv. 4; ver. 11 with xvii. 15), and with indisputably ancient portions of the Pentateuch (Exod. xxiii. 13, xix. 6, Gen. xlix. 6). Scarcely any other Psalm shews so clearly as this, what deep roots psalm-poetry

has struck into the Tôra, both as it regards the matter and the language. Concerning the circumstances of its composition, *vid.* on Ps. xxx.

The superscription לְדָוִד מִכְתָּם, Ps. xvi. has in common with Ps. lvi.—lx. After the analogy of the other superscriptions, it must have a technical meaning. This at once militates against Hitzig's explanation, that it is a poem hitherto unknown, an ἀνέκδοτον, according to the Arabic *mâktum*, hidden, secret, just as also against the meaning κειμήλιον, which says nothing further to help us. The LXX. translates it στηλογραφία (εἰς στηλογραφίαν), instead of which the Old Latin version has *tituli inscriptio* (Hesychius τίτλος· πτυχίον ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον). That this translation accords with the tradition is shewn by that of the Targum גְּלִיפָא תְּרִיצָא *sculptura recta* (not *erecta* as Hupfeld renders it). Both versions give the verb the meaning כָּתַם *insculpere*, which is supported both by a comparison with כָּתַב, cogn. חָצַב, חָצַב, and by חָתַם *imprimere* (*sigillum*). Moreover, the sin of Israel is called נִכְתָּם in Jer. ii. 22 (cf. xvii. 1) as being a deeply impressed spot, not to be wiped out. If we now look more closely into the *Michtam* Psalms as a whole, we find they have two prevailing features in common. Sometimes significant and remarkable words are introduced by וַיֹּאמֶר, אָמַרְתִּי, דִּבֶּר, xvi. 2, lviii. 12, lx. 8, cf. Isa. xxxviii. 10, 11 (in Hezekiah's psalm, which is inscribed מִכְתָּב = מִכְתָּם as it is perhaps to be read); sometimes words of this character are repeated after the manner of a refrain, as in Ps. lvi.: *I will not fear, what can man do to me!* in Ps. lvii.: *Be Thou exalted, Elohim, above the heavens, Thy glory above all the earth!* and in Ps. lix.: *For Elohim is my high tower, my merciful God.* Hezekiah's psalm unites this characteristic with the other. Accordingly מכתם, like ἐπίγραμμα,* appears to mean first of all an inscription and then to be equivalent to an inscription-poem or epigram, a poem containing pithy sayings; since in the Psalms of this order some expressive sentence, after the style of an inscription or a motto on a

* In modern Jewish poetry מכתם is actually the name for the epigram.

monument, is brought prominently forward, by being either specially introduced or repeated as a refrain.

The strophe-schema is 5. 5. 6. 7. The last strophe, which has grown to seven lines, is an expression of joyous hopes in the face of death, which extend onward even into eternity.

Vers. 1—3. The Psalm begins with a prayer that is based upon faith, the special meaning of which becomes clear from ver. 10: May God preserve him (which He is able to do as being אֵל, the Almighty, able to do all things), who has no other refuge in which he has hidden and will hide but Him. This short introit is excepted from the parallelism; so far therefore it is monostichic, — a sigh expressing everything in few words. And the emphatic pronunciation שָׁמְרֵנִי *shāmᵉreni* harmonises with it; for it is to be read thus, just as in lxxxvi. 2, cxix. 167 *shāmᵉrah* (cf. on Isa. xxxviii. 14 עָשְׁקָה), according to the express testimony of the Masora.*

The text of the next two verses (so it appears) needs to be improved in two respects. The reading אָמַרְתְּ as addressed to the soul (Targ.), cf. Lam. iii. 24 sq., is opposed by the absence of any mention of the thing addressed. It rests upon a misconception of the defective form of writing, אָמַרְתִּ (Ges. § 44, rem. 4). Hitzig and Ewald (§ 190, *d*) suppose that in such cases a rejection of the final vowel, which really occurs in the language of the people, after the manner of the Aramaic (אֲמַרַת or אֲמָרַת), lies at the bottom of the form. And it does really seem as though the frequent occurrence of this defective form (ידעתי = ידעת cxl. 13, Job xlii. 2, בניתי = בנית 1 Kings viii. 48, עשׂיתי = עשׂית Ezek. xvi. 59, cf. 2 Kings xviii. 20, אמרת now pointed אמרתָ, with Isa. xxxvi. 5) has its occasion at least in some such cutting away of the *i*, peculiar to the language of the common people; although,

---

* The Masora observes ב׳ גרשין בספרא, *i. e.* twice in the Psalter שׁמרה is in the imperative, the ŏ being displaced by *Gaja (Metheg)* and changed into *ā*, *vid.* Baer, *Torath Emeth* p. 22 sq. In spite of this the grammarians are not agreed as to the pronunciation of the imperative and infinitive forms when so pointed. Luzzatto, like Lonzano, reads it *shŏmᵉreni*.

if David wrote it so, אמרת is not intended to be read otherwise than it is in xxxi. 15, cxl. 7.*

First of all David gives expression to his confession of Jahve, to whom he submits himself unconditionally, and whom he sets above everything else without exception. Since the suffix of אֲדֹנָי (properly *domini mei* = *domine mi*, Gen. xviii. 3, cf. xix. 2), which has become mostly lost sight of in the usage of the language, now and then retains its original meaning, as it does indisputably in xxxv. 23, it is certainly to be rendered also here: "Thou art my Lord" and not "Thou art the Lord". The emphasis lies expressly on the "my". It is the unreserved and joyous feeling of dependence (more that of the little child, than of the servant), which is expressed in this first confession. For, as the second clause of the confession says: Jahve, who is his Lord, is also his benefactor, yea even his highest good. The preposition עַל frequently introduces that which extends beyond something else, Gen. xlviii. 22 (cf. lxxxix. 8, xcv. 3), and to this passage may be added Gen. xxxi. 50, xxxii. 12, Exod. xxxv. 22, Num. xxxi. 8, Deut. xix. 9, xxii. 6, the one thing being above, or co-ordinate with, the other. So also here: "my good, *i. e.* whatever makes me truly happy, is not above Thee", *i. e.* in addition to Thee, beside Thee; according to the sense it is equivalent to out of Thee or without Thee (as the Targ., Symm., and Jerome render it), Thou alone, without exception, art my good. In connection with this rendering of the עַל, the בַּל (poetic, and contracted from בְּלִי), which is unknown to the literature before David's time, presents no difficulty. As in Prov. xxiii. 7 it is short for בַּל־תִּהְיֶה. Hengstenberg remarks, "Just as *Thou art the Lord!* is the response of the soul to the words *I am the Lord thy God* (Exod. xx. 2), so *Thou only art my salvation!* is the response to *Thou shalt have no other gods beside Me* (עַל־פָּנַי)". The psalmist knows no fountain of true hap-

* Pinsker's view (*Einleit.* S. 100—102), who considers פַּעַלְתָּ to have sprung from פַּעֲלָה as the primary form of the 1. *pers. sing*, from which then came פָּעַלְתִּי and later still פָּעַיְתִּי, is untenable according to the history of the language.

piness but Jahve, in Him he possesses all, his treasure is in Heaven.

Such is his confession to Jahve. But he also has those on earth to whom he makes confession. Transposing the ו we read:

וְלִקְדוֹשִׁים אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ
הֵמָּה אַדִּירֵי כָל־חֶפְצִי־בָם׃

While Diestel's alteration: "to the saints, who are in his land, he makes himself glorious, and all his delight is in them," is altogether strange to this verse: the above transfer of the *Waw** suffices to remove its difficulties, and that in a way quite in accordance with the connection. Now it is clear, that לקדושים, as has been supposed by some, is the dative governed by אָמַרְתִּי, the influence of which is thus carried forward; it is clear what is meant by the addition אשר בארץ, which distinguishes the object of his affection here below from the One above, who is incomparably the highest; it is clear, as to what הֵמָּה defines, whereas otherwise this purely descriptive relative clause אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ הֵמָּה (which von Ortenberg transposes into אֲשֶׁר אֶרֶץ בָּהֵמָּה) appears to be useless and surprises one both on account of its redundancy (since המה is superfluous, cf. *e. g.* 2 Sam. vii. 9, ii. 18) and on account of its arrangement of the words (an arrangement, which is usual in connection with a negative construction, Deut. xx. 15, 2 Chron. viii. 7, cf. Gen. ix. 3, Ezek. xii. 10); it is clear, in what sense אדירי alternates with קדושים, since it is not those who are accounted by the world as אדירים on account of their worldly power and possessions (cxxxvi. 18, 2 Chron. xxiii. 20), but the holy, prized by him as being also glorious, partakers of higher glory and worthy of higher honour; and moreover, this corrected arrangement of the verse harmonises with the *Michtam* character of the Psalm. The thought thus obtained, is the thought one expected (love to God and love to His saints), and the one which one is also obliged to wring from the text as we have it, either by translating with De Welte, Maurer, Dietrich and others:

* Approved by Kamphausen and by the critic in the *Liter. Blatt* of the *Allgem. Kirchen-Zeitung* 1864 S. 107.

"the saints who are in the land, they are the excellent in whom I have all my delight", — a *Waw apodoseos*, with which one could only be satisfied if it were וְהֵמָּה (cf. 2 Sam. xv. 34) — or: "the saints who are in the land and the glorious — all my delight is in them". By both these interpretations, לְ would be the exponent of the *nom. absol.* which is elsewhere detached and placed at the beginning of a sentence, and this לְ of reference (Ew. § 310, *a*) is really common to every style (Num. xviii. 8, Isa. xxxii. 1, Eccl. ix. 4); whereas the לְ understood of the fellowship in which he stands when thus making confession to Jahve: associating myself with the saints (Hengst.), with (von Lengerke), among the saints (Hupf., Thenius), would be a preposition most liable to be misapprehended, and makes ver. 3 a cumbersome appendage of ver. 2. But if לְ be taken as the *Lamed* of reference then the elliptical construct וְאַדִּירֵי, to which הָאָרֶץ ought to be supplied, remains a stumbling-block not to be easily set aside. For such an isolation of the connecting form from its genitive cannot be shown to be syntactically possible in Hebrew (*vid.* on 2 Kings ix. 17, Thenius, and Keil); nor are we compelled to suppose in this instance what cannot be proved elsewhere, since כָּל־חֶפְצֵי־בָם is, without any harshness, subordinate to ואדירי as a genitival notion (Ges. § 116, 3). And still in connection with the reading ואדירי, both the formation of the sentence which, beginning with לְ, leads one to expect an apodosis, and the relation of ver. 3 to ver. 2, according to which the central point of the declaration must lie just within כָּל־חֶפְצֵי־בָם, are opposed to this rendering of the words וְאַדִּירֵי כָל־ חֶפְצֵי־בָם.

Thus, therefore, we come back to the above easy improvement of the text. קְדוֹשִׁים are those in whom the will of Jahve concerning Israel, that it should be a holy nation (Exod. xix. 6, Deut. vii. 6), has been fulfilled, viz. the living members of the *ecclesia sanctorum* in this world (for there is also one in the other world, lxxxix. 6). Glory, δόξα, is the outward manifestation of holiness. It is ordained of God for the sanctified (cf. Rom. viii. 30), whose moral nobility is now for the present veiled under the menial form

of the עָנִי; and in the eyes of David they already possess it. His spiritual vision pierces through the outward form of the servant. His verdict is like the verdict of God, who is his all in all. The saints, and they only, are the excellent to him. His whole delight is centred in them, all his respect and affection is given to them. The congregation of the saints is his *Chephzibah,* Isa. lxii. 4 (cf. 2 Kings xxi. 1).

Vers. 4—5. As he loves the saints so, on the other hand, he abhors the apostates and their idols. אַחֵר מָהֲרוּ is to be construed as an appositional relative clause to the preceding: *multi sunt cruciatus* (cf. xxxii. 10) *eorum, eorum scil. qui alium permutant.* The expression would flow on more smoothly if it were יִרְבּוּ: they multiply, or increase their pains, who..., so that אחר מהרו would be the subject, for instance like ה' אֲהֵבוֹ (he whom Jahve loves), Isa. xlviii. 14. This ver. 4 forms a perfect antithesis to ver. 3. In David's eyes the saints are already the glorified, in whom his delight centres; while, as he knows, a future full of anguish is in store for the idolatrous, and their worship, yea, their very names are an abomination to him. The suffixes of נְסָכֵיהֶם and שְׁמוֹתָם might be referred to the idols according to Exod. xxiii. 13, Hos. ii. 19, if אַחֵר be taken collectively as equivalent to אַחֵר ם, as in Job viii. 19. But it is more natural to assign the same reference to them as to the suffix of עַצְּבוֹתָם, which does not signify "their idols" (for idols are עֲצַבִּים), but their torments, pains (from עֲצֶבֶת derived from עָצַב), cxlvii. 3, Job ix. 28. The thought is similar to 1 Tim. vi. 10, ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύναις ποικίλαις. אַחֵר is a general designation of the broadest kind for everything that is not God, but which man makes his idol beside God and in opposition to God (cf. Isa. xlii. 8, xlviii. 11). מָהֲרוּ cannot mean *festinant,* for in this signification it is only found in *Piel* מִהֵר, and that once with a local, but not a personal, accusative of the direction, Nah. ii. 6. It is therefore to be rendered (and the *perf.* is also better adapted to this meaning): they have taken in exchange that which is not God (מָהַר like הֵמִיר, cvi. 20, Jer. ii. 11). Perhaps (cf. the phrase זָנָה אַחֲרֵי) the secondary meaning of wooing and fondling is connected with it; for מָהַר is the proper word for acquiring

a wife by paying down the price asked by her father, Exod. xxii. 15. With such persons, who may seem to be אַדִּירִים in the eyes of the world, but for whom a future full of anguish is in store, David has nothing whatever to do: he will not pour out drink-offerings as they pour them out. נְסָכֵיהֶם has the *Dag. lene*, as it always has. They are not called מִדָּם as actually consisting of blood, or of wine actually mingled with blood; but consisting as it were of blood, because they are offered with blood-stained hands and blood-guilty consciences. מִן is the *mun* of derivation; in this instance (as in Amos iv. 5, cf. Hos. vi. 8) of the material, and is used in other instances also for similar virtually adjectival expressions, x. 18, xvii. 14, lxxx. 14.

In ver. 4*c* the expression of his abhorrence attains its climax: even their names, *i. e.* the names of their false gods, which they call out, he shuns taking upon his lips, just as is actually forbidden in the Tôra, Exod. xxiii. 13 (cf. *Const. Apost.* V. 10 εἴδωλον μνημονεύειν ὀνόματα δαιμονικά). He takes the side of Jahve. Whatever he may wish for, he possesses in Him; and whatever he has in Him, is always secured to him by Him. חֶלְקִי does not here mean food (Böttch.), for in this sense חֵלֶק (Lev. vi. 10) and מָנָה (1 Sam. i. 4) are identical; and parallel passages like cxlii. 6 shew what חלקי means when applied to Jahve. According to xi. 6, כוסי is also a genitive just like חלקי; מְנָת חֵלֶק is the share of landed property assigned to any one; מְנָת כּוֹס the share of the cup according to paternal apportionment. The tribe of Levi received no territory in the distribution of the country, from which they might have maintained themselves; Jahve was to be their חֵלֶק, Num. xviii. 20, and the gifts consecrated to Jahve were to be their food, Deut. x. 9, xviii. 1 sq. But nevertheless all Israel is βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, Exod. xix. 6, towards which even קדושים and אדרים in ver. 3 pointed; so that, therefore, the very thing represented by the tribe of Levi in outward relation to the nation, holds good, in all its deep spiritual significance, of every believer. It is not anything earthly, visible, created, and material, that is allotted to him as his possession and his sustenance, but Jahve and Him only; but in Him is perfect contentment.

In ver. 5*b*, תּוֹמִיךְ, as it stands, looks at first sight as though it were the *Hiph.* of a verb יָמַךְ (וָמַךְ). But such a verb is not to be found anywhere else, we must therefore seek some other explanation of the word. It cannot be a substantive in the signification of possession (Maurer, Ewald), for such a substantival form does not exist. It might more readily be explained as a participle = תּוֹמֵךְ, somewhat like יוֹסִיף, Isa. xxix. 4, xxxviii. 5, Eccl. i. 18, = יוֹסֵף, — a comparison which has been made by Aben-Ezra (*Sefath Jether* No. 421) and Kimchi (*Michlol* 11*a*), — a form of the participle to which, in writing at least, סוֹבִיב, 2 Kings viii. 21, forms a transition; but there is good reason to doubt the existence of such a form. Had the poet intended to use the *part.* of תמך, it is more probable he would have written אתה תּוֹמְכִי גורלי, just as the LXX. translators might have had it before them, taking the *Chirek compaginis* as a suffix: σὺ εἶ ὁ ἀποκαθιστῶν τὴν κληρονομίαν μου ἐμοί (Böttcher). For the conjecture of Olshausen and Thenius, תּוֹסִיף in the sense: "thou art continually my portion" halts both in thought and expression. Hitzig's conjecture תּוֹמֶיךָ "thou, thy Tummîm are my lot", is more successful and tempting. But the fact that the תֻּמִּים are never found (not even in Deut. xxxiii. 8) without the אוּרִים, is against it. Nevertheless, we should prefer this conjecture to the other explanations, if the word would not admit of being explained as *Hiph.* from יָמַךְ (וָמַךְ), which is the most natural explanation. Schultens has compared the Arabic *wamika*, to be broad, from which there is a *Hiphil* form أَوْمَكَ, to make broad, in Syro-Arabic, that is in use even in the present day among the common people.* And since we must at any rate come down to the supposition of something unusual about this תומיך, it is surely not too bold to regard it as a ἅπαξ γεγραμμ.: Thou

* The Arabic Lexicographers are only acquainted with a noun *wamka*, breadth (*amplitudo*), but not with the verb. And even the noun does not belong to the universal and classical language. But at the present day الوَمْك (pronounced *wumk*), breadth, and *wamik* are in common use in Damascus; and it is only the verb that is shunned in the better conversational style. — Wetzstein.

makest broad my lot, *i. e.* ensurest for me a spacious habitation, a broad place, as the possession that falleth to me,* — a thought, that is expanded in ver. 6.

Vers. 6—8. The measuring lines (חֲבָלִים) are cast (Mic. ii. 5) and fall to any one just where and as far as his property is assigned to him; so that נָפַל חֶבֶל (Josh. xvii. 5) is also said of the falling to any one of his allotted portion of land. נְעִמִים (according to the Masora defective as also in ver. 11 נְעִמוֹת) is a *pluralet.*, the plural that is used to denote a unity in the circumstances, and a similarity in the relations of time and space, Ges. § 108, 2, *a*; and it signifies both pleasant circumstances, Job xxxvi. 11, and, as here, a pleasant locality, Lat. *amœna* (to which נְעִמוֹת in ver. 11, more strictly corresponds). The lines have fallen to him in a charming district, viz. in the pleasurable fellowship of God, this most blessed domain of love has become his paradisaic possession. With אַף he rises from the fact to the perfect contentment which it secures to him: such a heritage seems to him to be fair, he finds a source of inward pleasure and satisfaction in it. נַחֲלָת — according to Ew. § 173, *d*, lengthened from the construct form נַחֲלַת (like נְגִינַת lxi. 1); according to Hupfeld, springing from נַחֲלָתִי (by the same apocope that is so common in Syriac, perhaps like אָמַרְתְּ ver. 1 from אָמַרְתִּי) just like זִמְרָת Exod. xv. 2 — is rather, since in the former view there is no law for the change of vowel and such an application of the form as we find in lx. 13 (cviii. 13) is opposed to the latter, a stunted

---

* It is scarcely possible for two words to be more nearly identical than גּוֹרָל and κλῆρος. The latter, usually derived from κλάω (a piece broken off), is derived from κέλεσθαι (a determining of the divine will) in Döderlein's *Homer. Glossar*, iii. 124. But perhaps it is one word with גורל. Moreover κλῆρος signifies 1) the sign by which anything whatever falls to one among a number of persons in conformity with the decision of chance or of the divine will, a pebble, potsherd, or the like. So in Homer, *Il.* iii. 316, vii. 175, xxiii. 351, *Od.* x. 206, where casting lots is described with the expression κλῆρος. 2) The object that falls to any one by lot, *patrimonium, e. g. Od.* xiv. 64, *Il.* xv. 498, οἶκος καὶ κλῆρος, especially of lands. 3) an inheritance without the notion of the lot, and even without any thought of inheriting, absolutely: a settled, landed property. It is the regular expression for the allotments of land assigned to colonists (κληροῦχοι).

form of נְחָלָתָה: the heritage = such a heritage pleases me, lit. seems fair to me (שְׁפַר, cognate root סְפַר, צְפַר, cognate in meaning בשׂר, בְּשַׂר, to rub, polish, make shining, intr. שָׂפַר to be shining, beautiful). עָלַי of beauty known and felt by him (cf. Esth. iii. 9 with 1 Sam. xxv. 36 טוב עליו, and the later way of expressing it Dan. iii. 32). But since the giver and the gift are one and the same, the joy he has in the inheritance becomes of itself a constant thanksgiving to and blessing of the Giver, that He (אשׁר *quippe qui*) has counselled him (lxxiii. 24) to chose the one thing needful, the good part. Even in the night-seasons his heart keeps watch, even then his reins admonish him (יסר, here of moral incitement, as in Isa. viii. 11, to warn). The reins are conceived of as the seat of the blessed feeling that Jahve is his possession (*vid. Psychol.* S. 268; tr. p. 316). He is impelled from within to offer heart-felt thanks to his merciful and faithful God. He has Jahve always before him, Jahve is the point towards which he constantly directs his undiverted gaze; and it is easy for him to have Him thus ever present, for He is מִימִינִי (supply הוּא, as in xxii. 29, lv. 20, cxii. 4), at my right hand (*i. e.* where my right hand begins, close beside me), so that he has no need to draw upon his power of imagination. The words בַּל־אֶמּוֹט, without any conjunction, express the natural effect of this, both in consciousness and in reality: he will not and cannot totter, he will not yield and be overthrown.

Vers. 9—11. Thus then, as this concluding strophe, as it were like seven rays of light, affirms, he has the most blessed prospect before him, without any need to fear death. Because Jahve is thus near at hand to help him, his heart becomes joyful (שָׂמַח) and his glory, *i. e.* his soul (*vid.* on vii. 6) rejoices, the joy breaking forth in rejoicing, as the *fut. consec.* affirms. There is no passage of Scripture that so closely resembles this as 1 Thess. v. 23. לֵב is πνεῦμα (νοῦς), כָּבוֹד, ψυχή (*vid. Psychol.* S. 98; tr. p. 119), בָּשָׂר (according to its primary meaning, *attrectabile,* that which is frail), σῶμα. The ἀμέμπτως τηρηθῆναι which the apostle in the above passage desires for his readers in respect of all three parts of their being, David here expresses as a confident expectation; for אַף implies that he also hopes for his body

that which he hopes for his spirit-life centred in the heart, and for his soul raised to dignity both by the work of creation and of grace. He looks death calmly and triumphantly in the face, even his flesh shall dwell or lie securely, viz. without being seized with trembling at its approaching corruption. David's hope rests on this conclusion: it is impossible for the man, who, in appropriating faith and actual experience, calls God his own, to fall into the hands of death. For ver. 10 shews, that what is here thought of in connection with לָבֶטַח שָׁכַן, dwelling in safety under the divine protection (Deut. xxxiii. 12, 28, cf. Prov. iii. 24), is preservation from death. שַׁחַת is rendered by the LXX. διαφθορά, as though it came from שָׁחַת διαφθείρειν, as perhaps it may do in Job xvii. 14. But in vii. 16 the LXX. has βόθρος, which is the more correct: prop. a sinking in, from שׁוּחַ to sink, to be sunk, like נַחַת from נוּחַ, רַחַת from רוּחַ. To leave to the unseen world (עָזַב prop. to loosen, let go) is equivalent to abandoning one to it, so that he becomes its prey. Ver. 10*b* — where to see the grave (xlix. 10), equivalent to, to succumb to the state of the grave, *i. e.* death (lxxxix. 49, Lk. ii. 26, John viii. 51) is the opposite of "seeing life", *i. e.* experiencing and enjoying it (Eccl. ix. 9, John iii. 36), the sense of sight being used as the noblest of the senses to denote the *sensus communis, i. e.* the common sense lying at the basis of all feeling and perception, and figuratively of all active and passive experience (*Psychol.* S. 234; tr. p. 276) — shews, that what is said here is not intended of an abandonment by which, having once come under the power of death, there is no coming forth again (Böttcher). It is therefore the hope of not dying, that is expressed by David in ver. 10. For by חֲסִידְךָ David means himself. According to Norzi, the Spanish MSS. have חֲסִידֶיךָ with the Masoretic note יתיר יוֹ, and the LXX., Targ., and Syriac translate, and the Talmud and Midrash interpret it, in accordance with this *Keri*. There is no ground for the reading חֲסִידֶיךָ, and it is also opposed by the personal form of expression surrounding it.*

---

* Most MSS. and the best, which have no distinction of *Keri* and *Chethib* here, read חֲסִידְךָ, as also the *Biblia Ven.* 1521, the Spanish

The positive expression of hope in ver. 11 comes as a companion to the negative just expressed: Thou wilt grant me to experience (הוֹדִיעַ, is used, as usual, of the presentation of a knowledge, which concerns the whole man and not his understanding merely) אֹרַח חַיִּים, the path of life, *i. e.* the path to life (cf. Prov. v. 6, ii. 19 with *ib.* x. 17, Mat. vii. 14); but not so that it is conceived of as at the final goal, but as leading slowly and gradually onwards to life; חַיִּים in the most manifold sense, as, *e. g.*, in xxxvi. 10, Deut. xxx. 15: life from God, with God, and in God, the living God; the opposite of death, as the manifestation of God's wrath and banishment from Him. That his body shall not die is only the external and visible phase of that which David hopes for himself; on its inward, unseen side it is a living, inwrought of God in the whole man, which in its continuance is a walking in the divine life. The second part of ver. 11, which consists of two members, describes this life with which he solaces himself. According to the accentuation, — which marks חיים with *Olewejored* not with *Rebia magnum* or *Pazer*, — שְׂבַע שְׂמָחוֹת is not a second object dependent upon תּוֹדִיעֵנִי, but the subject of a substantival clause: a satisfying fulness of joy is אֶת־פָּנֶיךָ, with Thy countenance, *i. e.* connected with and naturally produced by beholding Thy face (אֵת preposition of fellowship, as in xxi. 7, cxl. 14); for joy is light, and God's countenance, or doxa, is the light of lights. And every kind of pleasurable things, נְעִמוֹת, He holds in His right hand, extending them to His saints — a gift which lasts for ever; נֶצַח equivalent to לָנֶצַח. נֶצַח, from the primary notion of conspicuous brightness, is duration extending beyond all else — an expression for לְעוֹלָם, which David has probably coined, for it appears for the first time in the Davidic Psalms. Pleasures are in Thy right hand continually — God's right hand is never empty, His fulness is inexhaustible.

The apostolic application of this Psalm (Acts ii. 29—32, xiii. 35—37) is based on the considerations that David's

---

Polyglott and other older printed copies. Those MSS. which give חֲסִידֶיךָ (without any *Keri*), on the other hand, scarcely come under consideration.

hope of not coming under the power of death was not realised in David himself, as is at once clear, to the unlimited extent in which it is expressed in the Psalm; but that it is fulfilled in Jesus, who has not been left to Hades and whose flesh did not see corruption; and that consequently the words of the Psalm are a prophecy of David concerning Jesus, the Christ, who was promised as the heir to his throne, and whom, by reason of the promise, he had prophetically before his mind. If we look into the Psalm, we see that David, in his mode of expression, bases that hope simply upon his relation to Jahve, the ever-living One. That it has been granted to him in particular, to express this hope which is based upon the mystic relation of the חסיד to Jahve in such language, — a hope which the issue of Jesus' life has sealed by an historical fulfilment, — is to be explained from the relation, according to the promise, in which David stands to his seed, the Christ and Holy One of God, who appeared in the person of Jesus. David, the anointed of God, looking upon himself as in Jahve, the God who has given the promise, becomes the prophet of Christ; but this is only indirectly, for he speaks of himself, and what he says has also been fulfilled in his own person. But this fulfilment is not limited to the condition, that he did not succumb to any peril that threatened his life so long as the kingship would have perished with him, and that, when he died, the kingship nevertheless remained (Hofmann); nor, that he was secured against all danger of death until he had accomplished his life's mission, until he had fulfilled the vocation assigned to him in the history of the plan of redemption (Kurtz) — the hope which he cherishes for himself personally has found a fulfilment which far exceeds this. After his hope has found in Christ its full realisation in accordance with the history of the plan of redemption, it receives through Christ its personal realisation for himself also. For what he says, extends on the one hand far beyond himself, and therefore refers prophetically to Christ: *in decachordo Psalterio* — as Jerome boldly expresses it — *ab inferis suscitat resurgentem.* But on the other hand that which is predicted comes back upon himself, to raise him also from death and Hades to the beholding of God. *Verus justitiæ sol* — says

Sonntag in his *Tituli Psalmorum*, 1687 — *e sepulcro resurrexit, στήλη seu lapis sepulcralis a monumento devolutus, arcus triumphalis erectus, victoria ab hominibus reportata. En vobis Michtam! En Evangelium!* —

PSALM XVII.

FLIGHT OF AN INNOCENT AND PERSECUTED MAN FOR REFUGE IN THE LORD, WHO KNOWETH THEM THAT ARE HIS.

1 HEAR, O Jahve, righteousness, hearken to my cry,
Give ear to my prayer with undeceitful lips!
2 From Thy presence let my right go forth,
Thine eyes behold rightly.
3 Thou hast proved my heart, Thou hast visited (me) by night,
Thou hast tried me — Thou findest nothing:
If I think evil, it doth not pass my mouth.
4 In connection with the doings of men, by the words of Thy lips
I have guarded myself against the paths of the destroyer;
5 My steps held fast to Thy paths,
My footsteps have not slipped.
6 As such an one I call upon Thee, for Thou hearest me, O God!
Incline Thine ear unto me, hear my speech.
7 Shew Thy marvellous lovingkindness, Helper of those who seek refuge
From those that rise up [against them], at Thy right hand.
8 Keep me as the apple — the pupil — of the eye;
Hide me in the shadow of Thy wings
9 From the wicked, who would destroy me,
From my deadly enemies, who compass me about.
10 They have shut up their fat,
They speak proudly with their mouth;
11 At every step they have surrounded me,
Their purpose is to smite down to the earth.
12 He is like a lion that is greedy to ravin,
And like a young lion lurking in the lair.

13 Arise, Jahve, go forth to meet him, cast him down,
Deliver my soul from the wicked, with Thy sword,
14 From men, with Thy hand, Jahve — from men of this world,
Whose portion is in life, and with Thy treasures Thou fillest their belly,
They have plenty of children and leave their abundance to their young ones.
15 As for me — in righteousness shall I behold Thy face,
I will satisfy myself, when I awake, with Thine image.

Ps. xvii. is placed after Ps. xvi., because just like the latter (cf. xi. 7) it closes with the hope of a blessed and satisfying vision of God. In other respects also the two Psalms have many prominent features in common: as, for instance, the the petition שָׁמְרֵנִי, xvi. 1, xvii. 8; the retrospect on nightly fellowship with God, xvi. 7, xvii. 3; the form of address in prayer אֵל, xvi. 1, xvii. 6; the verb תָּמַךְ, xvi. 5, xvii. 5, &c. (*vid. Symbolæ* p. 49), notwithstanding a great dissimilarity in their tone. For Ps. xvi. is the first of those which we call Psalms written in the indignant style, in the series of the Davidic Psalms. The language of the Psalms of David, which is in other instances so flowing and clear, becomes more harsh and, in accordance with the subject and mood, as it were, full of unresolved dissonances (Ps. xvii. cxl. lviii. xxxvi. 2 sq., cf. x. 2—11) when describing the dissolute conduct of his enemies, and of the ungodly in general. The language is then more rough and unmanageable, and wanting in the clearness and transparency we find elsewhere. The tone of the language also becomes more dull and, as it were, a dull murmur. It rolls on like the rumble of distant thunder, by piling up the suffixes *mo, āmo, ēmo,* as in xvii. 10, xxxv. 16, lxiv. 6, 9, where David speaks of his enemies and describes them in a tone suggested by the indignation, which is working within his breast; or in lix. 12—14, lvi. 8, xxi. 10—13, cxl. 10, lviii. 7., where, as in prophetic language, he announces to them of the judgment of God. The more vehement and less orderly flow of the language which we find here, is the result of the inward tumult of his feelings.

There are so many parallels in the thought and expression of thought of this Psalm in other Davidic Psalms (among those we have already commented on we may instance more especially Ps. vii. and xi., and also iv. and x.), that even Hitzig admits the לדוד. The author of the Psalm is persecuted, and others with him; foes, among whom one, their leader, stands prominently forward, plot against his life, and have encompassed him about in the most threatening manner, eager for his death. All this corresponds, line for line, with the situation of David in the wilderness of *Maon* (about three hours and three quarters S.S.E. of Hebron), as narrated in 1 Sam. xxiii. 25 sq., when Saul and his men were so close upon the heels of David and his men, that he only escaped capture by a most fortunate incident.

The only name inscribed on this Psalm is תְּפִלָּה (a prayer), the most comprehensive name for the Psalms, and the oldest (lxxii. 20); for שִׁיר and מִזְמוֹר were only given to them when they were sung in the liturgy and with musical accompaniment. As the title of a Psalm it is found five times (xvii. lxxxvi. xc. cii. cxlii) in the Psalter, and besides that once, in Hab. iii. Habakkuk's תפלה is a hymn composed for music. But in the Psalter we do not find any indication of the Psalms thus inscribed being arranged for music. The strophe schema is 4. 7; 4. 4. 6. 7.

Vers. 1—2. צֶדֶק is the accusative of the object: the righteousness, intended by the suppliant, is his own (ver. 15*a*). He knows that he is not merely righteous in his relation to man, but also in his relation to God. In all such assertions of pious self-consciousness, that which is intended is a righteousness of life which has its ground in the righteousness of faith. True, Hupfeld is of opinion, that under the Old Testament nothing was known either of righteousness which is by faith or of a righteousness belonging to another and imputed. But if this were true, then Paul was in gross error and Christianity is built upon the sand. But the truth, that faith is the ultimate ground of righteousness, is expressed in Gen. xv. 6, and at other turning-points in the course of the history of redemption; and the truth, that the righteousness which avails before God is a gift of grace is, for instance, a thought distinctly marked out in the

expression of Jeremiah יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ, "the Lord our righteousness." The Old Testament conception, it is true, looks more to the phenomena than to the root of the matter (*ist mehr phänomenell als wurzelhaft*), is (so to speak) more Jacobic than Pauline; but the righteousness of life of the Old Testament and that of the New have one and the same basis, viz. in the grace of God, the Redeemer, towards sinful man, who in himself is altogether wanting in righteousness before God (cxliii. 2). Thus there is no self-righteousness, in David's praying that the righteousness, which in him is persecuted and cries for help, may be heard. For, on the one hand, in his personal relation to Saul, he knows himself to be free from any ungrateful thoughts of usurpation, and on the other, in his personal relation to God free from מִרְמָה, *i. e.* self-delusion and hypocrisy. The shrill cry for help, רִנָּה, which he raises, is such as may be heard and answered, because they are not lips of deceit with which he prays. The actual fact is manifest לְפָנֶי יהוה, therefore may his right go forth מִלְּפָנָיו, — just what does happen, by its being publicly proclaimed and openly maintained — from Him, for His eyes, the eyes of Him who knoweth the hearts (xi. 4), behold מֵישָׁרִים (as in lviii. 2, lxxv. 3 = בְּמֵישָׁרִים, ix. 9, and many other passages), in uprightness, *i. e.* in accordance with the facts of the case and without partiality. מישרים might also be an accusative of the object (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 17), but the usage of the language much more strongly favours the adverbial rendering, which is made still more natural by the confirmatory relation in which ver. 2*b* stands to 2*a*.

Vers. 3—5. David refers to the divine testing and illumination of the inward parts, which he has experienced in himself, in support of his sincerity. The preterites in ver. 3 express the divine acts that preceded the result בַּל־תִּמְצָא, viz. the testing He has instituted, which is referred to in צָרַפְתָּנִי and also בָּחַנְתָּ as a trying of gold by fire, and in פָּקַד as an investigation (Job vii. 18). The result of the close scrutiny to which God has subjected him in the night, when the bottom of a man's heart is at once made manifest, whether it be in his thoughts when awake or in the dream and fancies of the sleeper, was and is this, that He does not find,

viz. anything whatever to punish in him, anything that is separated as dross from the gold. To the mind of the New Testament believer with his deep, and as it were microscopically penetrating, insight into the depth of sin, such a confession concerning himself would be more difficult than to the mind of an Old Testament saint. For a separation and disunion of flesh and spirit, which was unknown in the same degree to the Old Testament, has been accomplished in the New Testament consciousness by the facts and operations of redemption revealed in the New Testament; although at the same time it must be remembered that in such confessions the Old Testament consciousness does not claim to be clear from sins, but only from a conscious love of sin, and from a self-love that is hostile to God.

With זַמּוֹתִי David begins his confession of how Jahve found him to be, instead of finding anything punishable in him. This word is either an infinitive like חֲנוֹת (lxxvii. 10) with the regular *ultima* accentuation, formed after the manner of the ל״ה verbs, — in accordance with which Hitzig renders it: my thinking does not overstep my mouth, — or even 1 *pers. præt.*, which is properly *Milel,* but does also occur as *Milra, e. g.* Deut. xxxii. 41, Isa. xliv. 16 (*vid.* on Job xix. 17), — according to which Böttcher translates: should I think anything evil, it dare not pass beyond my mouth, — or (since זָמַם may denote the determination that precedes the act, *e. g.* Jer. iv. 28, Lam. ii. 17): I have determined my mouth shall not transgress. This last rendering is opposed by the fact, that עָבַר by itself in the ethical signification "to transgress" (cf. post-biblical עֲבֵרָה παράβασις) is not the usage of the biblical Hebrew, and that when יַעֲבַר־פִּי stand close together, פִּי is presumptively the object. We therefore give the preference to Böttcher's explanation, which renders זמותי as a hypothetical perfect and is favoured by Prov. xxx. 32 (which is to be translated: and if thou thinkest evil, (lay) thy hand on thy mouth!). Nevertheless בל יעבר־פי is not the expression of a fact, but of a purpose, as the combination of בל with the future requires it to be taken. The psalmist is able to testify of himself that he so keeps evil thoughts in subjection within him, even when they may arise, that they do not pass beyond his mouth,

much less that he should put them into action. But perhaps the psalmist wrote פִּיךָ originally, "my reflecting does not go beyond Thy commandment" (according to Num. xxii. 18, 1 Sam. xv. 24, Prov. viii. 29), — a meaning better suited, as a result of the search, to the nightly investigation. The ל of לְפָעֲלוֹת need not be the ל of reference (as to); it is that of the state or condition, as in xxxii. 6, lxix. 22. אָדָם, as perhaps also in Job xxxi. 33, Hos. vi. 7 (if אדם is not there the name of the first man), means, men as they are by nature and habit. בִּדְבַר שְׂפָתֶיךָ does not admit of being connected with לְפָעֲלוֹת: at the doings of the world contrary to Thy revealed will (Hofmann and others); for פָּעַל בְּ cannot mean: to act contrary to any one, but only: to work upon any one, Job xxxv. 6. These words must therefore be regarded as a closer definition, placed first, of the שָׁמַרְתִּי which follows: in connection with the doings of men, by virtue of the divine commandment, he has taken care of the paths of the oppressor, viz. not to go in them; 1 Sam. xxv. 21 is an instance in support of this rendering, where שמרתי, as in Job ii. 6, means: I have kept (Nabal's possession), not seizing upon it myself. Jerome correctly translates *vias latronis*; for פָּרִיץ signifies one who breaks in, *i. e.* one who does damage intentionally and by violence. The confession concerning himself is still continued in ver. 5, for the *inf. absol.* תָּמֹךְ, if taken as imperative would express a prayer for constancy, that is alien to the circumstances described. The perfect after בַּל is also against such a rendering. It must therefore be taken as *inf. historicus*, and explained according to Job xxiii. 11, cf. Ps. xli. 13. The noun following the *inf. absol.*, which is usually the object, is the subject in this instance, as, *e. g.* in Job xl. 2, Prov. xvii. 12, Eccl. iv. 2, and frequently. It is אֲשׁוּרַי, and not אֲשׁוּרַי, אשׁוּר (a step) never having the שׁ dageshed, except in ver. 11 and Job xxxi. 7.

Vers. 6—7. It is only now, after his inward parts and his walk have been laid open to Jahve, that he resumes his petition, which is so well justified and so soundly based, and enters into detail. The אני* found beside קְרָאתִיךָ (the

* The word is pointed אֲנִי in correct texts, as אני always is when

perfect referring to that which has just now been put into execution) is meant to imply: such an one as he has described himself to be according to the testimony of his conscience, may call upon God, for God hears such and will therefore also hear him. הַט אָזְנְךָ exactly corresponds to the Latin *au-di* (*aus-cul-ta*). The *Hiph.* הִפְלָה (הִפְלִיא, xxxi. 22, cf. iv. 4) signifies here to work in an extraordinary and marvellous manner. The danger of him who thus prays is great, but the mercies of God, who is ready and able to help, are still greater. Oh that He may, then, exhibit all its fulness on his behalf. The form of the address resembles the Greek, which is so fond of participles. If it is translated as Luther translates it: "Shew Thy marvellous loving-kindness, Thou Saviour of those who trust in Thee, Against those who so set themselves against Thy right hand", then חוֹסִים is used just as absolutely as in Prov. xiv. 32, and the right hand of God is conceived of as that which arranges and makes firm. But "to rebel against God's right (not *statuta,* but *dexteram*)" is a strange expression. There are still two other constructions from which to choose, viz. "Thou Deliverer of those seeking protection from adversaries, with Thy right hand" (Hitz.), or: "Thou Helper of those seeking protection from adversaries, at Thy right hand" (Aben-Ezra, Tremell.). This last rendering is to be preferred to the two others. Since, on the one hand, one says מחסה מן, refuge from . . . , and on the other, חָסָה בְּ to hide one's self in any one, or in any place, this determining of the verbal notion by the preposition (on this, see above on ii. 12) must be possible in both directions. מִמִּתְקוֹמְמִים is equivalent to ממתקוממיהם Job. xxvii. 7; and חוסים בימינך, those seeking protection at the strong hand of Jahve. The force of the בְּ is just the same as in connection with הִסְתַּתֵּר, 1 Sam. xxiii. 19. In Damascus and throughout Syria — Wetzstein observes on this passage — the weak make use of these words when they surrender themselves to the strong:

---

it has *Munach* and *Dechi* follows, *e. g.* also cxvi. 16. This *Gaja* demands an emphatic intonation of the secondary word in its relation to the principal word (which here is קראתיך).

انا بقَبْضة يدك "I am in the grasp of thy hand (in thy closed hand) *i. e.* I give myself up entirely to thee".*

Vers. 8—9. The covenant relationship towards Himself in which Jahve has placed David, and the relationship of love in which David stands to Jahve, fully justified the oppressed one in his extreme request. The apple of the eye, which is surrounded by the iris, is called אִישׁוֹן, the man (Arabic *insân*), or in the diminutive and endearing sense of the termination *on:* the little man of the eye, because a picture in miniature of one's self is seen, as in a glass, when looking into another person's eye. בַּת־עַיִן either because it is as if born out of the eye and the eye has, as it were, concentrated itself in it, or rather because the little image which is mirrored in it is, as it were, the little daughter of the eye (here and Lam. ii. 18). To the Latin *pupilla (pupula),* Greek κόρη, corresponds most closely עַיִן בָּבָת, Zech. ii. 12, which does not signify the gate, aperture, sight, but, as בַּת shews, the little boy, or more strictly, the little girl of the eye. It is singular that אִישׁוֹן here has the feminine בַּת־עַיִן as the expression in apposition to it. The construction might be genitival: "as the little man of the apple of the eye", inasmuch as the saint knows himself to be so near to God, that, as it were, his image in miniature is mirrored in the great eye of God. But (1) the more ordinary name for the pupil of the eye is not בַּת עַיִן, but אִישׁוֹן; and (2) with that construction the proper point of the comparison, that the apple of the eye is an object of the most careful self-preservation, is missed. There is, consequently, a combination of two names of the pupil or apple of the eye, the usual one and one more select, without reference to the gender of the former, in order to give greater definition

---

* Cognate in meaning to חסה ב are استتر ب and تَذَرَّى ب, *e. g.* تذرّى بالحايط من الريح he shelters (hides) himself by the wall from the wind, or بالعضاة من البرد by a fire against the cold, and عاذ, which is often applied in like manner to God's protection. Thus, *e. g.* (according to Bochâri's *Sunna*) a woman, whom Muhammed wanted to seize, cried out: أَعُوذُ بالله منك I place myself under God's protection against thee, and he replied: عُذْتِ بِمَعَاذٍ thou hast taken refuge in an (inaccessible) *asylum* (cf. *Job*, i. 310 n. and ii. 22 n. 2).

and emphasis to the figure. The primary passage for this bold figure, which is the utterance of loving entreaty, is Deut. xxxii. 10, where the dazzling anthropomorphism is effaced by the LXX. and other ancient versions;* cf. also Sir. xvii. 22. Then follows another figure, taken from the eagle, which hides its young under its wings, likewise from Deut. xxxii, viz. ver. 11, for the figure of the hen (Mat. xxiii. 37) is alien to the Old Testament. In that passage, Moses, in his great song, speaks of the wings of God; but the double figure of the shadow of God's wings (here and in xxxvi. 8, lvii. 2, lxiii. 8) is coined by David. "God's wings" are the spreadings out, *i. e.* the manifestations of His love, taking the creature under the protection of its intimate fellowship, and the "shadow" of these wings is the refreshing rest and security which the fellowship of this love affords to those, who hide themselves beneath it, from the heat of outward or inward conflict.

From ver. 9 we learn more definitely the position in which the psalmist is placed. שָׁדַד signifies to use violence, to destroy the life, continuance, or possession of any one. According to the accentuation בְּנֶפֶשׁ is to be connected with אֹיְבַי, not with יַקִּיפוּ, and to be understood according to Ez. xxv. 6: "enemies with the soul" are those whose enmity is not merely superficial, but most deep-seated (cf. ἐκ ψυχῆς, Eph. vi. 6, Col. iii. 23). The soul (viz. the hating and eagerly longing soul, xxvii. 12, xli. 3) is just the same as if בנפשׁ is combined with the verb, viz. the soul of the enemies; and איבי נפשׁי would therefore not be more correct, as Hitzig thinks, than איבי בנפשׁ, but would have a different meaning. They are eager to destroy him (*perf. conatus*), and form a circle round about him, as ravenous ones, in order to swallow him up.

Vers. 10—12 tell what sort of people these persecutors are. Their heart is called fat, *adeps,* not as though חֵלֶב could in itself be equivalent to לֵב, more especially as both words are radically distinct (חֵלֶב from the root לב, λιπ; לֵב from the root לב, לף to envelope: that which is enveloped, the kernel, the inside), but (without any need for

* *Vid.* Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel,* S. 324.

von Ortenberg's conjecture חֶלֶב לִבָּמוֹ סָגָרוּ "they close their heart with fat") because it is, as it were, entirely fat (cxix. 70, cf. lxxiii. 7), and because it is inaccessible to any feeling of compassion, and in general incapable of the nobler emotions. To shut up the fat = the heart (cf. κλείειν τὰ σπλάγχνα 1 John iii. 17), is equivalent to: to fortify one's self wilfully in indifference to sympathy, tender feeling, and all noble feelings (cf. הִשְׁמִין לֵב = to harden, Isa. vi. 10). The construction of פִּימוֹ (which agrees in sound with פִּימָה, Job xv. 27) is just the same as that of קוֹלִי, iii. 5. On the other hand, אַשּׁוּרֵנוּ (after the form עַמּוּד and written *plene*) is neither such an accusative of the means or instrument, nor the second accusative, beside the accusative of the object, of that by which the object is surrounded, that is usually found with verbs of surrounding (*e. g.* v. 13, xxxii. 7); for "they have surrounded me (us) with our step" is unintelligible. But אשורנו can be the accusative of the member, as in iii. 8, cf. xxii. 17, Gen. iii. 15, for "it is true the step is not a member" (Hitz.), but since "step" and "foot" are interchangeable notions, lxxiii. 2, the σχῆμα καθ'ὅλον καὶ μέρος is applicable to the former, and as, *e. g.* Homer says, *Iliad* vii. 355: σὲ μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν, the Hebrew poet can also say: they have encompassed us (and in fact) our steps, each of our steps (so that we cannot go forwards or backwards with our feet). The *Kerî* סְבָבוּנִי gets rid of the change in number which we have with the *Chethîb* סבבוני; the latter, however, is admissible according to parallels like lxii. 5, and corresponds to David's position, who is hunted by Saul and at the present time driven into a strait at the head of a small company of faithful followers. Their eyes — he goes on to say in ver. 11*b* — have they set to fell, viz. us, who are encompassed, to the earth, *i. e.* so that we shall be cast to the ground. נָטָה is transitive, as in xviii. 10, lxii. 4, in the transitively applied sense of lxxiii. 2 (cf. xxxvii. 31): to incline to fall (whereas in xliv. 19, Job xxxi. 7, it means to turn away from); and בָּאָרֶץ (without any need for the conjecture בָּאֹרַח) expresses the final issue, instead of לָאָרֶץ, vii. 6. By the expression דְּמוּתוֹ one is prominently singled out from the host of the enemy, viz. its chief, the words being: his likeness is as a lion, according to the pecu-

liarity of the poetical style, of changing verbal into substantival clauses, instead of דֻּמָּה כְּאַרְיֵה. Since in Old Testament Hebrew, as also in Syriac and Arabic, כְּ is only a preposition, not a connective conjunction, it cannot be rendered: as a lion longs to prey, but: as a lion that is greedy or hungry (cf. كسف used of sinking away, decline, obscuring or eclipsing, growing pale, and خسف more especially of enfeebling, hunger, distinct from חָשַׂף = كشف to peel off, make bare) to ravin. In the parallel member of the verse the participle alternates with the attributive clause. כְּפִיר is (according to Meier) the young lion as being covered with thicker hair.

Vers. 13—15. The phrase קִדַּם פָּנָיו, *antevertere faciem alicujus*, means both to appear before any one with reverence, xcv. 2 (post-biblical: to pay one's respects to any one) and to meet any one as an enemy, rush on him. The foe springs like a lion upon David, may Jahve — so he prays — as his defence cross the path of the lion and intercept him, and cast him down so that he, being rendered harmless, shall lie there with bowed knees (כָּרַע, of the lion, Gen. xlix. 9, Num. xxiv. 9). He is to rescue his soul from the ungodly חַרְבֶּךָ. This חרב, and also the יָדֶךָ which follows, can be regarded as a permutative of the subject (Böttcher, Hupfeld, and Hitzig), an explanation which is commended by xliv. 3 and other passages. But it is much more probably that more exact definitions of this kind are treated as accusatives, *vid.* on iii. 5. At any rate "sword" and "hand" are meant as the instruments by which the פַּלֵּט, rescuing, is effected. The force of פַּלְטָה extends into ver. 14, and מֵמֵת ם (with a *Chateph* under the letter that is freed from reduplication, like מִמֵּכֶן, xxxiii. 14) corresponds to מֵרָשַׁע, as יָדְךָ to חַרְבֶּךָ. The word ממתים (plural of מַת, men, Deut. ii. 34, whence מִתִּם, each and every one), which of itself gives no complete sense, is repeated and made complete after the interruption caused by the insertion of יָדְךָ ה׳, — a remarkable manner of obstructing and then resuming the thought, which Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis* ii. 2. 495) seeks to get over by a change in the division of the verse and in the interpunction. חֶלֶד, either from חָלַד Syriac to creep, glide, slip away (whence חֲלָדָה a weasel, a mole) or from חָלַד Talmudic

to cover, hide, signifies: this temporal life which glides by unnoticed (distinct from the Arabic *chald, chuld,* an abiding stay, endless duration); and consequently חֶדֶל, limited existence, from חָדַל to have an end, alternates with חֵלֶד as a play upon the letters, comp. xlix. 2 with Isa. xxxviii. 11. The combination מתים מחלד resembles x. 18, xvi. 4. What is meant, is: men who have no other home but the world, which passeth away with the lust thereof, men ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, or υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. The meaning of the further description חֶלְקָם בַּחַיִּים (cf. Eccl. ix. 9) becomes clear from the converse in xvi. 5. Jahve is the חֵלֶק of the godly man; and the sphere within which the worldling claims his חלק is הַחַיִּים, this temporal, visible, and material life. This is everything to him; whereas the godly man says: טוֹב חַסְדְּךָ מֵחַיִּים, lxiii. 4. The contrast is not so much between this life and the life to come, as between the world (life) and God. Here we see into the inmost nature of the Old Testament faith. To the Old Testament believer, all the blessedness and glory of the future life, which the New Testament unfolds, is shut up in Jahve. Jahve is his highest good, and possessing Him he is raised above heaven and earth, above life and death. To yield implicitly to Him, without any explicit knowledge of a blessed future life, to be satisfied with Him, to rest in Him, to hide in Him in the face of death, is the characteristic of the Old Testament faith. חלקם בחיים expresses both the state of mind and the lot of the men of the world. Material things which are their highest good, fall also in abundance to their share. The words "whose belly Thou fillest with Thy treasure" (*Chethîb:* וּצְפִינְךָ the usual participial form, but as a participle an Aramaising form) do not sound as though the poet meant to say that God leads them to repentance by the riches of His goodness, but on the contrary that God, by satisfying their desires which are confined to the outward and sensuous only, absolutely deprives them of all claim to possessions that extend beyond the world and this present temporal life. Thus, then, צָפַן in this passage is used exactly as צְפוּנִים is used in Job xx. 26 (from צָפַן to hold anything close to one, to hold back, to keep by one). Moreover, there is not the slightest alloy of murmur or envy in the words. The godly man who lacks

these good things out of the treasury of God, has higher delights; he can exclaim, xxxi. 20: "how great is Thy goodness which Thou hast laid up (צָפַנְתָּ) for those who fear Thee!" Among the good things with which God fills the belly and house of the ungodly (Job xxii. 17 sq.) are also children in abundance; these are elsewhere a blessing upon piety (cxxvii. 3 sq., cxxviii. 3 sq.), but to those who do not acknowledge the Giver they are a snare to self-glorifying, Job xxi. 11 (cf. Wisdom iv. 1). בָּנִים is not the subject, but an accusative, and has been so understood by all the old translators from the original text, just as in the phrase שָׂבַע יָמִים to be satisfied with, or weary of, life. On עוֹלְלִים *vid.* on viii. 3. יֶתֶר (from יָתַר to stretch out in length, then to be overhanging, towering above, projecting, superfluous, redundant) signifies here, as in Job xxii. 20, riches and the abundance of things possessed.

Ver. 15. With אֲנִי he contrasts his incomparably greater prosperity with that of his enemies. He, the despised and persecuted of men, will behold God's face בְּצֶדֶק, in righteousness, which will then find its reward (Mat. v. 8, Hebr. xii. 14), and will, when this hope is realised by him, thoroughly refresh himself with the form of God. It is not sufficient to explain the vision of the divine countenance here as meaning the experience of the gracious influences which proceed from the divine countenance again unveiled and turned towards him. The parallel of the next clause requires an actual vision, as in Num. xii. 8, according to which Jahve appeared to Moses in the true form of His being, without the intervention of any self-manifestation of an accommodative and visionary kind; but at the same time, as in Exod. xxxiii. 20, where the vision of the divine countenance is denied to Moses, according to which, consequently, the self-manifestation of Jahve in His intercourse with Moses is not to be thought of without some veiling of Himself which might render the vision tolerable to him. Here, however, where David gives expression to a hope which is the final goal and the very climax of all his hopes, one has no right in any way to limit the vision of God, who in love permits him to behold Him (*vid.* on xi. 7), and to limit the being satisfied with His תְּמוּנָה (LXX. τὴν δόξαν σου, *vid. Psychol*

S. 49; transl. p. 61). If this is correct, then בְּהָקִיץ cannot mean "when I wake up from this night's sleep" as Ewald, Hupfeld and others explain it; for supposing the Psalm were composed just before falling asleep what would be the meaning of the postponement of so transcendent a hope to the end of his natural sleep? Nor can the meaning be to "awake to a new life of blessedness and peace through the sunlight of divine favour which again arises after the night of darkness and distress in which the poet is now to be found" (Kurtz); for to awake from a night of affliction is an unsuitable idea and for this very reason cannot be supported. The only remaining explanation, therefore, is the waking up from the sleep of death (cf. Böttcher, *De inferis* § 365—367). The fact that all who are now in their graves shall one day hear the voice of Him that wakes the dead, as it is taught in the age after the Exile (Dan. xii. 2), was surely not known to David, for it was not yet revealed to him. But why may not this truth of revelation, towards which prophecy advances with such giant strides (Isa. xxvi. 19. Ezek. xxxvii. 1—14), be already heard even in the Psalms of David as a bold demand of faith and as a hope that has struggled forth to freedom out of the comfortless conception of Sheôl possessed in that age, just as it is heard a few decades later in the master-work of a cotemporary of Solomon, the Book of Job? The morning in Ps. xlix. 15 is also not any morning whatever following upon the night, but that final morning which brings deliverance to the upright and inaugurates their dominion. A sure knowledge of the fact of the resurrection such as, according to Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis* ii. 2, 490), has existed in the Old Testament from the beginning, is not expressed in such passages. For laments like vi. 6, xxx. 10, lxxxviii. 11—13, shew that no such certain knowledge was then in existence; and when the Old Testament literature which we now possess allows us elsewhere an insight into the history of the perception of redemption, it does not warrant us in concluding anything more than that the perception of the future resurrection of the dead did not pass from the prophetic word into the believing mind of Israel until about the time of the Exile, and that up to that period faith made bold to hope for a

redemption from death, but only *by means of an inference drawn from that which was conceived and existed within itself,* without having an express word of promise in its favour.* Thus it is here also. David certainly gives full expression to the hope of a vision of God, which, as righteous before God, will be vouchsafed to him; and vouchsafed to him, even though he should fall asleep in death in the present extremity (xiii. 4), as one again awakened from the sleep of death, and, therefore (although this idea does not directly coincide with the former), as one raised from the dead. But this hope is not a believing appropriation of a "certain knowledge", but a view that, by reason of the already existing revelation of God, lights up out of his consciousness of fellowship with Him.

PSALM XVIII.

DAVID'S HYMNIC RETROSPECT OF A LIFE CROWNED WITH MANY MERCIES.

2 FERVENTLY do I love Thee, Jahve, my strength,
3 Jahve, my rock, and my fortress, and my Deliverer,
My God, my fastness wherein I hide myself,
My shield, and the horn of my salvation, my high tower!
4 As worthy to be praised do I call upon Jahve,
And against mine enemies shall I be helped.

5 The bands of death had compassed me
And the floods of the abyss came upon me.
6 The bands of hades had surrounded me,
The snares of death assaulted me.

---

* To this Hofmann, *loc. cit.* S. 496, replies as follows: "We do not find that faith indulges in such boldness elsewhere, or that the believing ones cherish hopes which are based on such insecure grounds." But the word of God is surely no insecure ground, and to draw bold conclusions from that which is intimated only from afar, was indeed, even in many other respects (for instance, respecting the incarnation, and respecting the abrogation of the ceremonial law), the province of the Old Testament faith.

7 In my distress I called upon Jahve,
And unto my God did I cry;
He heard my call out of His temple,
And my cry before Him came into His ears.

8 The earth shook and quaked,
And the foundations of the mountains trembled,
And they swung to and fro, for He was wroth.
9 There went up a smoke in His nostrils,
And fire out of His mouth devoured,
Coals were kindled by it.
10 Then He bowed the heavens and came down,
And thick darkness was under His feet

11 And He rode upon a cherub and did fly,
And floated upon the wings of the wind;
12 He made darkness His covering, His pavilion round about Him
Darkness of waters, thick clouds of the skies.
13 Out of the brightness before Him there broke through His clouds
Hail-stones and coals of fire.

14 Then Jahve thundered in the heavens,
And the Highest made His voice to sound forth.
[Hail-stones and coals of fire.]
15 And He sent forth His arrows and scattered them,
And lightnings in abundance and discomfited them.
16 And the channels of the waters became visible,
And the foundations of the earth were laid bare,
At Thy threatening, Jahve,
At the snorting of the breath of Thy wrath.

17 He reached from the height, He seized me,
He drew me up out of great waters;
18 He delivered me from my grim foe,
And from them that hated me, because they were too strong for me.
19 They came upon me in the day of my calamity,
Then Jahve was a stay to me,

20 And brought me forth into a large place;
He delivered me, for He delighted in me.

21 Jahve rewarded me according to my righteousness,
According to the cleanness of my hands did He recompense me.
22 For I have kept the ways of Jahve,
And have not wickedly departed from my God.
23 Far from this, all His judgments are my aim,
And His statutes I do not put away from me.
24 And I was spotless towards Him,
And I have kept myself from mine iniquity.

25 Therefore Jahve recompensed me according to any righteousness,
According to the cleanness of my hands, which was manifest in His eyes.
26 Towards the good Thou shewest Thyself good
Towards the man of perfect submission Thou shewest Thyself yielding.
27 Towards him who sanctifies himself Thou shewest Thyself pure,
And towards the perverse Thou shewest Thyself froward.
28 For Thou, Thou savest the afflicted people,
And high looks Thou bringest down.

29 For Thou makest my lamp light;
Jahve, my God, enlighteneth my darkness.
30 For by Thee do I scatter a troop,
And by my God do I leap walls.
31 As for God — spotless is His way,
The word of Jahve is tried;
A shield is He to all who hide in Him.

32 For who is a divine being, but Jahve alone,
And who is a rock save our God?
33 The God, who girded me with strength,
And made my way perfect,

34 Making my feet like hinds' feet,
And who set me upon my high places,
35 Training my hands for war,
And mine arms bent a bow of brass.

36 And Thou gavest me also the shield of Thy salvation,
And Thy right hand upheld me,
And Thy lowliness made me great.
37 Thou madest room for my footsteps under me,
And mine ankles have not slipped.

38 I pursued mine enemies and overtook them,
And turned not back, till they were consumed.
39 I smote them, so that they could not rise,
They fell under my feet
40 And Thou didst gird me with strength for the battle,
Thou madest my foes to bow down under me,
41 Thou gavest me the necks of mine enemies,
And those that hated me, I utterly destroyed.

42 They cried, but there was no helper,
Even to Jahve, but He answered them not.
43 And I crushed them as dust before the wind,
Like the dirt of the streets I emptied them out.

44 Thou didst deliver me from the strivings of the people,
Thou didst make me Head of the nations;
A people that I knew not, served me.
45 At the hearing of the ear, they obeyed me,
Strangers submitted to me,
46 Strangers faded away,
And came forth trembling from their strongholds.

47 Jahve liveth, and blessed be my Rock,
And let the God of my salvation be exalted;
48 The God, who gave me revenges
And bent back peoples under me,
49 My Deliverer from mine enemies,
Yea, Thou who liftest me up above my foes,
Who rescuest me from the violent man.

50 Therefore will I praise Thee among the nations, O Jahve,
And I will sing praises unto Thy name,
51 As He, who giveth great deliverance to His king
And sheweth favour to His anointed,
To David and his seed for ever.

Next to a תְּפִלָּה of David comes a שִׁירָה (*nom. unitatis* from שִׁיר), which is in many ways both in words and thoughts (*Symbolae* p. 49) interwoven with the former. It is the longest of all the hymnic Psalms, and bears the inscription: *To the Precentor, by the servant of Jahve, by David, who spake unto Jahve the words of this song in the day that Jahve had delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies and out of the hand of Saûl: then he said.* The original inscription of the Psalm in the primary collection was probably only למנצח לעבד ה' לדוד, like the inscription of Ps. xxxvi. The rest of the inscription resembles the language with which songs of this class are wont to be introduced in their connection in the historical narrative, Ex. xv. 1, Num. xxi. 17, and more especially Deut. xxxi. 30. And the Psalm before us is found again in 2 Sam. xxii., introduced by words, the manifestly unaccidental agreement of which with the inscription in the Psalter, is explained by its having been incorporated in one of the histories from which the Books of Samuel are extracted, — probably the Annals (*Dibre ha-Jamim*) of David. From this source the writer of the Books of Samuel has taken the Psalm, together with that introduction; and from this source also springs the historical portion of the inscription in the Psalter, which is connected with the preceding by אֲשֶׁר.

David may have styled himself in the inscription עֶבֶד ה', just as the apostles call themselves δοῦλοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. He also in other instances, in prayer, calls himself "the servant of Jahve", xix. 12, 14, cxliv. 10, 2 Sam. vii. 20, as every Israelite might do; but David, who is the first after Moses and Joshua to bear this designation or by-name, could do so in an especial sense. For he, with whom the kingship of promise began, marks an epoch in his service of the work of God no less than did Moses, through whose mediation Israel received the Law, and Joshua, through whose instrumentality they obtained the Land of promise.

The terminology of psalm-poesy does not include the word שִׁירָה, but only שִׁיר. This at once shews that the historical portion of the inscription comes from some other source. בְּיוֹם is followed, not by the *infin.* הַצִּיל: on the day of deliverance, but by the more exactly *plusquamperf.* הִצִּיל: on the day (בְּיוֹם = at the time, as in Gen. ii. 4, and frequently) when he had delivered — a genitival (Ges. § 116, 3) relative clause, like cxxxviii. 3, Ex. vi. 28, Num. iii. 1, cf. Ps. lvi. 10. מִיַּד alternates with מִכַּף in this text without any other design than that of varying the expression. The deliverance out of the hand of Saul is made specially prominent, because the most prominent portion of the Psalm, vers. 5—20, treats of it. The danger in which David then was placed, was of the most personal, the most perilous, and the most protracted kind. This prominence was of great service to the collector, because the preceding Psalm bears the features of this time, the lamentations over which are heard there and further back, and now all find expression in this more extended song of praise.

Only a fondness for doubt can lead any one to doubt the Davidic origin of this Psalm, attested as it is in two works, which are independent of one another. The twofold testimony of tradition is supported by the fact that the Psalm contains nothing that militates against David being the author; even the mention of his own name at the close, is not against it (cf. 1 Kings ii. 45). We have before us an Israelitish counterpart to the cuneiform monumental inscriptions, in which the kings of worldly monarchies recapitulate the deeds they have done by the help of their gods. The speaker is a king; the author of the Books of Samuel found the song already in existence as a Davidic song; the difference of his text from that which lies before us in the Psalter, shews that at that time it had been transmitted from some earlier period; writers of the later time of the kings here and there use language which is borrowed from it or are echoes of it (comp. Prov. xxx. 5 with ver. 31; Hab. iii. 19 with ver. 34); it bears throughout the mark of the classic age of the language and poetry, and "if it be not David's, it must have been written in his name and by some one imbued with his spirit, and who could have been this

cotemporary poet and twin-genius?" (Hitzig). All this irresistibly points us to David himself, to whom really belong also all the other songs in the Second Book of Samuel, which are introduced as Davidic (over Saul and Jonathan, over Abner, &c.). This, the greatest of all, springs entirely from the new self-consciousness to which he was raised by the promises recorded in 2 Sam. vii.; and towards the end, it closes with express retrospective reference to these promises; for David's certainty of the everlasting duration of his house, and God's covenant of mercy with his house, rests upon the announcement made by Nathan.

The Psalm divides into two halves; for the strain of praise begins anew with ver. 32, after having run its first course and come to a beautiful close in ver. 31. The two halves are also distinct in respect of their artificial form. The strophe schema of the first is: 6. 8. 8. 6. 8 (not 9). 8. 8. 8. 7. The mixture of six and eight line strophes is symmetrical, and the seven of the last strophe is nothing strange. The mixture in the second half on the contrary is varied. The art of the strophe system appears here, as is also seen in other instances in the Psalms, to be relaxed; and the striving after form at the commencement has given way to the pressure and crowding of the thoughts.

The traditional mode of writing out this Psalm, as also the *Cantica*, 2 Sam. xxii. and Judges v., is "a half-brick upon a brick, and a brick upon a half-brick" (אירח על גבי לבנה ולבנה על גבי אריח): *i. e.* one line consisting of two, and one of three parts of a verse, and the line consisting of the three parts has only one word on the right and on the left; the whole consequently forms three columns. On the other hand, the song in Deut. xxxii. (as also Josh. xii. 9 sqq., Esth. ix. 7—10) is to be written "a half-brick upon a half-brick and a brick upon a brick", *i. e.* in only two columns, cf. *infra* p. 269.

Vers. 2—4. The poet opens with a number of endearing names for God, in which he gratefully comprehends the results of long and varied experience. So far as regards the parallelism of the members, a monostich forms the beginning of this Psalm, as in Ps. xvi. xxiii. xxv. and many

others. Nevertheless the matter assumes a somewhat different aspect, if ver. 3 is not, with Maurer, Hengstenberg and Hupfeld, taken as two predicate clauses (Jahve is . . ., my God is . . .), but as a simple vocative — a rendering which alone corresponds to the intensity with which this greatest of the Davidic hymns opens — God being invoked by יְ, יְ, אֵלִי, and each of these names being followed by a predicative expansion of itself, which increases in fulness of tone and emphasis. The אֶרְחָמְךָ (with *ā*, according to Ew. § 251, *b*), which carries the three series of the names of God, makes up in depth of meaning what is wanting in compass. Elsewhere we find only the *Piel* רִחַם of tender sympathising love, but here the *Kal* is used as an Aramaism. Hence the Jalkut on this passage explains it by רחמאי יתך "I love thee", of ardent, heartfelt love and attachment. The primary signification of softness (root רח, רך, רך, to be soft, lax, loose), whence רֶחֶם, *uterus*, is transferred in both cases to tenderness of feeling or sentiment. The most general predicate חִזְקִי (from חָזָק according to a similar inflexion to אֹמֶר, בֹּסֶר, עֹמֶק, *plur.* עֲמֻקִּי Prov. ix. 18) is followed by those which describe Jahve as a protector and deliverer in persecution on the one hand, and on the other as a defender and the giver of victory in battle. They are all typical names symbolising what Jahve is in Himself; hence instead of וּמַפַּלְטִי it would perhaps have been more correct to point וּמְפַלְטִי (and my refuge). God had already called Himself a shield to Abram, Gen. xv. 1; and He is called צוּר (cf. אֵבֶן Gen. xlix. 24) in the great Mosaic song, Deut. xxxii. 4, 37 (the latter verse is distinctly echoed here). סֶלַע from סָלַע, سلع, *findere*, means properly a cleft in a rock (Arabic سَلْع*), then a cleft

---

* Neshwân defines thus: السَلْع is a cutting in a mountain after the manner of a gorge; and Jâḳût, who cites a number of places that are so called: a wide plain (فضاء) enclosed by steep rocks, which is reached through a narrow pass (شَعْب), but can only be descended on foot. Accordingly, in סַלְעִי the idea of a safe (and comfortable) hiding-place preponderates; in צוּרִי that of firm ground and inaccessibility. The one figure calls to mind the (well-watered) Edomitish סֶלַע surrounded with precipitous rocks, Isa. xvi. 1, xlii. 11, the Πέτρα

rock, and צוּר, like the Arabic صَخْر, a great and hard mass of rock (Aramaic טוּר, a mountain). The figures of the מְצוּדָה (מָצָד, מְצֻדָה) and the מִשְׂגָּב are related; the former signifies properly *specula*, a watch-tower*, and the latter, a steep height. The horn, which is an ancient figure of victorious and defiant power in Deut. xxxiii. 17, 1 Sam. ii. 1, is found here applied to Jahve Himself: "horn of my salvation" is that which interposes on the side of my feebleness, conquers, and saves me. All these epithets applied to God are the fruits of the affliction out of which David's song has sprung, viz. his persecution by Saul, when, in a country abounding in rugged rocks and deficient in forest, he betook himself to the rocks for safety, and the mountains served him as his fortresses. In the shelter which the mountains, by their natural conformations, afforded him at

---

described by Strabo, xvi. 4, 21; the other calls to mind the Phœnician rocky island צוֹר, *Ṣûr* (Tyre), the refuge in the sea.

* In Arabic مَصَادٌ signifies (1) a high hill (a signification that is wanting in Freytag), (2) the summit of a mountain, and according to the original lexicons it belongs to the root مَصَدَ, which in outward appearance is supported by the synonymous forms مَصَدٌ and مَصْدٌ, as also by their plurals أَمْصِدَةٌ and مُصْدَانٌ, since these can only be properly formed from those singulars on the assumption of the *m* being part of the root. Nevertheless, since the meanings of مَصَدَ all distinctly point to its being formed from the root مص contained in the reduplicated stem مَصَّ to suck, but the meanings of مَصَادٌ, مَصَدٌ, and مَصْدٌ do not admit of their being referred to it, and moreover there are instances in which original *nn. loci* from *vv. med.* و and ى admit of the prefixed *m* being treated as the first radical through forgetfulness or disregard of their derivation, and with the retention of it form secondary roots (as مَكَنَ, مَدَنَ, مَصَّرَ), it is highly probable that in *maṣâd*, *maṣad* and *maṣd* we have an original מָצָד, מְצוּדָה, מְצֹדָה. These Hebrew words, however, are to be referred to a צוּר in the signification to look out, therefore properly *specula*. — Fleischer

that time, and in the fortunate accidents, which sometimes brought him deliverance when in extreme peril, David recognises only marvellous phenomena of which Jahve Himself was to him the final cause. The confession of the God tried and known in many ways is continued in ver. 4 by a general expression of his experience. מְהֻלָּל is a predicate accusative to יהוה: As one praised (worthy to be praised) do I call upon Jahve, — a rendering that is better suited to the following clause, which expresses confidence in the answer coinciding with the invocation, which is to be thought of as a cry for help, than Olshausen's, "Worthy of praise, do I cry, is Jahve", though this latter certainly is possible so far as the style is concerned (*vid.* on Isa. xlv. 24, cf. also Gen. iii. 3, Mic. ii. 6). The proof of this fact, viz. that calling upon Him who is worthy to be praised, who, as the history of Israel shews, is able and willing to help, is immediately followed by actual help, as events that are coincident, forms the further matter of the Psalm.

Vers. 5—7. In these verses David gathers into one collective figure all the fearful dangers to which he had been exposed during his persecution by Saul, together with the marvellous answers and deliverances he experienced, that which is unseen, which stands in the relation to that which is visible of cause and effect, rendering itself visible to him. David here appears as passive throughout; the hand from out of the clouds seizes him and draws him out of mighty waters: while in the second part of the Psalm, in fellowship with God and under His blessing, he comes forward as a free actor.

The description begins in vers. 5—7 with the danger and the cry for help which is not in vain. The verb אָפַף according to a tradition not to be doubted (cf. אוֹפָן a wheel) signifies to go round, surround, as a poetical synonym of סָבַב, הִקִּיף, כָּתַר, and not, as one might after the Arabic have thought: to drive, urge. Instead of "the bands of death," the LXX. (cf. Acts ii. 24) renders it ὠδῖνες (constrictive pains) θανάτου; but ver. 6*b*. favours the meaning bands, cords, cf. cxix. 61 (where it is likewise חֲבָלַי instead of the חַבְלֵי, which one might have expected, Josh. xvii. 5, Job xxxvi. 8), death is therefore represented as a hunter with a cord and

net, xci. 3. בְּלִיַּעַל, compounded of בְּלִי and יַעַל (from יָעַל, יָעַל, root על), signifies unprofitableness, worthlessness, and in fact both deep-rooted moral corruption and also abysmal destruction (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 15, Βελίαρ = Βελίαλ as a name of Satan and his kingdom). Rivers of destruction are those, whose engulfing floods lead down to the abyss of destruction (Jon. ii. 7). Death, *Belîjáal,* and *Sheôl* are the names of the weird powers, which make use of David's persecutors as their instruments. *Futt.* in the sense of imperfects alternate with *prætt.* בִּעֵת (= بغت) signifies to come suddenly upon any one (but compare also بعث, to startle, *excitare,* to alarm), and קִדֵּם, to rush upon; the two words are distinguished from one another like *überfallen* and *anfallen.* The הֵיכָל out of which Jahve hears is His heavenly dwelling-place, which is both palace and temple, inasmuch as He sits enthroned there, being worshipped by blessed spirits. לְפָנָיו belongs to וְשַׁוְעָתִי: my cry which is poured forth before Him (as *e. g.* in cii. 1), for it is tautological if joined with תָּבֹא beside בְּאָזְנָיו. Before Jahve's face he made supplication and his prayer urged its way into His ears.

Vers. 8—10. As these verses go on to describe, the being heard became manifest in the form of deliverance. All nature stands to man in a sympathetic relationship, sharing his curse and blessing, his destruction and glory, and to God in a (so to speak) synergetic relationship, furnishing the harbingers and instruments of His mighty deeds. Accordingly in this instance Jahve's interposition on behalf of David is accompanied by terrible manifestations in nature. Like the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, Ps. lxviii. lxxvii., and the giving of the Law on Sinai, Exod. xix., and like the final appearing of Jahve and of Jesus Christ according the words of prophet and apostle (Hab. iii., 2 Thess. i. 7 sq.), the appearing of Jahve for the help of David has also extraordinary natural phenomena in its train. It is true we find no express record of any incident in David's life of the kind recorded in 1 Sam. vii. 10, but it must be some real experience which David here idealises (*i. e.* seizes at its very roots, and generalises and works up into a grand majestic picture of his miraculous deliverance). Amidst earthquake, a black thunderstorm gathers, the charging of

which is heralded by the lightning's flash, and its thick clouds descend nearer and nearer to the earth. The aorists in ver. 8 introduce the event, for the introduction of which, from ver. 4 onwards, the way has been prepared and towards which all is directed. The inward excitement of the Judge, who appears to His servant for his deliverance, sets the earth in violent oscillation. The foundations of the mountains (Isa. xxiv. 18) are that upon which they are supported beneath and within, as it were, the pillars which support the vast mass. געשׁ (rhyming with רעשׁ) is followed by the *Hithpa.* of the same verb: the first impulse having been given they, viz. the earth and the pillars of the mountains, continue to shake of themselves. These convulsions occur, because "it is kindled with respect to God"; it is unnecessary to supply אַפּוֹ, חָרָה לוֹ is a synonym of חַם לוֹ. When God is wrath, according to Old Testament conception, the power of wrath which is present in Him is kindled and blazes up and breaks forth. The panting of rage may accordingly also be called the smoke of the fire of wrath (lxxiv. 1, lxxx. 5). The smoking is as the breathing out of the fire, and the vehement hot breath which is inhaled and exhaled through the nose of one who is angry (cf. Job xli. 12), is like smoke rising from the internal fire of anger. The fire of anger itself "devours out of the mouth", *i. e.* flames forth out of the mouth, consuming whatever it lays hold of, — in men in the form of angry words, with God in the fiery forces of nature, which are of a like kind with, and subservient to, His anger, and more especially in the lightning's flash. It is the lightning chiefly, that is compared here to the blazing up of burning coals. The power of wrath in God, becoming manifest in action, breaks forth into a glow, and before it entirely discharges its fire, it gives warning of action like the lightning's flash heralding the outburst of the storm. Thus enraged and breathing forth His wrath, Jahve bowed the heavens, *i. e.* caused them to bend towards the earth, and came down, and darkness of clouds (עֲרָפֶל similar in meaning to ὄρφνη, cf. ἔρεβος) was under His feet: black, low-hanging clouds announced the coming of Him who in His wrath was already on His way downwards towards the earth.

Vers. 11—13. The storm, announcing the approaching

outburst of the thunderstorm, was also the forerunner of the Avenger and Deliverer. If we compare ver. 11 with civ. 3, it is natural to regard כְּרוּב as a transposition of רְכוּב (a chariot, Ew. § 153,*a*). But assuming a relationship between the biblical *Cherub* and (according to Ctesias) the Indo-Persian griffin, the word (from the Zend *grab, garew, garefsh,* to seize) signifies a creature seizing and holding irrecoverably fast whatever it seizes upon; perhaps in Semitic language the strong creature, from כָּרַב = كرب *torquere, constringere,* (whence *mukrab,* tight, strong). It is a passive form like גְּבוּל, יְסַד, לְבוּשׁ. The cherubim are mentioned in Gen. iii. 24 as the guards of Paradise (this alone is enough to refute the interpretation recently revived in the *Evang. Kirchen-Zeit.*, 1866, No. 46, that they are a symbol of the unity of the living One, כרוב = כְּרוֹב "like a multitude"!), and elsewhere, as it were, as the living mighty rampart and vehicle of the approach of the inaccessible majesty of God; and they are not merely in general the medium of God's personal presence in the world, but more especially of the presence of God as turning the fiery side of His doxa towards the world. As in the Prometheus of Æschylus, Oceanus comes flying τὸν πτερυγωκῆ τόνδ' οἰωνὸν γνώμῃ στομίων ἄτερ εὐθύνων, so in the present passage Jahve rides upon the cherub, of which the heathenish griffin is a distortion; or, if by a comparison of passages like civ. 3, Isa. lxvi. 15, we understand David according to Ezekiel, He rides upon the cherub as upon His living throne-chariot (מֶרְכָּבָה). The throne floats upon the cherubim, and this cherub-throne flies upon the wings of the wind; or, as we can also say: the cherub is the celestial spirit working in this vehicle formed of the spirit-like elements. The Manager of the chariot is Himself hidden behind the thick thunder-clouds. יָשֶׁת is an aorist without the consecutive ו (cf. יָדְ Hos. vi. 1). חֶשְׁכָּה is the accusative of the object to it; and the accusative of the predicate is doubled: His covering, His pavilion round about Him. In Job xxxvi. 29 also the thunder-clouds are called God's סֻכָּה, and also in xcvii. 2 they are סְבִיבָיו, concealing Him on all sides and announcing only His presence when He is wroth. In ver. 12*b* the accusative of the object, חֶשְׁכַּת, is expanded into "darkness of waters", *i. e.* swelling with

waters* and billows of thick vapour, thick, and therefore dark, masses (עָב in its primary meaning of denseness, or a thicket, Exod. xix. 9, cf. Jer. iv. 29) of שְׁחָקִים, which is here a poetical name for fleecy clouds. The dispersion and discharge, according to ver. 13, proceeded from נֹגַהּ נֶגְדּוֹ. Such is the expression for the doxa of God as being a mirroring forth of His nature, as it were, over against Him, as being therefore His brightness, or the reflection of His glory. The doxa is fire and light. On this occasion the forces of wrath issue from it, and therefore it is the fiery forces: heavy and destructive hail (cf. Exod. ix. 23 sq., Isa. xxx. 30) and fiery glowing coals, *i. e.* flashing and kindling lightning. The object עָבָיו stands first, because the idea of clouds, behind which, according to ver. 11, the doxa in concealed, is prominently connected with the doxa. It might be rendered: before His brightness His clouds turn into hail . . . , a rendering which would be more in accordance with the structure of the stichs, and is possible according to Ges. § 138, rem. 2. Nevertheless, in connection with the combination of עבר with clouds, the idea of breaking through (Lam. iii. 44) is very natural. If עביו is removed, then עברו signifies "thence came forth hail . . . " But the mention of the clouds as the medium, is both natural and appropriate.

Vers. 14—16. Amidst thunder, Jahve hurled lightnings as arrows upon David's enemies, and the breath of His anger laid bare the beds of the flood to the very centre of the earth, in order to rescue the sunken one. Thunder is the rumble of God, and as it were the hollow murmur of His mouth, Job xxxvii. 2. עֶלְיוֹן, the Most High, is the name of God as the inapproachable Judge, who governs all things. The third line of ver. 14 is erroneously repeated from the preceding strophe. It cannot be supported on grammatical grounds by Ex. ix. 23, since נָתַן קוֹל, *edere vocem,* has a different meaning from the נָתַן קֹלֹת, *dare tonitrua*, of that passage. The symmetry of the strophe structure is also against it; and it is wanting both in 2 Sam. and in the LXX. רַב,

* Rab Dimi, *B. Taanith* 10*a*, for the elucidation of the passage quotes a Palestine proverb: נהור ענני זעירין מוהי חשוך ענני סגיין מוהי i. *e.* if the clouds are transparent they will yield but little water, if they are dark they will yield a quantity.

which, as the opposite of מְעָט Neh. ii. 12, Isa. x. 7, means adverbially "in abundance", is the parallel to וַיִּשְׁלַח. It is generally taken, after the analogy of Gen. xlix. 23, in the sense of דָּרַךְ, cxliv. 6: רָב in pause = רַב (the *ō* passing over into the broader *å* like עָו instead of עָוֹ in Gen. xlix. 3) = רָבַב, cognate with רָבָה, רָמָה; but the forms סַב, סַבּוּ, here, and in every other instance, have but a very questionable existence, as *e. g.* רַב, Isa. liv. 13, is more probably an adjective than the third person *præt.* (cf. Böttcher, *Neue Aehrenlese* No. 635, 1066). The suffixes *ēm* do not refer to the arrows, *i. e.* lightnings, but to David's foes. הָמַם means both to put in commotion and to destroy by confounding, Exod. xiv. 24, xxiii. 27. In addition to the thunder, the voice of Jahve, comes the stormwind, which is the snorting of the breath of His nostrils. This makes the channels of the waters visible and lays bare the foundations of the earth. אָפִיק (collateral form to אָפֵק) is the bed of the river and then the river or brook itself, *a continendo aquas* (Ges.), and exactly like the Arabic *mesîk*, *mesâk*, *mesek* (from مسك, the VI. form of which, *tamâsaka,* corresponds to הִתְאַפֵּק), means a place that does not admit of the water soaking in, but on account of the firmness of the soil preserves it standing or flowing. What are here meant are the water-courses or river beds that hold the water. It is only needful for Jahve to threaten (ἐπιτιμᾶν Mat. viii. 26) and the floods, in which he, whose rescue is undertaken here, is sunk, flee (civ. 7) and dry up (cvi. 9, Nah. i. 4). But he is already half engulfed in the abyss of Hades, hence not merely the bed of the flood is opened up, but the earth is rent to its very centre. From the language being here so thoroughly allegorical, it is clear that we were quite correct in interpreting the description as ideal. He, who is nearly overpowered by his foes, is represented as one engulfed in deep waters and almost drowning.

Vers. 17—20. Then Jahve stretches out His hand from above into the deep chasm and draws up the sinking one. The verb שָׁלַח occurs also in prose (2 Sam. vi. 6) without יָד (lvii. 4, cf. on the other hand the borrowed passage, cxliv. 7) in the signification to reach (after anything). The verb מָשָׁה, however, is only found in one other instance, viz.

Exod. ii. 10, as the root (transferred from the Egyptian into the Hebrew) of the name of Moses, and even Luther saw in it an historical allusion, "He hath made a Moses of me", He hath drawn me out of great (many) waters, which had well nigh swallowed me up, as He did Moses out of the waters of the Nile, in which he would have perished. This figurative language is followed, in ver. 18, by its interpretation, just as in cxliv. 7 the "great waters" are explained by מִיַּד בְּנֵי נֵכָר, which, however, is not suitable here, or at least is too limited.

With ver. 17 the hymn has reached the climax of epic description, from which it now descends in a tone that becomes more and more lyrical. In the combination אֹיְבִי עָז, עָז is not an adverbial accusative, but an adjective, like רוּחֲךָ טוֹבָה cxliii. 10, and ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός (*Hebräerbrief* S. 353). כִּי introduces the reason for the interposition of the divine omnipotence, viz. the superior strength of the foe and the weakness of the oppressed one. On the day of his אֵיד, *i. e.* (*vid.* on xxxi. 12) his load or calamity, when he was altogether a homeless and almost defenceless fugitive, they came upon him (קִדַּם xvii. 13), cutting off all possible means of delivering himself, but Jahve became the fugitive's staff (xxiii. 4) upon which he leaned and kept himself erect. By the hand of God, out of straits and difficulties he reached a broad place, out of the dungeon of oppression to freedom, for Jahve had delighted in him, he was His chosen and beloved one. חָפֵץ has the accent on the penult here, and *Metheg* as a sign of the lengthening (הֶעָמָרָה) beside the *ē*, that it may not be read *ĕ*.* The following strophe tells the reason of his pleasing God and of His not allowing him to perish. This כִּי חָפֵץ בִּי (for He delighted in me) now becomes the primary thought of the song.

Vers. 21—24. On גָּמַל (like שָׁלַם with the accusative not merely of the thing, but also of the person, *e. g.* 1 Sam. xxiv. 18), εὖ or κακῶς πράττειν τινά, *vid.* on vii. 5. שָׁמַר, to observe = to keep, is used in the same way in Job xxii. 15.

---

* In like manner *Metheg* is placed beside the *ē* of the final closed syllable that has lost the tone in חָפֵץ xxii. 9, וַיְחוֹלֵל xc. 2., *vid. Isaiah* S. 594 note.

רָשַׁע מִן is a pregnant expression of the *malitiosa desertio.* "From God's side", *i. e.* in His judgment, would be contrary to the general usage of the language (for the מִן in Job iv. 17 has a different meaning) and would be but a chilling addition. On the poetical form מִנִּי, in pause מֻנִּי, *vid.* Ew. § 263,*b*. The *fut.* in ver. 23*b*, close after the substantival clause ver. 23*a*, is not intended of the habit in the past, but at the present time: he has not wickedly forsaken God, but (כִּי = *imo, sed*) always has God's commandments present before him as his rule of conduct, and has not put them far away out of his sight, in order to be able to sin with less compunction; and thus then (*fut. consec.*) in relation (עִם, as in Deut. xviii. 13, cf. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5) to God he was תָּמִים, with his whole soul undividedly devoted to Him, and he guarded himself against his iniquity (עֲוֹן, from עָוָה, غوى, to twist, pervert, cf. غَوِى of error, delusion, self-enlightenment), *i. e.* not: against acquiescence in his in-dwelling sin, but: against iniquity becoming in any way his own; מֵעֲוֹנִי equivalent to מֵעֲוֹתִי (Dan. ix. 5), cf. מֵחַיַּי = than that I should live, Jon. iv. 8. In this strophe, this Psalm strikes a cord that harmonises with Ps. xvii., after which it is therefore placed. We may compare David's own testimony concerning himself in 1 Sam. xxvi. 23 sq., the testimony of God in 1 Kings xiv. 8, and the testimony of history in 1 Kings xv. 5, xi. 4.

Vers. 25.—28. What was said in ver. 21 is again expressed here as a result of the foregoing, and substantiated in vers. 26, 27. חָסִיד is a friend of God and man, just as *pius* is used of behaviour to men as well as towards God. גְּבַר תָּמִים the man (construct of גֶּבֶר) of moral and religious completeness (*integri* = *integritatis*, cf. xv. 2), *i. e.* of undivided devotion to God. נָבָר (instead of which we find בַּר לֵבָב elsewhere, xxiv. 4, lxxiii. 1) not one who is purified, but, in accordance with the reflexive primary meaning of *Niph.*, one who is purifying himself, ἁγνίζων ἑαυτόν, 1 John iii. 3. עִקֵּשׁ (the opposite of יָשָׁר) one who is morally distorted, perverse. Freely formed *Hithpaels* are used with these attributive words to give expression to the corresponding self-manifestation: הִתַּמֵּם, הִתְחַסֵּד (Ges. § 54, 2,*b*), הִתְבָּרֵר, and הִתְפַּתֵּל (to shew one's self נִפְתָּל or פִּתַּלְתֹּל). The fervent

love of the godly man God requites with confiding love, the entire submission of the upright with a full measure of grace, the endeavour after purity by an unbeclouded charity (cf. lxxiii. 1), moral perverseness by paradoxical judgments, giving the perverse over to his perverseness (Rom. i. 28) and leading him by strange ways to final condemnation (Isa. xxix. 14, cf. Lev. xxvi. 23 sq.). The truth, which is here enunciated, is not that the conception which man forms of God is the reflected image of his own mind and heart, but that God's conduct to man is the reflection of the relation in which man has placed himself to God; cf. 1 Sam. ii. 30, xv. 23. This universal truth is illustrated and substantiated in ver. 28. The people who are bowed down by affliction experience God's condescension, to their salvation; and their haughty oppressors, God's exaltation, to their humiliation. Lofty, proud eyes are among the seven things that Jahve hateth, according to Prov. vi. 17. The judgment of God compels them to humble themselves with shame, Isa. ii. 11.

Vers. 29—31. The confirmation of what has been asserted is continued by David's application of it to himself. Hitzig translates the futures in vers. 29 sq. as imperfects; but the sequence of the tenses, which would bring this rendering with it, is in this instance interrupted, as it has been even in ver. 28, by כִּי. The lamp, נֵר (contracted from *nawer*), is an image of life, which as it were burns on and on, including the idea of prosperity and high rank; in the form נִיר (from *niwr, nijr*) it is the usual figurative word for the continuance of the house of David, 1 Kings xi. 36, and frequently. David's life and dominion, as the covenant king, is the lamp which God's favour has lighted for the well-being of Israel, and His power will not allow this lamp (2 Sam. xxi. 17) to be quenched. The darkness which breaks in upon David and his house is always lighted up again by Jahve. For His strength is mighty in the weak; in, with, and by Him he can do all things. The *fut.* אָרָץ may be all the more surely derived from רָצַץ (= אָרַץ), inasmuch as this verb has the changeable *u* in the future also in Isa. xlii. 4, Eccl. xii. 6. The text of 2 Sam. xxii., however, certainly seems to put "rushing upon" in the stead of "breaking down". With

ver. 31 the first half of the hymn closes epiphonematically. הָאֵל is a *nom. absol.*, like הַצּוּר, Deut. xxxii. 4. This old Mosaic utterance is re-echoed here, as in 2 Sam. vii. 22, in the mouth of David. The article of הָאֵל points to God as being manifest in past history. His way is faultless and blameless. His word is צְרוּפָה, not slaggy ore, but purified solid gold, xii. 7. Whoever retreats into Him, the God of the promise, is shielded from every danger. Prov. xxx. 5 is borrowed from this passage.

Vers. 32—35. The grateful description of the tokens of favour he has experienced takes a new flight, and is continued in the second half of the Psalm in a more varied and less artificial mixture of the strophes. What is said in ver. 31 of the way and word of Jahve and of Jahve Himself, is confirmed in ver. 32 by the fact that He alone is אֱלוֹהַּ, a divine being to be reverenced, and He alone is צוּר, a rock, *i. e.* a ground of confidence that cannot be shaken. What is said in ver. 31 consequently can be said only of Him. מִבַּלְעֲדֵי and זוּלָתִי alternate; the former (with a negative intensive מִן) signifies "without reference to" and then absolutely "without" or besides, and the latter (with *î* as a connecting vowel, which elsewhere has also the function of a suffix), from זוּלַת (זוּלָה), "exception". The verses immediately following are attached descriptively to אֱלֹהֵינוּ, our God (*i. e.* the God of Israel), the God, who girded me with strength; and accordingly (*fut. consec.*) made my way תָּמִים, "perfect", *i. e.* absolutely smooth, free from stumblings and errors, leading straight forward to a divine goal. The idea is no other than that in ver. 31, cf. Job xxii. 3, except that the freedom from error here is intended to be understood in accordance with its reference to the way of a man, of a king, and of a warrior; cf., moreover, the other text. The verb שִׁוָּה signifies, like سوّى, to make equal (*æquare*), to arrange, to set right; the dependent passage Hab. iii. 19 has, instead of this verb, the more uncoloured שִׂים. The hind, אַיָּלָה or אַיֶּלֶת, is the perfection of swiftness (cf. ἔλαφος and ἐλαφρός) and also of gracefulness among animals. "Like the hinds" is equivalent to like hinds' feet; the Hebrew style leaves it to the reader to infer the appropriate point of

comparison from the figure. It is not swiftness in flight (De Wette), but in attack and pursuit that is meant, — the latter being a prominent characteristic of warriors, according to 2 Sam. i. 23, ii. 18, 1 Chron. xii. 8. David does not call the high places of the enemy, which he has made his own by conquest "my high places", but those heights of the Holy Land which belong to him as king of Israel: upon these Jahve preserves him a firm position, so that from them he may rule the land far and wide, and hold them victoriously (cf. passages like Deut. xxxii. 13, Isa. lviii. 14). The verb לָמַד, which has a double accusative in other instances, is here combined with לְ of the subject taught, as the aim of the teaching. The verb נָחַת (to press down = to bend a bow) precedes the subject "my arms" in the singular; this inequality is admissible even when the subject stands first (*e. g.* Gen. xlix. 22, Joel i. 20, Zech. vi. 14). קֶשֶׁת נְחוּשָׁה a bow of brazen = of brass, as in Job xx. 24. It is also the manner of heroes in Homer and in the Ramâjana to press down and bend with their hand a brazen bow, one end of which rests on the ground.

Vers. 36—37. Yet it is not the brazen bow in itself that makes him victorious, but the helpful strength of his God. "Shield of Thy salvation" is that consisting of Thy salvation. מָגֵן has an unchangeable *å*, as it has always. The salvation of Jahve covered him as a shield, from which every stroke of the foe rebounded; the right hand of Jahve supported him that his hands might not become feeble in the conflict. In its ultimate cause it is the divine עֲנָוָה, to which he must trace back his greatness, *i. e.* God's lowliness, by virtue of which His eyes look down upon that which is on the earth (cxiii. 6), and the poor and contrite ones are His favourite dwelling-place (Isa. lvii. 15, lxvi. 1 sq.); cf. *B. Megilla* 31*a*, "wherever Scripture testifies of the גבורה of the Holy One, blessed be He, it gives prominence also, in connection with it, to His condescension, עַנְוָתָנוּתוֹ, as in Deut. x. 17 and in connection with it ver. 18, Isa. lvii. 15*a* and 15*b*, Ps. lxviii. 5 and 6". The rendering of Luther, who follows the LXX. and Vulgate, "When Thou humblest me, Thou makest me great" is opposed by the fact that עֲנָוָה means the bending of one's self, and not of another. What

is intended is, that condescension of God to mankind, and especially to the house of David, which was in operation, with an ultimate view to the incarnation, in the life of the son of Jesse from the time of his anointing to his death, viz. the divine χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία (Tit. iii. 4), which elected the shepherd boy to be king, and did not cast him off even when he fell into sin and his infirmities became manifest. To enlarge his steps under any one is equivalent to securing him room for freedom of motion (cf. the opposite form of expression in Prov. iv. 12). Jahve removed the obstacles of his course out of the way, and steeled his ankles so that he stood firm in fight and endured till he came off victorious. The *præt.* מעדו substantiates what, without any other indication of it, is required by the *consecutio temporum,* viz. that everything here has a retrospective meaning.

Vers. 38—41. Thus in God's strength, with the armour of God, and by God's assistance in fight, he smote, cast down, and utterly destroyed all his foes in foreign and in civil wars. According to the Hebrew syntax the whole of this passage is a retrospect. The imperfect signification of the futures in vers. 38, 39 is made clear from the aorist which appears in ver. 40, and from the perfects and futures in what follows it. The strophe begins with an echo of Exod. xv. 9 (cf. *supra* vii. 6). The poet calls his opponents קָמַי, as in ver. 49, xliv. 6, lxxiv. 23, cf. קִימָנִי Job xxii. 20, inasmuch as קוּם by itself has the sense of rising up in hostility and consequently one can say קָמַי instead of קָמִים עָלַי (קוֹמִים 2 Kings xvi. 7).* The frequent use of this phrase (*e. g.* xxxvi. 13, Lam. i. 14) shews that קוּם in ver. 39*a* does not mean "to stand (resist)", but "to rise (again)." The phrase עֹרֶף נָתַן, however, which in other passages has those fleeing as its subject (2 Chron. xxix. 6), is here differently applied: Thou gavest, or madest me mine enemies a

* In the language of the Beduins *ḳôm* is war, feud, and *ḳômānî* (denominative from *ḳôm*) my enemy (*hostis*); *ḳôm* also has the signification of a collective of *ḳômāni*, and one can equally well say: *entum wajjânâ ḳôm*, you and we are enemies, and: *bênâtnâ ḳôm*, there is war between us.

back, *i. e.* those who turn back, as in Exod. xxiii. 27. From xxi. 13 (תְּשִׁיתָמוֹ שְׁכֶם, Symm. τάξεις αὐτοὺς ἀποστρόφους) it becomes clear that עֹרֶף is not an accusative of the member beside the accusative of the person (as *e. g.* in Deut. xxxiii. 11), but an accusative of the factitive object according to Ges. § 139, 2.

Vers. 42—43. Their prayer to their gods, wrung from them by their distress, and even to Jahve, was in vain, because it was for their cause, and too late put up to Him. עַל = אֶל; in xlii. 2 the two prepositions are interchanged. Since we do not pulverize dust, but to dust, כְּעָפָר is to be taken as describing the result: so that they became as dust (cf. Job xxxviii. 30, כָּאֶבֶן, so that it is become like stone, and the extreme of such pregnant brevity of expression in Isa. xli. 2) before the wind (עַל־פְּנֵי as in 2 Chron. iii. 17, before the front). The second figure is to be explained differently: I emptied them out (אֲרִיקֵם from הֲרִיק) like the dirt of the streets, *i. e.* not merely: so that they became such, but as one empties it out, — thus contemptuously, ignominiously and completely (cf. Isa. x. 6, Zech. x. 5). The LXX. renders it λεανῶ from הֲרֵק (root רק to stretch, make thin, cf. *tendo tenuis*, *dehnen dünn*); and the text of 2 Sam. xxii. presents the same idea in אֲדִיקֵם.

Vers. 44—46. Thus victorious in God, David became what he now is, viz. the ruler of a great kingdom firmly establish both in home and foreign relations. With respect to the גּוֹיִם and the verb תְּפַלְּטֵנִי which follows, רִיבֵי עָם can only be understood of the conflicts among his own people, in which David was involved by the persecution of Saul and the rebellions of Absolom and Sheba the son of Bichri· and from which Jahve delivered him, in order to preserve him for his calling of world-wide dominion in accordance with the promise. We therefore interpret the passage according to בְּרִית עָם in Isa. xlix. 8., and קְנַאת־עָם in Isa. xxvi. 11; whereas the following עַם comes to have a foreign application by reason of the attributive clause לֹא־יָדַעְתִּי (Ges. § 123, 3). The *Niph.* נִשְׁמַע in ver. 45 is the reflexive of שָׁמַע, to obey (*e. g.* Ex. xxiv. 7), and is therefore to be rendered: shew themselves obedient (= *Ithpa.* in Dan. vii. 27). לִשְׁמַע אֹזֶן implies more than that they obeyed at the

word; שֵׁמַע means information, rumour, and אֹזֶן שֵׁמַע is the opposite of personal observation (Job xlii. 5), it is therefore to be rendered: they submitted even at the tidings of my victories; and 2 Sam. viii. 9 sq. is an example of this. כָּחַשׁ to lie, disown, feign, and flatter, is used here, as it is frequently, of the extorted humility which the vanquished shew towards the conqueror. Ver. 46 completes the picture of the reason of the sons of a foreign country "putting a good face on a bad game". They faded away, *i. e.* they became weak and faint-hearted (Ex xviii. 18), incapable of holding out against or breaking through any siege by David, and trembled, surrendering at discretion, out of their close places, *i. e.* out of their strongholds behind which they had shut themselves in (cf. cxlii. 8). The signification of being alarmed, which in this instance, being found in combination with a local מִן, is confined to the sense of terrified flight, is secured to the verb חָרַג by the Arabic حَرِجَ (root حر, of audible pressure, crowding, and the like) to be pressed, crowded, tight, or narrow, to get in a strait, and the Targumic אִיתְחַם דמותא = חַרְגָא דְמוֹתָא (*vid.* the Targums on Deut. xxxii. 25). حَجِلَ to limp, halt, which is compared by Hitzig, is far removed as to the sound; and the most natural, but colourless خرج, to go out of (according to its radical meaning — cf. خرق, خرع &c. —: to break forth, *erumpere*), cannot be supported in Hebrew or Aramaic. The יִרְגְּזוּ found in the borrowed passage in Micah, ch. vii. 17, favours our rendering.

Vers. 47—49. The hymn now draws towards the end with praise and thanksgiving for the multitude of God's mighty deeds, which have just been displayed. Like the בָּרוּךְ (צוּרִי) which is always doxological, חִי ה׳ (*vivus Jahve*) is meant as a predicate clause, but is read with the accent of an exclamation just as in the formula of an oath, which is the same expression; and in the present instance it has a doxological meaning. Accordingly וְיָרוֹם also signifies "exalted be," in which sense it is written וירם (וְיָרֹם = וְיָרֹם) in the other text. There are three doxological utterances drawn from the events which have just been celebrated in

song. That which follows, from הָאֵל onwards, describes Jahve once more as the living, blessed (εὐλογητόν), and exalted One, which He has shewn Himself to be. From וַיְרַבֵּר we see that הַנּוֹתֵן is to be resolved as an imperfect. The proofs of vengeance, נְקָמוֹת, are called God's gift, insofar as He has rendered it possible to him to punish the attacks upon his own dignity and the dignity of his people, or to witness the punishment of such insults (*e. g.* in the case of Nabal); for divine vengeance is a securing by punishment (*vindicatio*) of the inviolability of the right. It is questionable whether הַרְדִּיר (synonym רָדַד, cxliv. 2) here and in xlvii. 4 means "to bring to reason" as an intensive of דָּבַר, to drive (Ges.); the more natural meaning is "to turn the back" according to the Arabic *adbara* (Hitzig), cf. *dabar, dabre*, flight, retreat; *dabira* to be wounded behind; *medbûr,* wounded in the back. The idea from which הרביר gains the meaning "to subdue" is that of flight, in which hostile nations, overtaken from behind, sank down under him (xlv. 6); but the idea that is fully worked out in cxxix. 3, Isa. li. 23, is by no means remote. With מְפַלְּטִי the assertion takes the form of an address. רוֹמַם מִן does not differ from ix. 14: Thou liftest me up away from mine enemies, so that I hover above them and triumph over them. The climactic אַף, of which poetry is fond, here unites two thoughts of a like import to give intensity of expression to the one idea. The participle is followed by futures: his manifold experience is concentrated in one general ideal expression.

Vers. 50—51. The praise of so blessed a God, who acts towards David as He has promised him, shall not be confined within the narrow limits of Israel. When God's anointed makes war with the sword upon the heathen, it is, in the end, the blessing of the knowledge of Jahve for which he opens up the way, and the salvation of Jahve, which he thus mediatorially helps on. Paul has a perfect right to quote ver. 50 of this Psalm (Rom. xv. 9), together with Deut. xxxii. 43 and Ps. cxvii. 1, as proof that salvation belongs to the Gentiles also, according to the divine purpose of mercy. What is said in ver. 51 as the reason and matter of the praise that shall go forth beyond Israel, is an echo of the Messianic promises in 2 Sam. vii. 12—16 which is per-

fectly reconcileable with the Davidic authorship of the Psalm, as Hitzig acknowledges. And Theodoret does not wrongly appeal to the closing words עַד־עוֹלָם against the Jews. In whom, but in Christ, the son of David, has the fallen throne of David any lasting continuance, and in whom, but in Christ, has all that has been promised to the seed of David eternal truth and reality? The praise of Jahve, the God of David, His anointed, is, according to its ultimate import, a praising of the Father of Jesus Christ.

PSALM XVIII. ACCORDING TO THE TEXT OF 2 SAM. XXII.

On the differences of the introductory superscription, see on xviii. 1. The relation of the prose accentuation of the Psalm in 2 Sam. xxii. to the poetical accentuation in the Psalter is instructive. Thus, for example, instead of *Mercha mahpach.* (*Olewejored*) in the Psalter we here find *Athnach;* instead of the *Athnach* following upon *Mercha mahpach.,* here is *Zakeph* (cf. xviii. 7, 16, 31 with 2 Sam. xxii. 7, 16, 31); instead of *Rebia mugrash*, here *Tiphcha* (cf. xviii. 4 with 2 Sam. xxii. 4); instead of *Pazer* at the beginning of a verse, here *Athnach* (cf. Ps. xviii. 2 with 2 Sam. xxii. 2).* The peculiar mode of writing the stichs, in which we find this song in our editions, is the old traditional mode. If a half-line is placed above a half-line, so that they form two columns, it is called לבנה על־גבי לבנה אריח על־גבי אריח, brick upon brick, a half-brick upon a half-brick, as the song *Haazinu* in Deut. xxxii. is set out in our editions. On the other hand if the half-lines appear as they do here divided and placed in layers one over another, it is called אריח על־גבי לבנה ולבנה על־גבי אריח. According to *Megilla* 16*b* all the *cantica* in the Scriptures are to be written thus; and according to *Sofrim* xiii., Ps. xviii. has this form in common with 2 Sam. xxii.

Vers. 2—4. This strophe is stunted by the falling away of its monostichic introit, xviii. 2. In consequence of this, the vocatives in vers. 2 sq. are deprived of their support

* *Vid.* Baer's *Accentsystem* xv., and *Thorath Emeth* iii. 2 together with S. 44, Anm.

and lowered to substantival clauses: *Jahve is my Rock*, &c., which form no proper beginning for a hymn. Instead of וּמְפַלְטִי we have, as in cxliv. 2, ומפלטי־לי; and instead of אֱלִי צוּרִי we find אֱלֹהֵי צוּרִי, which is contrary to the usual manner of arranging these emblematical names. The loss the strophe sustains is compensated by the addition: *and my Refuge, my Saviour, who savest me from violence.* In ver. 4*b* as in ver. 49*b* the non-assimilated מִן (cf. ver. 14, xxx. 4, lxxiii. 19) is shortened into an assimilated one. May לִי perhaps be the remains of the obliterated אֵלִי, and אֱלֹהֵי, as it were, the clothing of the צוּרִי which was then left too bare?

Vers. 5—**7**. The connection of this strophe with the preceding by כִּי accords with the sense, but is tame. On the other hand, the reading מְשִׁבְרֵי instead of חֶבְלֵי (even though the author of cxvi. 3 may have thus read it) is commended by the parallelism, and by the fact, that now the latter figure is not repeated in vers. 5, 6. משברי are not necessarily waves that break upon the shore, but may also be such as break one upon another, and consequently אֲפָפוּנִי is not inadmissible. The ו of וְנַחֲלֵי, which is not wanted, is omitted. Instead of the fuller toned form סְבָבוּנִי, which is also more commensurate with the closing cadence of the verse, we have here the usual syncopated סַבּוּנִי (cf. cxviii. 11). The repetition of the אֶקְרָא (instead of אֲשַׁוֵּעַ) is even more unpoetical than the repetition of חבלי would be. On the other hand, it might originally have been וַיִּשְׁמַע instead of וַיִּשְׁמַע; without ו it is an expression (intended retrospectively) of what takes place simultaneously, with ו it expresses the principal fact. The concluding line וְשַׁוְעָתִי בְּאָזְנָיו is stunted: the brief substantival clause is not meaningless (cf. Job xv. 21, Isa. v. 9), but is only a fragment of the more copious, fuller toned conclusion of the strophe which we find in the Psalter.

Vers. 8—10. The *Kerî* here obliterates the significant alternation of the *Kal* and *Hithpa.* of נָעַשׁ. Instead of וּמוֹסְדֵי we have the feminine form of the plural מוֹסְדוֹת (as in both texts in ver. 16) without ו. Instead of the genitive הָרִים, by an extension of the figure, we have הִשְׁמִים (cf. the pillars, Job xxvi. 11), which is not intended of the mountains as of Atlasses, as it were, supporting the heavens, but of the points

of support and central points of the heavens themselves: the whole universe trembles.

Vers. 11—13. Instead of the pictorial וַיֵּדְא (Deut. xxviii. 49, and hence in Jeremiah), which is generally used of the flight of the eagle, we have the plain, uncoloured וַיֵּרָא *He appeared.* Instead of וַיָּשֶׁת, which is intended as an aorist, we meet the more strictly regular, but here, where so many aorists with ו come together, less poetical וַיָּשֶׁת. In ver. 12*a* the rise and fall of the parallel members has grown over till it forms one heavy clumsy line: *And made darkness round about Him a pavilion* (סְבִיבוֹת). But the ἅπ. λεγ. חֲשֵׁכַת, to which the signification of a "massive gathering together" is secured by the Arabic, is perhaps original. The word حشر, frequently used in the Koran of assembling to judgment, with the radical signification *stipare, cogere* (to crowd together, compress) which is also present in حاش, حشى, حشد, is here used like ἀγείρειν in the Homeric νεφεληγερέτα (the cloud-gatherer).* Ver. 13 is terribly mutilated. Of עביו ערו ברד ו of the other text there are only the four letters בֶּעָרוֹ (as in ver. 9*c*) left.

Vers. 14—16. Instead of וַיַּרְעֵם we find יַרְעֵם, which is less admissible here, where a principal fact is related and the description is drawing nearer and nearer to its goal. Instead of מִן־שָׁמַיִם the other text has בַּשָּׁמַיִם; in xxx. 4 also, מן is retained without being assimilated before ש. But the fact, however, that the line בָּרָד וְגַחֲלֵי־אֵשׁ is wanting, is a proof, which we welcome, that it is accidentally repeated from the preceding strophe, in the other text. On the other hand, חִצָּיו is inferior to חִצָּיו רָב; וּבְרָקִים is corrupted into a tame בָּרָק; and the *Kerî* וַיָּהָם erroneously assumes that the suffix of וַיְפִיצֵם refers to the arrows, *i. e.* lightnings. Again on the other hand, אפיקי ים, channels *of the sea*, is perhaps

---

* Midrash and Talmud explain it according to the Aramaic "a straining of the clouds", inasmuch as the clouds, like a sieve, let the drops trickle down to the earth, falling close upon each other and yet separately (*B. Taanith* 9*b*: מחשרות מים עלי־גבי קרקע). Kimchi combines חֲשֵׁכַת with קְשֹׁר. But the ancient Arabic حشر is the right key to the word. The root of חֲשֵׁכָה and חֲשֵׁכָה is perhaps the same (cf. Exod. x. 21).

original; מים in this connection expresses too little, and, as being the customary word in combination with אפיקי (xlii. 2, Joel i. 20), may easily have been substituted after it. At any rate יָם and תֵּבֵל form a more exact antithesis. יִגְלוּ instead of וַיִּגְלוּ is the same in meaning. The close of the strophe is here also weakened by the obliteration of the address to God: *by* (בְּ instead of the מִ of the other text) *the threatening of Jahve, at the snorting of His breath of anger*. The change of the preposition in this surge (so-to-speak) of the members of the verse is rather interruptive than pleasing.

Vers. 17—20. The variant מִמְּשֹׂנְאָי instead of ומשׂאני is unimportant; but מִמְּשָׁעָן instead of לְמִשְׁעָן, *for a support*, is less pleasing both as it regards language and rhythm. The resolution of ויוציאני into אֹתִי . . . וַיּוֹצֵא is a clumsy and needless emphasising of the *me*.

Vers. 21—24. Instead of כְּצִדְקִי, we find כְּצִדְקָתִי here and in ver. 25, contrary to usage of the language of the Psalms (cf. vii. 9 with 1 King viii. 32). Instead of the poetical אֲמִיר מֻמָּנִי (Job xxvii. 5, xxiii. 12) we have אֲמִיר מֻמָּנָה (with the *fem.* used as a neuter), according to the common phrase in 2 Kings iii. 3, and frequently (cf. Deut. v. 32). Instead of וָאֶהְיֶה, the not less (*e. g.* cii. 8) usual וְאֶהְיֶה; and instead of וָאֶשְׁתַּמֵּר, the form with *ah* of direction which occurs very frequently with the first person of the *fut. convers.* in the later Hebrew, although it does also occur even in the older Hebrew (iii. 6, vii. 5, Gen. xxxii. 6, Job xix. 20). And instead of עִמּוֹ we find לוֹ, which does not commend itself, either as a point of language or of rhythm; and by comparison with vers. 26, 27, it certainly is not original.

Vers. 25—28. On כְּצִדְקָתִי see ver. 21. בָּרִי is without example, since elsewhere (כַּפַּיִם) בַּר יָדַיִם is the only expression for innocence. In the equally remarkable expression גִּבּוֹר תָּמִים (*the upright "man of valour"*), גבור is used just as in the expression גִּבּוֹר חַיִל. The form תִּתָּבָר, has only the sound of an assimilated *Hithpa.* like תִּתַּמָּם (= תתתמם), and is rather a reflexive of the *Hiph.* הִבֵּר after the manner of the Aramaic *Ittaphal* (therefore = תִּתַּבְּרַר); and the form תִּתָּפָל sounds altogether like a *Hithpa.* from תָּפַל (thou shewest thyself insipid, absurd, foolish), but — since תִּתְפַּלָּה

cannot be ascribed to God (Job i. 22), and is even unseemly as an expression — appears to be treated likewise as an *Ittaphal* with a kind of inverted assimilation = תִּתְהַפָּתֵל (Böttcher). They are contractions such as are sometimes allowed by the dialect of the common people, though contrary to all rules. וְאֶת instead of כִּי at the beginning of ver. 28 changes what is confirmatory into a mere continuation of the foregoing. One of the most sensible variations is the change of ועינים רמות to וְעֵינֶיךָ עַל־רָמִים. The rendering: And Thine eyes (are directed down) upon the haughty that Thou mayst bring (them) low (Stier, Hengst., and others), violates the accentuation and is harsh so far as the language is concerned (תַּשְׁפִּיל for לְהַשְׁפִּילָם). Hitzig renders it, according to the accents: And Thou lowerest Thine eyes against the proud, הטיל פנים = השפיל עינים (Jer. iii. 12). But one would expect בְּ instead of עַל, if this were the meaning. It is better to render it according to Ps. cxiii. 6: *And Thou dost cast down Thine eyes upon the haughty*, in which rendering the haughty are represented as being far beneath Jahve notwithstanding their haughtiness, and the "casting down or depressing of the eyes" is an expression of the utmost contempt (*despectus*).

Vers. 29—31. Here in ver. 29*a* תָּאִיר has been lost, for Jahve is called, and really is, אור in xxvii. 1, but not נר. The form of writing נִיר is an incorrect wavering between נֵר and נִיר. The repetition יהוה ויהוה, by which the loss of תאיר, and of אֱלֹהַי in ver. 29*b*, is covered, is inelegant. We have בְּךָ here instead of בָּךְ, as twice besides in the Old Testament. The form of writing אָרוּץ, as Isa. xlii. 4 shews, does not absolutely require that we should derive it from רוּץ; nevertheless רוּץ can be joined with the accusative just as well as דָּלַג, in the sense of running against, rushing upon; therefore, since the parallelism is favourable, it is to be rendered: *by Thee I rush upon a troop*. The omission of the ו before בֵּאלֹהַי is no improvement to the rhythm.

Vers. 32—35. The variety of expression in ver. 32 which has been preserved in the other text is lost here. Instead of הַמְאַזְּרֵנִי חָיִל we find, as if from a faded MS., מָעוּז חָיִל (according to Norzi מָעוּזִּי) my refuge (*lit.* hiding) of strength, *i. e.* my strong refuge, according to a syntactically more

elegant style of expression (= מעוזי מָעוֹז חיל), like lxxi. 7, Lev. vi. 3, xxvi. 42; *vid.* Nägelsbach § 63, *g*, where it is correctly shewn, that this mode of expression is a matter of necessity in certain instances.* The form of writing, מָעוּזִי, seems here to recognise a מָעוּז, a hiding-place, refuge, = معاذ, which is different from מָעוֹז a fortress (from עוז); but just as in every other case the punctuation confuses the two substantives (*vid.* on xxxi. 3), so it does even here, since מָעוֹז, from עוז, ought to be inflected מָעוֹזִי, like מָנוֹסִי, and not מָעוּזִי. Nevertheless the *plena scriptio* may avail to indicate to us, that here מעוז is intended to be a synonym of מַחְסֶה. Instead of (תמים דרכי) וַיִּתֵּן we have וַיִּתֵּר here; perhaps it is He let, or caused, my way to be spotless, *i. e.* made it such. Thus Ewald renders it by referring to the modern Arabic خلّى to let, cause [Germ. *lassen*, French *faire*] = to make, effect; even the classic ancient Arabic language uses ترك (*lassen*) in the sense of جعل (to make), *e. g.* "I have made (تَرَكْتُ) the sword my camp-companion", *i. e.* my inseparable attendant (*lit.* I have caused it to be such), as it is to be translated in Nöldecke's *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber*, S. 131.** Or does הִתִּיר retain its full and

* In the present instance מָעוֹז חַיַּי, like מַחְסֶה עֻזִּי in lxxi. 7 (cf. Ezek. xvi. 27, xviii. 7, and perhaps Hab. iii. 8) would not be inadmissible, although in the other mode of expression greater prominence is given to the fact of its being provided and granted by God. But in cases like the following it would be absolutely inadmissible to append the suffix to the *nom. rectum*, viz. שִׂנְאֵי שֶׁקֶר xxxviii. 20; בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב my covenant with Jacob, Lev. xxvi. 42; מְהוּ בַד his garment of linen, Lev. vi. 3; כְּתָבָם הַמִּתְיַחְשִׂים their ancestral register, Ezra ii. 62; and it is probable that this transference of the pronominal suffix to the *nom. regens* originated in instances like these, where it was a logical necessary and then became transferred to the *syntax ornata*. At the same time it is clear from this, that in cases like שִׂנְאֵי שֶׁקֶר, and consequently also שִׂנְאֵי חִנָּם, the second notion is not conceived as an accusative of more precise definition, but as a governed genitive.

** *Ibid.* S. 133, Z. 13 is, with Fleischer, to be rendered: ye have made (تركتم) my milk camels restless, *i. e.* caused them to be such, by having stolen them and driven them away so that they now yearn after home and their young ones.

proper meaning "to unfetter"? This is more probable, since the usage of Hebrew shews no example of הֵתִיר in the post-biblical signification "to allow, permit", which ought to form the transition to "to cause to be = to effect". Therefore we may compare on the contrary Koran ix. 15, *challu sebîlahum* loose their way, *i. e.* let them go forth free, and render it: He unfettered, unbound, left to itself, *let my way go on as faultless* (unobstructed). Hitzig, following the *Chethîb* דרכו, renders it differently: "and made the upright skip on his way." But תמים beside דרכו is to be regarded at the outset as its predicate, and הֵתִיר means "to cause to jump up", Hab. iii. 6, not "to skip along". Nevertheless, the *Chethîb* דרכו, which, from the following *Chethîb* רגליו, bears the appearance of being designed, at any rate seems to have understood תמים personally: *He unfettered* (*expedit*) *the upright his way, making his feet like* &c. The reading וְנַחַת instead of וְנֵחָתָה, although admissible so far as the syntax is concerned (Ges. § 147,*a*), injures the flow of the rhythm.

Vers. 36—37. The pentastich is stunted here by the falling away of the middle line of ver. 36: *and Thy right hand supported me.* Instead of the expressive וְעַנְוָתְךָ (and Thy condescension) we find here וְעֲנִיָּתְךָ which, in accordance with the usage of the language, does not mean Thy being low (Hengst.), but rather: Thy labour (Böttch.), or more securely: *Thine answering,* LXX. ὑπακοή (*i. e.* the actual help, wherewith Thou didst answer my prayer). Instead of תַּחְתָּי we find, as also in vers. 40, 48, תַּחְתֵּנִי with a verbal suffix, like בָּעֵר in cxxxix. 11; it is perhaps an inaccuracy of the common dialect, which confused the genitive and accusative suffix. But instances of this are not wanting even in the written language, Ges. § 103, rem. 3.

Vers. 38—41. The cohortative אֶרְדְּפָה, as frequently, has the sense of a hypothetical antecedent, whether it refers to the present, as in cxxxix. 8, or to the past as in lxxiii. 16 and here: *in case I pursued.* In the text in the Psalter it is וְאַשִּׁיגֵם, here it is וְאַשְׁמִידֵם, by which the echo of Exod. xv. is obliterated. And after עַד־כִּלּוֹתָם how tautological is the וְאֲכַלֵּם which is designed to compensate for the shortening of the verse! The verse, to wit, is shortened at the end, וְלֹא־יָכְלוּ קוּם being transformed into וְלֹא יְקוּמוּן. Instead of

וַיָּבֹלוּ, וַיָּבֶלוּ is not inappropriate. Instead of וַתְּאַזְּרֵנִי we find וַתְּזָרֵנִי, by a syncope that belongs to the dialect of the people, cf. תְּזָלִי for תְּאַזְּלִי Jer. ii. 36, מָלֵךְ for מַאֲלִיךְ Job xxxv. 11. Of the same kind is תַּתָּה = נָתַתָּה, an apocope take from the mouths of the people, with which only רַד, Judg. xix. 11, if equivalent to יָרַד, can be compared. The conjunctive ו of ומשנאי stands here in connection with אצמיתם as a *consec.: my haters, whom I destroyed.* The other text is altogether more natural, better conceived, and more elegant in this instance.

Vers. 42—43. Instead of יְשַׁוְּעוּ we have יָשְׁעוּ, a substitution which is just tolerable: they look forth for help, or even: they look up expectantly to their gods, Isa. xvii. 8, xxxi. 1. The two figurative expressions in ver. 43, however, appear here, in contrast with the other text, in a distorted form: *And I pulverised them as the dust of the earth, as the mire of the street did I crush them, I trampled them down.* The lively and expressive figure כעפר על־פני רוח is weakened into כעפר־ארץ. Instead of אֲרִיקֵם, we have the overloaded glossarial אֲדַקֵּם אֲרַקֵּעֵם. The former (root דק, דך, to break in pieces) is a word that is interchanged with the אריקם of the other text in the misapprehended sense of אֲרַקֵּם. The latter (root רק, to stretch, to make broad, thin, and compact) looks like a gloss of this ארקם. Since one does not intentionally either crush or trample upon the dirt of the street nor tread it out thin or broad, we must in this instance take not merely כעפר־ארץ but also כטיט־חוצות as expressing the issue or result.

Vers. 44—46. The various reading רִיבֵי עַמִּי proceeds from the correct understanding, that רִיבֵי refers to David's contentions within his kingdom. The supposition that עַמִּי is a *plur. apoc.* and equivalent to עַמִּים, as it is to all appearance in cxliv. 2, and like מָנִי = מָנִים xlv. 9, has no ground here. The reasonable variation תְּשִׁמְרֵנִי harmonises with עַמִּי: *Thou hast kept me* (preserved me) *for a head of the nations,* viz. by not allowing David to become deprived of the throne by civil foes. The two lines of ver. 45 are reversed, and not without advantage. The *Hithpa.* יִתְכַּחֲשׁוּ instead of the *Piel* יְכַחֲשׁוּ (cf. lxvi. 3, lxxxi. 16) is the reflexive of the latter: they made themselves flatterers (cf. the *Niph.* Deut. xxxiii. 29: to shew

themselves flattering, like the יִשָּׁמְעוּ which follows here, *audientes se præstabant = obediebant*). Instead of (אֹזֶן) לִשְׁמַע we have here, in a similar signification, but less elegant, לִשְׁמוּעַ(אֹזֶן) *according to the hearing of the ear, i. e.* hearsay. Instead of וַיַּחְגְּרוּ we find וַיַּחֲרִגוּ, which is either a transposition of the letters as a solecism (cf. פָּרִץ 2 Sam. xiii. 27 for פָּצַר), or used in a peculiar signification. "They gird (*accincti prodeunt*)" does not give any suitable meaning to this picture of voluntary submission. But חָגַר (whence Talmudic חִגֵּר lame) may have signified "to limp" in the dialect of the people, which may be understood of those who drag themselves along with difficulty and reluctance (Hitz.). "*Out of their closed places (castles)*", here with the suff. *ām* instead of *éhém*.

Vers. 47—49. The צוּר thrust into ver. 47*b* is troublesome. וְיָרֹם (without any necessity for correcting it to וְיָרֻם) is optative, cf. Gen. xxvii. 31, Prov. ix. 4, 16. Instead of וַיַּדְבֵּר we have וּמֹרִיד *and who subdueth,* which is less significant and so far as the syntax is concerned less elegant. Also here consequently תַּחְתֵּנִי for תַּחְתַּי. Instead of מְפַלְטִי we find וּמוֹצִיאִי *and who bringeth me forth out of my enemies,* who surround me — a peculiar form of expression and without support elsewhere (for it is different in ver. 20). The poetical אַף is exchanged for the prose וּ, מִקָּמַי for מִקָּמַי, and חָמָס (אִישׁ) for חֲמָסִים (אִישׁ); the last being a *plur.* (cxl. 2, 5, Prov. iv. 17), which is foreign to the genuine Davidic Psalms.

Vers. 50—51. The change of position of יהוה in ver. 50*a*, as well as אֲזַמֶּרְךָ for אֲזַמְּרָה, is against the rhythm; the latter, moreover, is contrary to custom, lvii. 10, cviii. 4. While מגדל of the other text is not pointed מִגְדָּל, but מַגְדִּל, it is corrected in this text from מגדיל into מִגְדּוֹל *tower* of salvation — a figure that recalls lxi. 4, Prov. xviii. 10, but is obscure and somewhat strange in this connection; moreover, *migdol* for *migdal,* a tower, only occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament as a proper name.

If we now take one more glance over the mutual relationship of the two texts, we cannot say that both texts equally partake of the original. With the exception of the correct omission of ver. 14*c* and the readings מִשְׁבְּרֵי, חַשְׁרַת, and אֶפְיְקֵי יָם there is scarcely anything in the text of 2 Sam.

xxii. that specially commends itself to us. That this text is a designed, and perhaps a Davidic, revision of the other text (Hengst.), is an assumption that is devoid of reason and appearance; for in 2 Sam. xxii. we have only a text that varies in some instances, but not a substantially new form of the text. The text in 2 Sam. xxii., as it has shewn us, is founded upon careless written and oral transmission. The rather decided tendency towards a defective form of writing leads one to conjecture the greater antiquity of the copy from which it is taken. It is easy to understand how poetical passages inserted in historical works were less carefully dealt with. It is characteristic of the form of the text of the Psalm in 2 Sam. xxii., that in not a few instances the licences of popular expression have crept into it. There is some truth in what Böttcher says, when he calls the text in the Psalter the recension of the priests and that in the Second Book of Samuel the recension of the laity.

PSALM XIX.

PRAYER TO GOD, WHOSE REVELATION OF HIMSELF IS TWOFOLD.

2 THE heavens are telling the glory of God,
And the work of His hands doth the firmament declare.
3 Day unto day poureth forth speech,
And night unto night sheweth knowledge —
4 There is no speech and there are no words,
Whose voice is inaudible.

5 Into all lands is their line gone forth,
And to the end of the world their utterances:
To the sun hath He appointed a tabernacle there.
6 And he is like a bridegroom coming out of his chamber,
He rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course.
7 From the end of the heaven is his going forth
And his circuit unto the end of it,
And nothing can hide itself from his heat.

8 The Law of Jahve is spotless,
restoring the soul;
The testimony of Jahve is sure,
making wise the simple.
9 The statutes of Jahve are right,
rejoicing the heart;
The commandment of Jahve is pure,
enlightening the eyes;
10 The fear of Jahve is clean
enduring for ever;
The decisions of Jahve are truth,
righteous altogether.

11 More to be desired are they than gold,
and much fine gold,
And sweeter than honey
and honey-comb.
12 Moreover Thy servant is instructed by them,
in keeping them there is great reward.
13 As for errors who observeth them?! From hidden sins
do Thou pronounce me clear!
14 Also from presumptuous sins keep Thy servant back,
that they may not have dominion over me!
Then shall I be guiltless and clean
from great transgression.
15 Thus let be acceptable the words of my mouth
and the meditation of my heart
Before Thy face, O Jahve,
my rock and my Redeemer!!

In the inscription of Ps. xviii. David is called עבד יהוה, and in Ps. xix. he gives himself this name. In both Psalms, in the former at the beginning, in the latter at the close, he calls upon Jahve by the name צוּרי, my rock. These and other points of contact (*Symbolæ* p. 49) have concurred to lead the collector to append Ps. xix., which celebrates God's revelation of Himself in nature and in the Law, to Ps. xviii., which celebrates God's revelation of Himself in the history of David. The view, that in Ps. xix. we have before us two torsi blown together from some quarter or other, is founded upon a defective insight into the relationship, which accords

with a definite plan, of the two halves vers. 2—7, 8—15, as Hitzig has recently shewn in opposition to that view. The poet begins with the praise of the glory of God the Creator, and rises from this to the praise of the mercy of God the Lawgiver; and thus through the praise, springing from wondering and loving adoration, he clears the way to the prayer for justification and sanctification. This prayer grows out of the praise of the mercy of the God who has revealed Himself in His word, without coming back to the first part, vers. 2—7. For, as Lord Bacon says, the heavens indeed tell of the glory of God, but not of His will, according to which the poet prays to be pardoned and sanctified. Moreover, if we suppose the Psalm to be called forth by the aspect of the heavens by day, just as Ps. viii. was by the aspect of the heavens by night, then the unity of this praise of the two revelations of God becomes still more clear. It is morning, and the psalmist rejoices on the one hand at the dawning light of day, and on the other he prepares himself for the day's work lying before him, in the light of the Tôra. The second part, just like the first part, consists of fourteen lines, and each of them is naturally divided into a six and an eight line strophe. But in the second part, in the place of the short lines comes the cæsural schema, which as it were bounds higher, draws deeper breaths and surges as the rise and fall of the waves, for the Tôra inspires the psalmist more than does the sun. And it is also a significant fact, that in the first part God is called אֵל according to his relationship of power to the world, and is only mentioned once; whereas in the second part, He is called by His covenant name יהוה, and mentioned seven times, and the last time by a threefold name, which brings the Psalm to a close with a full toned יהוה צורי וגאלי. What a depth of meaning there is in this distinction of the revelation of God, the Redeemer, from the revelation of God, the Creator!

The last strophe presents us with a sharply sketched soteriology *in nuce*. If we add Ps. xxxii., then we have the whole of the way of salvation in almost Pauline clearness and definiteness. Paul, moreover, quotes both Psalms; they were surely his favourites.

Vers. 2—4. The heavens, *i. e.* the superterrestrial spheres, which, so far as human vision is concerned, are lost in infinite space, declare how glorious is God, and indeed אֵל, as the Almighty; and what His hands have made, *i. e.* what He has produced with a superior power to which everything is possible, the firmament, *i. e.* vault of heaven stretched out far and wide and as a transparency above the earth (Græco-Veneta τάμα = ἔκταμα, from רָקִיעַ, root רק, to stretch, τείνειν), distinctly expresses. The sky and firmament are not conceived of as conscious beings which the middle ages, in dependence upon Aristotle (*vid.* Maimonides, *More Nebuchim* ii. 5), believed could be proved from this passage, cf. Neh. ix. 6, Job xxxviii. 7. Moreover, Scripture knows nothing of the "music of the spheres" of the Pythagoreans. What is meant is, as the old expositors correctly say, *objectivum vocis non articulatæ præconium.* The doxa, which God has conferred upon the creature as the reflection of His own, is reflected back from it, and given back to God as it were in acknowledgment of its origin. The idea of perpetuity, which lies even in the participle, is expanded in ver. 3. The words of this discourse of praise are carried forward in an uninterrupted line of transmission. יַבִּיעַ (fr. נָבַע, נבע, root נב, to gush forth, nearly allied to which, however, is also the root בע, to spring up) points to the rich fulness with which, as from an inexhaustible spring, the testimony passes on from one day to the next. The parallel word חָוָה is an unpictorial, but poetic, word that is more Aramaic than Hebrew (= הִגִּיד). אֹמֶר also belongs to the more elevated style; the γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ deposited in the creature, although not reflected, is here called דַּעַת. The poet does not say that the tidings proclaimed by the day, if they gradually die away as the day declines, are taken up by the night, and the tidings of the night by the day; but (since the knowledge proclaimed by the day concerns the visible works of God by day, and that proclaimed by the night, His works by night), that each dawning day continues the speech of that which has declined, and each approaching night takes up the tale of that which has passed away (*Psychol.* S. 347, tr. p 408). If ver. 4 were to be rendered

"there is no speech and there are no words, their voice is inaudible", *i. e.* they are silent, speechless witnesses, uttering no sound, but yet speaking aloud (Hengst.), only inwardly audible but yet intelligible everywhere (Then.): then, ver. 5 ought at least to begin with a *Waw adversativum*, and, moreover, the poet would then needlessly check his fervour, producing a tame thought and one that interrupts the flow of the hymn. To take ver. 4 as a circumstantial clause to ver. 5, and made to precede it, as Ewald does, "without loud speech . . . their sound has resounded through all the earth" (§ 341, *d*), is impossible, even apart from the fact of אֹמֶר not meaning "loud speech" and קוֹם hardly "their sound". Ver. 4 is in the form of an independent sentence, and there is nothing whatever in it to betray any designed subordination to ver. 5. But if it be made independent in the sense "there is no loud, no articulate speech, no audible voice, which proceeds from the heavens", then ver. 5 would form an antithesis to it; and this, in like manner, there is nothing to indicate, and it would at least require that the verb יצא should be placed first. Luther's rendering is better: There is no language nor speech, where their voice is not heard, *i. e.*, as Calvin also renders it, the testimony of the heavens to God is understood by the peoples of every language and tongue. But this ought to be אֵין לָשׁוֹן or אֵין שָׂפָה (Gen. xi. 1). Hofmann's rendering is similar, but more untenable: "There is no speech and there are no words, that their cry is not heard, *i. e.* the language of the heavens goes forth side by side with all other languages; and men may discourse ever so, still the speech or sound of the heavens is heard therewith, it sounds above them all." But the words are not בְּלִי נִשְׁמָע (after the analogy of Gen. xxxi. 20), or rather בְּלִי יִשָּׁמַע (as in Job xli. 18, Hos. viii. 7). בְּלִי with the *part.* is a poetical expression for the *Alpha privat.* (2 Sam. i. 21), consequently בלי נשמע is "unheard" or "inaudible", and the opposite of נִשְׁמָע, audible, Jer. xxxi. 15. Thus, therefore, the only rendering that remains is that of the LXX, Vitringa, and Hitzig: There is no language and no words, whose voice is unheard, *i. e.* inaudible. Hupfeld's assertion that this rendering destroys the parallelism is unfounded. The structure of the distich resembles cxxxix.

4. The discourse of the heavens and the firmament, of the day (of the sky by day) and of the night (of the sky by night), is not a discourse uttered in a corner, it is a discourse in speech that is everywhere audible, and in words that are understood by all, a φανερόν, Rom. i. 19.

Vers. 5—7. Since אֹמֶר and דִּבְרִים are the speech and words of the heavens, which form the ruling principal notion, comprehending within itself both יום and לילה, the suffixes of קַוָּם and מִלֵּיהֶם must unmistakeably refer to השמים in spite of its being necessary to assign another reference to קולם in ver. 4. Jer. xxxi. 39 shews how we are to understand קָו in connection with יֵצֵא. The measuring line of the heavens is gone forth into all the earth, *i. e.* has taken entire possession of the earth. Ver. 5*b* tells us what kind of measuring line is intended, viz. that of their heraldship: their words (from מְלָה, which is more Aramaic than Hebrew, and consequently more poetic) reach to the end of the world, they fill it completely, from its extreme boundary inwards. Isaiah's קָו, ch. xxviii. 10, is inapplicable here, because it does not mean commandment, but rule, and is there used as a word of derision, rhyming with צַו. The ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν of the LXX. (ὁ ἦχος αὐτῶν Symm.) might more readily be justified, inasmuch as קָו might mean a harpstring, as being a cord in tension, and then, like τόνος (cf. τοναία), a tone or sound (Gesenius in his *Lex.*, and Ewald), if the reading קולם does not perhaps lie at the foundation of that rendering. But the usage of the language presents the signification of a measuring line for קו when used with יצא (Aq. κανών, cf. 2 Cor. x. 13); and this gives a new thought, whereas in the other case we should merely have a repetition of what has been already expressed in ver. 4. Paul makes use of these first two lines of the strophe in order, with its very words, to testify to the spread of the apostolic message over the whole earth. Hence most of the older expositors have taken the first half of the Psalm to be an allegorical prediction, the heavens being a figure of the church and the sun a figure of the gospel. The apostle does not, however, make a formal citation in the passage referred to, he merely gives a New Testament application to Old Testament language, by taking the all-penetrating

præconium cœlorum as figure of the all-penetrating *præconium evangelii;* and he is fully justified in so doing by the parallel which the psalmist himself draws between the revelation of God in nature and in the written word.

The reference of בָּהֶם to הַשָּׁמַיִם is at once opposed by the tameness of the thought so obtained. The tent, viz. the retreat (אֹהֶל, according to its radical meaning a dwelling, from אהל, cogn. אול, to retire from the open country) of the sun is indeed in the sky, but it is more naturally at the spot where the sky and the קְצֵה תֵבֵל meet. Accordingly בהם has the neuter signification "there" (cf. Isa. xxx. 6); and there is so little ground for reading שָׁם instead of שָׂם, as Ewald does, that the poet on the contrary has written בהם and not שָׁם, because he has just used שָׂם (Hitzig). The name of the sun, which is always feminine in Arabic, is predominantly masculine in Hebrew and Aramaic (cf. on the other hand Gen. xv. 17, Nah. iii. 17, Isa. xlv. 6, Mal. iii. 20); just as the Sabians and heathen Arabs had a sun-god (*masc.*). Accordingly in ver. 6 the sun is compared to a bridegroom, who comes forth in the morning out of his חֻפָּה. Joel ii. 16 shews that this word means a bride-chamber; properly (from חָפַף to cover) it means a canopy (Isa. iv. 5), whence in later Hebrew the bridal or portable canopy (Talmud. בֵּית גְּנָנָא), which is supported by four poles and borne by four boys, at the consecration of the bridal pair, and then also the marriage itself, is called *chuppa.* The morning light has in it a freshness and cheerfulness, as it were a renewed youth. Therefore the morning sun is compared to a bridegroom, the desire of whose heart is satisfied, who stands as it were at the beginning of a new life, and in whose youthful countenance the joy of the wedding-day still shines. And as at its rising it is like a bridegroom, so in its rapid course (Sir. xliii. 5) it is like a hero (*vid.* on xviii. 34), inasmuch as it marches on its way ever anew, light-giving and triumphant, as often as it comes forth, with גִּבּוֹרָה (Judges v. 31). From one end of heaven, the extreme east of the horizon, is its going forth, *i. e.* rising (cf. Hos. vi. 3; the opposite is מָבוֹא going in = setting), and its circuit (תְּקוּפָה, from קוּף = נָקַף, Isa. xxix. 1, to revolve) עַל־קְצוֹתָם, to their (the heavens') end (= עַד Deut. iv. 32), cf.

1 Esdr. iv. 34: ταχὺς τῷ δρόμῳ ὁ ἥλιος, ὅτι στρέφεται ἐν τῷ κύκλῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πάλιν ἀποτρέχει εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ. On this open way there is not נִסְתָּר, anything hidden, *i. e.* anything that remains hidden, before its heat. חַמָּה is the enlightening and warming influence of the sun, which is also itself called חַמָּה in poetry.

Vers. 8—10. No sign is made use of to mark the transition from the one part to the other, but it is indicated by the introduction of the divine name יהוה instead of אֵל. The word of nature declares אֵל (God) to us, the word of Scripture יהוה (Jahve); the former God's power and glory, the latter also His counsel and will. Now follow twelve encomiums of the Law, of which every two are related as antecedent and consequent, rising and falling according to the cæsural schema, after the manner of waves. One can discern how now the heart of the poet begins to beat with redoubled joy as he comes to speak of God's word, the revelation of His will. תּוֹרָה does not in itself mean the law, but a pointing out, instruction, doctrine or teaching, and more particularly such as is divine, and therefore positive; whence it is also used of prophecy, Isa. i. 10, viii. 16, and prophetically of the New Testament gospel, Isa. ii. 3. But here no other divine revelation is meant than that given by the mediation of Moses, which is become the law, *i. e.* the rule of live (νόμος), of Israel; and this law, too, as a whole not merely as to its hortatory and disciplinary character, but also including the promises contained in it. The praises which the poet pronounces upon the Law, are accurate even from the standpoint of the New Testament. Even Paul says, Rom. vii. 12, 14, "The Law is holy and spiritual, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." The Law merits these praises in itself; and to him who is in a state of favour, it is indeed no longer a law bringing a curse with it, but a mirror of the God merciful in holiness, into which he can look without slavish fear, and is a rule for the direction of his free and willing obedience. And how totally different is the affection of the psalmists and prophets for the Law, — an affection based upon the essence and universal morality of the commandments, and upon a spiritual realisation of the letter, and the consolation

of the promises, — from the pharisaical rabbinical service of the letter and the ceremonial in the period after the Exile!

The divine Law is called תְּמִימָה, "perfect", *i. e.* spotless and harmless, as being absolutely well-meaning, and altogether directed towards the well-being of man. And מְשִׁיבַת נָפֶשׁ restoring, bringing back, *i. e.* imparting newness of life, quickening the soul (cf. *Pil.* שׁוֹבֵב, xxiii. 3), to him, viz., who obeys the will of God graciously declared therein, and enters upon the divine way or rule of salvation. Then in the place of the word תורה we find עֵדוּת, — as the tables of the Ten Commandments (לֻחוֹת הָעֵדוּת) are called, — from עוד (הֵעִיד), which signifies not merely a corroborative, but also a warning and instructive testimony or attestation. The testimony of Jahve is נֶאֱמָנָה, made firm, sure, faithful, *i. e.* raised above all doubt in its declarations, and verifying itself in its threatenings and promises; and hence מַחְכִּימַת פֶּתִי, making wise simplicity, or the simple, *lit.* openness, the open (root פת to spread out, open, Indo-Germ. *prat*, πετ, *pat, pad*), *i. e.* easily led astray; to such an one it gives a solid basis and stability, σοφίζει αὐτόν, 2 Tim. iii. 15. The Law divides into פִּקּוּדִים, precepts or declarations concerning man's obligation; these are יְשָׁרִים, straight or upright, as a *norma normata*, because they proceed from the upright, absolutely good will of God, and as a *norma normans* they lead along a straight way in the right track. They are therefore מְשַׂמְּחֵי לֵב, their educative guidance, taking one as it were by the hand, frees one from all tottering, satisfies a moral want, and preserves a joyous consciousness of being in the right way towards the right goal. מִצְוַת יהוה, Jahve's statute (from צִוָּה *statuere*), is the tenour of His commandments. The statute is a lamp — it is said in Prov. vi. 23 — and the law a light. So here: it is בָּרָה, clear, like the light of the sun (Cant. vi. 10), and its light is imparted to other objects: מְאִירַת עֵינַיִם, enlightening the eyes, which refers not merely to the enlightening of the understanding, but of one's whole condition; it makes the mind clear, and body as well as mind healthy and fresh, for the darkness of the eyes is sorrow, melancholy, and bewilderment. In this chain of names for the Law, יראת ה׳ is not the fear of

God as an act performed, but as a precept, it is what God's revelation demands, effects, and maintains; so that it is the revealed way in which God is to be feared (xxxiv. 12), — in short, it is the religion of Jahve (cf. Prov. xv. 33 with Deut. xvii. 19). This is טְהוֹרָה, clean, pure, as the word which is like to pure gold, by which it is taught, xii. 7, cf. Job xxviii. 19; and therefore עֹמֶדֶת לָעַד, enduring for ever in opposition to all false forms of reverencing God, which carry their own condemnation in themselves. מִשְׁפְּטֵי ה׳ are the *jura* of the Law as a *corpus juris divini*, everything that is right and constitutes right according to the decision of Jahve. These judgments are אֱמֶת, truth, which endures and verifies itself; because, in distinction from most others and those outside Israel, they have an unchangeable moral foundation: צָדְקוּ יַחְדָּו, *i. e.* they are צַדִּיקִים, in accordance with right and appropriate (Deut. iv. 8), altogether, because no reproach of inappositeness and sanctioned injustice or wrong clings to them. The eternal will of God has attained a relatively perfect form and development in the Law of Jahve according to the standard set up as the law of the nation.

Vers. 11—15. With הַנֶּחְמָדִים (for which, preferring a simple *Shebâ* with the gutturals, Ben-Naphtali writes הַנֶּחֱמָדִים) the poet sums up the characteristics enumerated; the article is summative, as in הַשִּׁשִּׁי at the close of the hexahemeron, Gen. i. 31. פָּז is the finest purified gold, cf. 1 Kings x. 18 with 2 Chron. ix. 17. נֹפֶת צוּפִים "the discharge (from נפת = נפשׁ) of the honeycombs" is the virgin honey, *i. e.* the honey that flows of itself out of the cells. To be desired are the revealed words of God, to him who possesses them as an outward possession; and to him who has received them inwardly they are sweet. The poet, who is himself conscious of being a servant of God, and of striving to act as such, makes use of these words for the end for which they are revealed: he is נִזְהָר, one who suffers himself to be enlightened, instructed, and warned by them. גַּם belongs to נזהר (according to the usual arrangement of the words, *e. g.* Hos. vi. 11), just as in ver. 14 it belongs to חֲשֹׂךְ. He knows that בְּשָׁמְרָם (with a subjective suffix in an objective se[illegible] cf. Prov. xxv. 7, just as we may also say:) in their o[illegible], or is included, great reward. עֵקֶב is that

which follows upon one's heels (עֵקֶב), or comes immediately after anything, and is used here of the result of conduct. Thus, then, inasmuch as the Law is not only a copy of the divine will, but also a mirror of self-knowledge, in which a man may behold and come to know himself, he prays for forgiveness in respect of the many sins of infirmity, — though for the most part unperceived by him, — to which, even the pardoned one succumbs. שְׁגִיאָה (in the terminology of the Law, שְׁגָגָה, ἀγνόημα) comprehends the whole province of the *peccatum involuntarium*, both the *peccatum ignorantiæ* and the *peccatum infirmitatis*. The question *delicta quis intelligit* is equivalent to the negative clause: no one can discern his faults, on account of the heart of man being unfathomable and on account of the disguise, oftentimes so plausible, and the subtlety of sin. Hence, as an inference, follows the prayer: pronounce me free also מִנִּסְתָּרוֹת, *ab occultis* (*peccatis*, which, however, cannot be supplied on grammatical grounds), equivalent to מֵעֲלָמִים (xc. 8), *i. e.* all those sins, which even he, who is most earnestly striving after sanctification, does not discern, although he may desire to know them, by reason of the ever limited nature of his knowledge both of himself and of sin.* נַקֵּה, δικαιοῦν, is a *vox judicialis,* to declare innocent, pronounce free from, to let go unpunished. The prayer for justification is followed in ver. 14 by the prayer for sanctification, and indeed for preservation against deliberate sins. From זוּד, זִיד, to seethe, boil over, *Hiph.* to sin wilfully, deliberately, insolently, — *opp.* of sin arising from infirmity, Exod. xxi. 14, Deut. xviii. 22, xvii. 12, — is formed זֵד an insolent sinner, one who does not sin בִּשְׁגָגָה, but בְּזָדוֹן (cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 28, where David's brethren bring this reproach against him), or בִּיד רָמָה, and the neuter collective זְדִים (cf. חֲטָאִים, ci. 3, Hos. v. 2) *peccata proœretica* or *contra conscientiam,* which cast one out of the state of grace or favour, Num. xv. 27—31. For if זדים had been intended of arrogant and insolent possessors

* In the Arab proverb, "no sin which is persisted in is small, no sin great for which forgiveness is sought of God," صغيرة directly means a little and كبيرة a great sin, *vid. Allgem. Literar. Zeitschr.* 1844. No. 46, p. 363.

of power (Ewald), the prayer would have taken some other form than that of "keeping back" (חָשַׂךְ as in 1 Sam. xxv. 39 in the mouth of David). זדים, presumptuous sins, when they are repeated, become dominant sins, which irresistibly enslave the man (מָשַׁל with a non-personal subject, as in Isa. iii. 4*b*, cf. Ps. ciii. 19); hence the last member of the climax (which advances from the *peccatum involuntarium* to the *proœreticum*, and from this to the *regnans*): let them not have dominion over me (בִּי with *Dechi* in Baer; generally wrongly marked with *Munach*).

Then (אָז), when Thou bestowest this twofold favour upon me, the favour of pardon and the grace of preservation, shall I be blameless (אֵיתָם 1 *fut. Kal*, instead of אֶתָּם, with י as a characteristic of *ē*) and absolved (וְנִקֵּיתִי not *Piel*, as in ver. 13, but *Niph.*, to be made pure, absolved) from great transgression. מִפֶּשַׁע* from פֶּשַׁע (root פּשׁ), to spread out, go beyond the bounds, break through, trespass, is a collective name for deliberate and reigning, dominant sin, which breaks through man's relation of favour with God, and consequently casts him out of favour, — in one word, for apostasy. Finally, the psalmist supplicates a gracious acceptance of his prayer, in which both mouth and heart accord, supported by the faithfulness, stable as the rock (צוּרִי), and redeeming love (גּוֹאֲלִי *redemptor, vindex*, root גל, חל, to loose, redeem) of his God. הָיָה לְרָצוֹן is a standing expression of the sacrificial tôra, *e. g.* Lev. i. 3 sq. The לְפָנֶיךָ, which, according to Exod. xxviii. 38, belongs to לרצון, stands in the second member in accordance with the "parallelism by postponement." Prayer is a sacrifice offered by the inner man. The heart meditates and fashions it; and the mouth presents it, by uttering that which is put into the form of words.

---

* The *Gaja* with מִפֶּשַׁע is intended in this instance, where מפּשׁע רב are to be read in close connection, to secure distinctness of pronunciation for the unaccented ע, as *e. g.* is also the case in lxxviii. 13, בָּקַע יָם (*bâḳa' jām*).

PSALM XX.

PRAYER FOR THE KING IN TIME OF WAR.

2 JAHVE answer thee in the day of distress,
The name of the God of Jacob set thee up on high,
3 Send thee help from the sanctuary,
And uphold thee out of Zion!

4 Remember all thy meat-offerings,
And graciously accept thy burnt offerings! (*Sela*).
5 Give thee according to thine own heart,
And fulfil all thy counsel!

6 We will shout for joy because of Thy help,
And in the name of our God will we raise our banners —
Jahve fulfil all thy wishes.
7 Now know I that Jahve giveth help to His Anointed;
He will answer him from His holy heaven
With the helpful mighty deeds of His right hand.

8 Some [praise] chariots and some horses,
And we, we praise the name of Jahve, our God.
9 If those have bowed down and fallen,
Then we have risen up and stand firm.

10 Jahve, Oh help the king! —
May He hear us in the day we call.

To Ps. xix. is closely attached Ps. xx., because its commencement is as it were the echo of the prayer with which the former closes; and to Ps. xx. is closely attached Ps. xxi., because both Psalms refer to the same event relatively, as prayer and thanksgiving. Ps. xx. is an intercessory psalm of the nation, and Ps. xxi. a thanksgiving psalm of the nation, on behalf of its king. It is clearly manifest that the two Psalms form a pair, being connected by unity of author and subject. They both open somewhat uniformly with a synonymous parallelism of the members,

xx. 2—6, xxi. 2—8; they then increase in fervour and assume a more vivid colouring as they come to speak of the foes of the king and the empire, xx. 7—9, xxi. 9—13; and they both close with an ejaculatory cry to Jahve, xx. 10, xxi. 14. In both, the king is apostrophised through the course of several verses, xx. 2—6, xxi. 9—13; and here and there this is done in a way that provokes the question whether the words are not rather addressed to Jahve, xx. 6, xxi. 10. In both Psalms the king is referred to by הַמֶּלֶךְ, xx. 10, xxi. 8; both comprehend the goal of the desires in the word יְשׁוּעָה, xx. 6, cf. 7, xxi. 2, 6; both delight in rare forms of expression, which are found only in these instances in the whole range of Old Testament literature, viz. נרגל xx. 6, נתעדר xx. 9, ארשת xxi. 3, תחדהו xxi. 7.

If, as the לדוד indicates, they formed part of the oldest Davidic Psalter, then it is notwithstanding more probable that their author is a cotemporary poet, than that it is David himself. For, although both as to form of expression (cf. xxi. 12 with x. 2) and as to thoughts (cf. xxi. 7 with xvi. 11), they exhibit some points of contact with Davidic Psalms, they still stand isolated by their peculiar character. But that David is their subject, as the inscription לדוד, and their position in the midst of the Davidic Psalms, lead one to expect, is capable of confirmation. During the time of the Syro-Ammonitish war comes David's deep fall, which in itself and in its consequences made him sick both in soul and in body. It was not until he was again restored to God's favour out of this self-incurred peril, that he went to his army which lay before Rabbath Ammon, and completed the conquest of the royal city of the enemy. The most satisfactory explanation of the situation referred to in this couplet of Psalms is to be gained from 2 Sam. xi. xii. Ps. xx. prays for the recovery of the king, who is involved in war with powerful foes; and Ps. xxi. gives thanks for his recovery, and wishes him a victorious issue to the approaching campaign. The "chariots and horses" (xx. 8) are characteristic of the military power of Aram (2 Sam. x. 18, and frequently), and in xxi. 4 and 10 we perceive an allusion to 2 Sam. xii. 30, 31, or at least a remarkable agreement with what is there recorded.

Vers. 2—6. Litany for the king in distress, who offers sacrifices for himself in the sanctuary. The futures in vers. 2—5, standing five times at the head of the climactic members of the parallelism, are optatives. יְמַלֵּא, ver. 6, also continues the chain of wishes, of which even נְרַנְּנָה (cf. lxix. 15) forms one of the links. The wishes of the people accompany both the prayer and the sacrifice. "The Name of the God of Jacob" is the self-manifesting power and grace of the God of Israel. יעקב is used in poetry interchangeably with ישראל, just like אלהים with יהוה. Alshêch refers to Gen. xxxv. 3; and it is not improbable that the desire moulds itself after the fashion of the record of the fact there handed down to us. May Jahve, who, as the history of Jacob shews, hears (and answers) in the day of distress, hear the king; may the Name of the God of Jacob bear him away from his foes to a triumphant height. שְׂגֵב alternates with רוּם (xviii. 49) in this sense. This intercession on the behalf of the praying one is made in the sanctuary on the heights of Zion, where Jahve sits enthroned. May He send him succour from thence, like auxiliary troops that decide the victory. The king offers sacrifice. He offers sacrifice according to custom before the commencement of the battle (1 Sam. xiii. 9 sq., and cf. the phrase קִדֵּשׁ מִלְחָמָה), a whole burnt-offering and at the same time a meat or rather meal offering also, מְנָחוֹת;* for every whole offering and every *shelamim*- or peace-offering had a meat-offering and a drink-offering as its indispensable accompaniment. The word זֵכֶר is perfectly familiar in the ritual of the meal-offering. That portion of the meal-offering, only a part of which was placed upon the altar (to which, however, according to traditional practice, does not belong the accompanying meal-offering of the מנחת נסכים, which was entirely devoted to the altar), which ascended with the altar fire is called אַזְכָּרָה, μνημόσυνον

---

* This, though not occurring in the Old Testament, is the principal form of the plural, which, as even David Kimchi recognises in his *Lexicon*, points to a verb מָנַח (just as עָמְלוֹת, גָּבְעוֹת, עָפְחוֹת point to עָמַל, גָּבַע, עָפַח); whereas other old grammarians supposed נָחָה to be the root, and were puzzled with the traditional pronunciation *m^enachôth*, but without reason.

(cf. Acts x. 4), that which brings to remembrance with God him for whom it is offered up (not "incense", as Hupfeld renders it); for the designation of the offering of jealousy, Num. v. 15, as "bringing iniquity to remembrance before God" shews, that in the meal-offering ritual זֵכֶר retains the very same meaning that it has in other instances. Every meal-offering is in a certain sense a מַזְכָּרָה וְזִכָּרוֹן. Hence here the prayer that Jahve would graciously remember them is combined with the meal-offerings.

As regards the *ʿolah,* the wish "let fire from heaven (Lev. ix. 24, 1 Kings xviii. 38, 1 Chron. xxi. 26) turn it to ashes", would not be vain. But the language does not refer to anything extraordinary; and in itself the consumption of the offering to ashes (Böttcher) is no mark of gracious acceptance. Moreover, as a denominative from דֶּשֶׁן, fat ashes, דִּשֵּׁן means "to clean from ashes", and not: to turn into ashes. On the other hand, דִּשֵּׁן also signifies "to make fat", xxiii. 5, and this effective signification is applied declaratively in this instance: may He find thy burnt-offering fat, which is equivalent to: may it be to Him a רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ [an odour of satisfaction, a sweet-smelling savour]. The voluntative *ah* only occurs here and in Job xi. 17 (which see) and Isa. v. 19, in the 3 *pers.*; and in this instance, just as with the cohortative in 1 Sam. xxviii. 15, we have a change of the lengthening into a sharpening of the sound (cf. the exactly similar change of forms in 1 Sam. xxviii. 15, Isa. lix. 5, Zech. v. 4, Prov. xxiv. 14, Ezek. xxv. 13) as is very frequently the case in מָה for מָה. The alteration to יְדַשְּׁנֶהָ or יְדַשְּׁנָהּ (Hitzig) is a felicitous but needless way of getting rid of the rare form. The explanation of the intensifying of the music here is, that the intercessory song of the choir is to be simultaneous with the presentation upon the altar (הַקְּטָרָה). עֵצָה is the resolution formed in the present wartime. "Because of thy salvation", *i. e.* thy success in war, is, as all the language is here, addressed to the king, cf. xxi. 2, where it is addressed to Jahve, and intended of the victory accorded to him. It is needless to read נְגַדֵּל instead of נְדַגֵּל, after the rendering of the LXX. μεγαλυνθησόμεθα. נְדַגֵּל is a denominative from דֶּגֶל: to wave a banner. In the closing line, the rejoicing of hope goes back again to the

present and again assumes the form of an intercessory desire.

Vers. 7—9. While vers. 2—6 were being sung the offering of the sacrifice was probably going on. Now, after a lengthened pause, there ascends a voice, probably the voice of one of the Levites, expressing the cheering assurance of the gracious acceptance of the offering that has been presented by the priest. With עַתָּה or וְעַתָּה, the usual word to indicate the turning-point, the instantaneous entrance of the result of some previous process of prolonged duration, whether hidden or manifest (*e. g.* 1 Kings xvii. 24, Isa. xxix. 22), is introduced. הוֹשִׁיעַ is the perfect of faith, which, in the certainty of being answered, realises the fulfilment in anticipation. The exuberance of the language in ver. 7 corresponds to the exuberance of feeling which thus finds expression.

In ver. 3 the answer is expected out of Zion, in the present instance it is looked for from God's holy heavens; for the God who sits enthroned in Zion is enthroned for ever in the heavens. His throne on earth is as it were the vestibule of His heavenly throne; His presence in the sanctuary of Israel is no limitation of His omnipresence; His help out of Zion is the help of the Celestial One and Him who is exalted above the heaven of heavens. גְּבוּרוֹת does not here mean the fulness of might (cf. xc. 10), but the displays of power (cvi. 2, cxlv. 4, cl. 2, Isa. lxiii. 15), by which His right hand procures salvation, *i. e.* victory, for the combatant. The glory of Israel is totally different from that of the heathen, which manifests itself in boastful talk. In ver. 8*a* הַזְכִּירוּ or יַזְכִּירוּ must be supplied from the נַזְכִּיר in ver. 8*b* (LXX. μεγαλυνθησόμεθα = נגביר, xii. 5); הִזְכִּיר בְּ, to make laudatory mention of any matter, to extol, and indirectly therefore to take credit to one's self for it, to boast of it (cf. הִלֵּל בְּ, xliv. 9). According to the Law Israel was forbidden to have any standing army; and the law touching the king (Deut. xvii. 16) speaks strongly against his keeping many horses. It was also the same under the judges, and at this time under David; but under Solomon, who acquired for himself horses and chariots in great number (1 Kings x. 26—29), it was very different. It is

therefore a confession that must belong to the time of David which is here made in ver. 8, viz. that Israel's glory in opposition to their enemies, especially the Syrians, is the sure defence and protection of the Name of their God alone. The language of David to Goliath is very similar, 1 Sam. xvii. 45. The preterites in ver. 9 are *præt. confidentiæ*. It is, as Luther says, "a song of triumph before the victory, a shout of joy before succour." Since קוּם does not mean to stand, but to rise, קָמְנוּ assumes the present superiority of the enemy. But the position of affairs changes: those who stand fall, and those who are lying down rise up; the former remain lying, the latter keep the field. The *Hithpa.* הִתְעוֹדֵד signifies to shew one's self firm, strong, courageous; like עוֹדֵד, cxlvi. 9, clxvii. 6, to strengthen, confirm, recover, from עוּד to be compact, firm, cogn. ﻉﺩ *f. i.*, inf. *aid*, strength; as, *e. g.*, the Koran (*Sur.* xxxviii. 16) calls David *dhâ-l-aidi*, possessor of strength, II. *ajjada*, to strengthen, support, and ﺩﺩ, inf. *add*, strength, superiority, V. *taaddada*, to shew one's self strong, brave, courageous.

Ver. 10. After this solo voice, the chorus again come on. The song is closed, as it was opened, by the whole congregation; and is rounded off by recurring to its primary note, praying for the accomplishment of that which is sought and pledged. The accentuation construes הַמֶּלֶךְ with יַעֲנֵנוּ as its subject, perhaps in consideration of the fact, that הוֹשִׁיעָה is not usually followed by a governed object, and because thus a medium is furnished for the transition from address to direct assertion. But if in a Psalm, the express object of which is to supplicate salvation for the king, הושיעה המלך stand side by side, then, in accordance with the connection, המלך must be treated as the object; and more especially since Jahve is called מֶלֶךְ רַב, in xlviii. 3, and the like, but never absolutely המלך. Wherefore it is, with Hupfeld, Hitzig, and others, to be rendered according to the LXX. and Vulgate, *Domine salvum fac regem.* The New Testament cry Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ is a peculiar application of this Davidic "God bless the king (God save the king)", which is brought about by means of cxviii. 25. The closing line, ver. 10*b*, is an expanded Amen.

PSALM XXI.

THANKSGIVING FOR THE KING IN TIME OF WAR.

2 JAHVE, on account of Thy strength is the king glad,
And on account of Thy succour how greatly doth he rejoice!
3 The wish of his heart hast Thou granted him,
And the desire of his lips hast Thou not refused. (*Sela.*)

4 For Thou dost meet him bringing blessings of good,
Thou settest upon his head a crown of fine gold.
5 He asked life of Thee, — Thou grantedst it to him,
Length of days, for ever and ever.

6 Great is his glory through Thy help,
Praise and glory dost Thou lay upon him.
7 For Thou makest him blessings for ever,
Thou dost delight him with joy in Thy presence.

8 For the king trusted in Jahve,
And through the favour of the Most High he shall not be moved.
9 Thy hand will reach to all thine enemies
Thy right hand will reach all those that hate thee.

10 Thou shalt make them as a fiery oven,
when thou art angry,
Jahve in His wrath shall swallow them up,
and a fire shall devour them.
11 Their fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth,
And their seed from among the children of men.

12 For they intend evil against thee,
They devise mischief: they shall accomplish nothing.
13 For thou wilt make them turn back,
With thy strings wilt thou aim at their faces.

14 Be Thou exalted, Jahve, in Thy might;
We will celebrate with voice and harp Thy strength.

"*Jahve fulfil all thy desires*" cried the people in the preceding Psalm, as they interceded on behalf of their king; and in this Psalm they are able thankfully to say to God "*the desire of his heart hast Thou granted.*" In both Psalms the people come before God with matters that concern the welfare of their king; in the former, with their wishes and prayers, in the latter, their thanksgivings and hopes; in the latter as in the former when in the midst of war, but in the latter after the recovery of the king, in the certainty of a victorious termination of the war.

The Targum and the Talmud, *B. Succa* 52*a*, understand this 21st Psalm of the king Messiah. Rashi remarks that this Messianic interpretation ought rather to be given up for the sake of the Christians. But even the Christian exposition cannot surely mean to hold fast this interpretation so directly and rigidly as formerly. This pair of Psalm treats of David; David's cause, however, in its course towards a triumphant issue — a course leading through suffering — is certainly figuratively the cause of Christ.

Vers. 2—3. The Psalm begins with thanksgiving for the bodily and spiritual blessings which Jahve has bestowed and still continues to bestow upon the king, in answer to his prayer. This occupies the three opening tetrastichs, of which these verses form the first. עֹז (whence עֻזֶּךָ, as in lxxiv. 13, together with עֻזֶּךָ, lxiii. 3, and frequently) is the power that has been made manifest in the king, which has turned away his affliction; יְשׁוּעָה is the help from above which has freed him out of his distrees. The יגיל, which follows the מה of the exclamation, is naturally shortened by the *Kerî* into יָגֶל (with the retreat of the tone); cf. on the contrary Prov. xx. 24, where מה is interrogative and, according to the sense, negative). The ἅπ. λεγ. אַרְשַׁת has the signification eager desire, according to the connection, the LXX. δέησιν, and the perhaps also cognate רוּשׁ, to be poor; the Arabic ورش, *avidum esse,* must be left out of consideration according to the laws of the interchange of consonants, whereas יָרַשׁ, ורث, *capere, captare* (cf. إِرْث = وِرْث an inheritance), but not רוּשׁ (*vid.* xxxiv. 11), belongs apparently to

the same root. Observe the strong negation בַּל: no, thou hast not denied, but done the very opposite. The fact of the music having to strike up here favours the supposition, that the occasion of the Psalm is the fulfilment of some public, well-known prayer.

Vers. 4—5. "Blessings of good" (Prov. xxiv. 25) are those which consist of good, *i. e.* true good fortune. The verb קִדַּם, because used of the favour which meets and presents one with some blessing, is construed with a double accusative, after the manner of verbs of putting on and bestowing (Ges. § 139). Since ver. 4*b* cannot be intended to refer to David's first coronation, but to the preservation and increase of the honour of his kingship, this particularisation of ver. 4*a* sounds like a prediction of what is recorded in 2 Sam. xii. 30: after the conquest of the Ammonitish royal city Rabbah David set the Ammonitish crown (עֲטָרָה), which is renowned for the weight of its gold and its ornamentation with precious stones, upon his head. David was then advanced in years, and in consequence of heavy guilt, which, however, he had overcome by penitence and laying hold on the mercy of God, was come to the brink of the grave. He, worthy of death, still lived; and the victory over the Syro-Ammonitish power was a pledge to him of God's faithfulness in fulfilling his promises. It is contrary to the tenour of the words to say that ver. 5*b* does not refer to length of life, but to hereditary succession to the throne. To wish any one that he may live לְעוֹלָם, and especially a king, is a usual thing, 1 Kings i. 31, and frequently. The meaning is, may the life of the king be prolonged to an indefinitely distant day. What the people have desired elsewhere, they here acknowledge as bestowed upon the king.

Vers. 6—7. The help of God turns to his honour, and paves the way for him to honour, it enables him — this is the meaning of ver. 6*b* — to maintain and strengthen his kingship with fame and glory. שִׁוָּה עַל used, as in lxxxix. 20, of divine investiture and endowment. To make blessings, or a fulness of blessing, is a stronger form of expressing God's words to Abram, Gen. xii. 2: thou shalt be a blessing *i. e.* a possessor of blessing thyself, and a medium of blessing

to others. Joy in connection with (אֵת as in xvi. 11) the countenance of God, is joy in delightful and most intimate fellowship with Him. חַדֵּהוּ, from חָדַד, which occurs once in Exod. xviii. 9, has in Arabic, with reference to nomad life, the meaning "to cheer the beasts of burden with a song and urge them on to a quicker pace", and in Hebrew, as in Aramaic, the general signification "to cheer, enliven."

Vers. 8—9. With this strophe the second half of the Psalm commences. The address to God is now changed into an address to the king; not, however, expressive of the wishes, but of the confident expectation, of the speakers. Hengstenberg rightly regards ver. 8 as the transition to the second half; for by its objective utterance concerning the king and God, it separates the language hitherto addressed to God, from the address to the king, which follows. We do not render ver. 8*b*: and [trusting] in the favour of the Most High — he shall not be moved; the mercy is the response of the trust, which (trust) does not suffer him to be moved; on the expression, cf. Prov. x. 30. This inference is now expanded in respect to the enemies who desire to cause him to totter and fall. So far from any tottering, he, on the contrary, makes a victorious assault upon his foes. If the words had been addressed to Jahve, it ought, in order to keep up the connection between vers. 9 and 8, at least to have been אֹיְבֶיךָ and שֹׂנְאֶיךָ (his, *i. e.* the king's, enemies). What the people now hope on behalf of their king, they here express beforehand in the form of a prophecy. לְ מָצָא (as in Isa. x. 10) and מָצָא *seq. acc.* (as in 1 Sam. xxiii. 17) are distinguished as: to reach towards, or up to anything, and to reach anything, attain it. Supposing לְ to represent the accusative, as *e. g.* in lxix. 6, ver. 9*b* would be a useless repetition.

Vers. 10—11. Hitherto the Psalm has moved uniformly in synonymous dipodia, now it becomes agitated; and one feels from its excitement that the foes of the king are also the people's foes. True as it is, as Hupfeld takes it, that לְעֵת פָּנֶיךָ sounds like a direct address to Jahve, ver. 10*b* nevertheless as truly teaches us quite another rendering The destructive effect, which in other passages is said to proceed from the face of Jahve, xxxiv. 17, Lev. xx. 6, Lam.

iv. 16 (cf. ἔχει θεὸς ἔκδικον ὄμμα), is here ascribed to the face, *i. e.* the personal appearing (2 Sam. xvii. 11) of the king. David's arrival did actually decide the fall of Rabbath Ammon, of whose inhabitants some died under instruments of torture and others were cast into brick-kilns, 2 Sam. xii. 26 sqq. The prospect here moulds itself according to this fate of the Ammonites. כְּתַנּוּר אֵשׁ is a second accusative to תְּשִׁיתֵמוֹ, thou wilt make them like a furnace of fire, *i. e.* a burning furnace, so that like its contents they shall entirely consume by fire (*synecdoche continentis pro contento*). The figure is only hinted at, and is differently applied to what it is in Lam. v. 10, Mal. iii. 19. Ver. 10*a* and 10*b* are intentionally two long rising and falling wave-like lines, to which succeed, in ver. 11, two short lines; the latter describe the peaceful gleaning after the fiery judgment of God that has been executed by the hand of David. פִּרְיָמוֹ, as in Lam. ii. 20, Hos. ix. 16, is to be understood after the analogy of the expression פְּרִי הַבֶּטֶן. It is the fate of the Amalekites (cf. ix. 6 sq.), which is here predicted of the enemies of the king.

Vers. 12—13. And this fate is the merited frustration of their evil project. The construction of the sentences in ver. 12 is like xxvii. 10, cxix. 83; Ew. § 362, *b*. נָטָה רָעָה is not to be understood according to the phrase נָטָה רֶשֶׁת (= פָּרַשׂ), for this phrase is not actually found; we have rather, with Hitzig, to compare Iv. 4, 2 Sam. xv. 14: to incline evil down upon any one is equivalent to: to put it over him, so that it may fall in upon him. נָטָה signifies "to extend lengthwise", to unfold, but also to bend by drawing tight. שִׁית שְׁכֶם to make into a back, *i. e.* to make them into such as turn the back to you, is a more choice expression than נָתַן עֹרֶף, xviii. 41, cf. 1 Sam. x. 9; the half segolate form שְׁכֶם, (= שִׁכְמָם) becomes here, in pause, the full segolate form שֶׁכֶם. חִצִּים must be supplied as the object to תְּכוֹנֵן, as it is in other instances after הוֹרָה, הִשְׁלִיךְ, יָרָה; כּוֹנֵן חֵץ, xi. 2, cf. vii. 14, signifies to set the swift arrow upon the bow-string (מֵיתָר = יֶתֶר) = to aim. The arrows hit the front of the enemy, as the pursuer overtakes them.

Ver. 14. After the song has spread abroad its wings in twice three tetrastichs, it closes by, as it were, soaring aloft

and thus losing itself in a distich. It is a cry to God for victory in battle, on behalf of the king. "Be Thou exalted", *i. e.* manifest Thyself in Thy supernal (lvii. 6, 12) and judicial (vii. 7 sq.) sovereignty. What these closing words long to see realised is that Jahve should reveal for world-wide conquest this גְּבוּרָה, to which everything that opposes Him must yield, and it is for this they promise beforehand a joyous gratitude.

PSALM XXII.

ELI ELI LAMA ASABTANI.

2 MY God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?!
Far from my help is my entreating cry,
3 O my God, I cry in the daytime, but Thou answerest not,
And in the night season, but I have no rest.

4 Yet Thou art holy, sitting enthroned above the praises of Israel.
5 In Thee our fathers trusted,
They trusted, and Thou didst deliver them.
6 Unto Thee they cried and were freed,
In Thee trusting, they were not put to shame.

7 But I am a worm, and not a man;
A reproach of men and despised of the people.
8 All they that see me laugh me to scorn;
They shoot out the lip, they shake the head:
9 "Roll it upon Jahve — let Him deliver him,
"Let Him rescue him, when He delighteth in him."

10 Yea Thou art He that took me out of the womb
That inspired me with trust at my mother's breasts
11 On Thee was I cast from my birth,
From my mother's womb Thou art my God.
12 Be not far from me, for trouble is near,
For there is no helper at hand.

13 Mighty bulls have compassed me,
Strong ones of Bashan have beset me round.

14 They open their mouth against me —
A lion ravening and roaring.

15 Like water am I poured out,
And out of joint are all my bones.
My heart is become like wax,
Melted in the midst of my bowels.
16 Dried up like a potsherd is my strength,
And my tongue cleaveth to my jaws,
And Thou layest me in the dust of death.

17 For dogs have compassed me,
A band of wicked men encircles me,
Like a lion, my hands and my feet.
18 I can count all my bones,
They look, they stare upon me.
19 They part my garments among them,
And upon my vesture they cast lots.

20 And Thou, Jahve, remain not afar off!
My strength, haste Thee to help me!
21 Rescue my soul from the sword,
My only one from the paw of the dog.
22 Save me from the lion's jaws,
And from the horns of the antilopes — Thou wilt answer me.

23 I will declare Thy name among my brethren,
In the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee:
24 "Ye that fear Jahve, praise Him;
"All ye the seed of Jacob, glorify Him,
"And stand in awe of Him, all ye seed of Israel!"

25 "For He hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted,
"Neither hath He hid His face from him,
"And when he cried, He hath hearkened to him."

26 From Thee cometh my praise in the great congregation —
My vows will I pay before them that fear Him.
27 The meek shall eat and be satisfied,
They shall praise Jahve that seek Him:
"Let your heart refresh itself for ever!"

28 Remember and turn unto Jahve shall all the ends of the earth,
And all the families of the nations shall bow down before Thee.
29 For Jahve's is the kingship, and He ruleth among the nations.
30 All the thriving of the earth shall eat and bow down,
Before Him shall all they that go down to the dust sink down and they that cannot prolong their life.
31 A seed shall serve Him: it shall be told to the generation concerning the Lord;
32 They shall come and declare His righteousness to a future people, that He hath finished it.

We have here a plaintive Psalm, whose deep complaints, out of the midst of the most humiliating degradation and most fearful peril, stand in striking contrast to the cheerful tone of Ps. xxi. — starting with a disconsolate cry of anguish, it passes on to a trustful cry for help, and ends in vows of thanksgiving and a vision of world-wide results, which spring from the deliverance of the sufferer. In no Psalm do we trace such an accumulation of the most excruciating outward and inward suffering pressing upon the complainant, in connection the most perfect innocence. In this respect Ps. lxix. is its counterpart; but it differs from it in this particular, that there is not a single sound of imprecation mingled with its complaints.

It is David, who here struggles upward out of the gloomiest depth to such a bright height. It is a Davidic Psalm belonging to the time of the persecution by Saul. Ewald brings it down to the time preceding the destruction

of Jerusalem, and Bauer to the time of the Exile. Ewald says it is not now possible to trace the poet more exactly. And Maurer closes by saying: *illud unum equidem pro certo habeo, fuisse vatem hominem opibus præditum atque illustrem, qui magna auctoritate valeret non solum apud suos, verum etiam apud barbaros.* Hitzig persists in his view, that Jeremiah composed the first portion when cast into prison as an apostate, and the second portion in the court of the prison, when placed under this milder restraint. And according to Olshausen, even here again, the whole is appropriate to the time of the Maccabees. But it seems to us to be confirmed at every point, that David, who was so persecuted by Saul, is the author. The cry of prayer אל־תרחק (xxii. 12, 20, xxxv. 22, xxxviii. 22, borrowed in lxxi. 12); the name given to the soul, יחידה (xxii. 21, xxxv. 17); the designation of quiet and resignation by דומיה (xxii. 3, xxxix. 3, lxii. 2, cf. lxv. 2), are all regarded by us, since we do not limit the genuine Davidic Psalms to Ps. iii. — xix. as Hitzig does, as Davidic idioms. Moreover, there is no lack of points of contact in other respects with genuine old Davidic hymns (cf. xxii. 30 with xxviii. 1, those that go down to the dust, to the grave; then in later Psalms as in cxliii. 7, in Isaiah and Ezekiel), and more especially those belonging to the time of Saul, as Ps. lxix. (cf. xxii. 27 with lxix. 33) and lix. (cf. xxii. 17 with lix. 15). To the peculiar characteristics of the Psalms of this period belong the figures taken from animals, which are heaped up in the Psalm before us. The fact that Ps. xxii. is an ancient Davidic original is also confirmed by the parallel passages in the later literature of the *Shîr* (lxxi. 5 sq. taken from xxii. 10 sq.; cii. 18 sq. in imitation xxii. 25, 31 sq.), of the *Chokma* (Prov. xvi. 3, גל אל־ה taken from Ps. xxii. 9, xxxvii. 5), and of prophecy (Isaiah, ch. xlix. liii.; Jeremiah, in Lam. iv. 4; cf. Ps. xxii. 15, and many other similar instances). In spite of these echoes in the later literature there are still some expressions that remain unique in the Psalm and are not found elsewhere, as the hapaxlegomena אַיָּלוּת and עֲנוּת. Thus, then, we entertain no doubts respecting the truth of the לדוד. David speaks in this Psalm, — he and not any other, and that

out of his own inmost being. In accordance with the nature of lyric poetry, the Psalm has grown up on the soil of his individual life and his individual sensibilities.

There is also in reality in the history of David, when persecuted by Saul, a situation which may have given occasion to the lifelike picture drawn in this Psalm, viz. 1 Sam. xxiii. 25 sq. The detailed circumstances of the distress at that time are not known to us, but they certainly did not coincide with the rare and terrible sufferings depicted in this Psalm in such a manner that these can be regarded as an historically faithful and literally exact copy of those circumstances; cf. on the other hand Ps. xvii. which was composed at the same period. To just as slight a degree have the prospects, which he connects in this Psalm with his deliverance, been realised in David's own life. On the other hand, the first portion exactly coincides with the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and the second with the results that have sprung from His resurrection. It is the agonising situation of the Crucified One which is presented before our eyes in vers. 15—18 with such artistic faithfulness: the spreading out of the limbs of the naked body, the torturing pain in hands and feet, and the burning thirst which the Redeemer, in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled, announced in the cry διψῶ, John xix. 28. Those who blaspheme and those who shake their head at Him passed by His cross, Mat. xxvii. 39, just as ver. 8 says; scoffers cried out to Him: let the God in whom He trusts help Him, Mat. xxvii. 43, just as ver. 9 says; His garments were divided and lots were cast for His coat, John xix. 23 sq., in order that ver. 19 of our Psalm might be fulfilled. The fourth of the seven sayings of the dying One, Ἠλί, Ἠλί κ. τ. λ., Mat. xxvii. 46, Mark xv. 34, is the first word of our Psalm and the appropriation of the whole. And the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. ii. 11 sq., cites ver. 23 as the words of Christ, to shew that He is not ashamed to call them brethren, whose sanctifier God has appointed Him to be, just as the risen Redeemer actually has done, Mat. xxviii. 10, John xx. 17. This has by no means exhausted the list of mutual relationships. The Psalm so vividly sets before us not merely the sufferings of the Crucified One, but also the salvation of the world.

arising out of His resurrection and its sacramental efficacy, that it seems more like history than prophecy, *ut non tam prophetia, quam historia videatur* (Cassiodorus). Accordingly the ancient Church regarded Christ, not David, as the speaker in this Psalm; and condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia who expounded it as cotemporary history. Bakius expresses the meaning of the older Lutheran expositors when he says: *asserimus, hunc Psalmum ad literam primo, proprie et absque ulla allegoria, tropologia et ἀναγωγῇ integrum et per omnia de solo Christo exponendum esse.* Even the synagogue, so far as it recognises a suffering Messiah, hears Him speak here; and takes the "hind of the morning" as a name of the *Shechina* and as a symbol of the dawning redemption.

To ourselves, who regard the whole Psalm as the words of David, it does not thereby lose anything whatever of its prophetic character. It is a typical Psalm. The same God who communicates His thoughts of redemption to the mind of men, and there causes them to develope into the word of prophetic announcement, has also moulded the history itself into a prefiguring representation of the future deliverance; and the evidence for the truth of Christianity which is derived from this factual prophecy (*Thatweissagung*) is as grand as that derived from the verbal prediction (*Wortweissagung*). That David, the anointed of Samuel, before he ascended the throne, had to traverse a path of suffering which resembles the suffering path of Jesus, the Son of David, baptized of John, and that this typical suffering of David is embodied for us in the Psalms as in the images reflected from a mirror, is an arrangement of divine power, mercy, and wisdom. But Ps. xxii. is not merely a typical Psalm. For in the very nature of the type is involved the distance between it and the antitype. In Ps. xxii., however, David descends, with his complaint, into a depth that lies beyond the depth of his affliction, and rises, with his hopes, to a height that lies far beyond the height of the reward of his affliction. In other words: the rhetorical figure hyperbole (مُبالغة, *i. e.* depiction, with colours thickly laid on), without which, in the eyes of the Semite, poetic diction would be flat and

faded, is here made use of by the Spirit of God. By this Spirit the hyperbolic element is changed into the prophetic. This elevation of the typical into the prophetic is also capable of explanation on psychological grounds. Since David has been anointed with the oil of royal consecration, and at same time with the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the kingship of promise, he regards himself also as the messiah of God, towards whom the promises point; and by virtue of this view of himself, in the light of the highest calling in connection with the redemptive history, the historical reality of his own experiences becomes idealised to him, and thereby both what he experiences and what he hopes for acquire a depth and height of background which stretches out into the history of the final and true Christ of God. We do not by this maintain any overflowing of his own consciousness to that of the future Christ, an opinion which has been shewn by Hengstenberg, Tholuck and Kurtz to be psychologically impossible. But what we say is, that looking upon himself as the Christ of God, — to express it in the light of the historical fulfilment, — he looks upon himself in Jesus Christ. He does not distinguish himself from the Future One, but in himself he sees the Future One, whose image does not free itself from him till afterwards, and whose history will coincide with all that is excessive in his own utterances. For as God the Father moulds the history of Jesus Christ in accordance with His own counsel, so His Spirit moulds even the utterances of David concerning himself the type of the Future One, with a view to that history. Through this Spirit, who is the Spirit of God and of the future Christ at the same time, David's typical history, as he describes it in the Psalms and more especially in this Psalm, acquires that ideal depth of tone, brilliancy, and power, by virtue of which it (the history) reaches far beyond its typical facts, penetrates to its very root in the divine counsels, and grows to be the word of prophecy: so that, to a certain extent, it may rightly be said that Christ here speaks through David, insofar as the Spirit of Christ speaks through him, and makes the typical suffering of His ancestor the medium for the representation of His own future sufferings. Without recognising this

incontestable relation of the matter Ps. xxii. cannot be understand nor can we fully enter into its sentiments.

The inscription runs: *To the precentor, upon* (*after*) *the hind of the morning's dawn, a Psalm of David.* Luther, with reference to the fact that Jesus was taken in the night and brought before the Sanhedrim, renders it "*of the hind, that is early chased,*" for

> *Patris Sapientia, Veritas divina,*
> *Deus homo captus est horâ matutinâ.*

This interpretation is certainly a well-devised improvement of the ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως τῆς ἑωθινῆς of the LXX. (Vulg. *pro susceptione matutina*), which is based upon a confounding of אילת with אילות (ver. 20), and is thus explained by Theodoret: ἀντίληψις ἑωθινὴ ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιφάνεια. Even the Midrash recalls Cant. ii. 8, and the Targum the lamb of the morning sacrifice, which was offered as soon as the watchman on the pinnacle of the Temple cried: ברק ברקאי (the first rays of the morning burst forth). אַיֶּלֶת הַשַּׁחַר is in fact, according to traditional definition, the early light preceding the dawn of the morning, whose first rays are likened to the horns of a hind.* But natural as it may be to assign to the inscription a symbolical meaning in the case of this Psalm, it certainly forms no exception to the technical meaning, in connection with the music, of the other inscriptions. And Melissus (1572) has explained it correctly "concerning the melody of a common song, whose commencement was *Ajéleth Hashâhar,* that is, The hind of the morning's dawn." And it may be that the choice of the melody bearing this name was designed to have reference to the glory which bursts forth in the night of affliction.

According to the course of the thoughts the Psalm falls into three divisions, vers. 2—12, 13—22, 23—32, which are

---

* There is a determination of the time to this effect, which is found both in the Jerusalem and in the Babylonian Talmud "from the hind of the morning's dawn till the east is lighted up." In *Jer. Beracholh, ad init.*, it is explained: אילה השחר כמין תרתי קרני דנהורא כלקין ממדינחא ומנהרין לעלמא, "like two horns of light, rising from the east and filling the world with light."

of symmetrical compass, consisting of 21, 24, and 21 lines. Whether the poet has laid out a more complete strophic arrangement within these three groups or not, must remain undecided. But the seven long closing lines are detached from the third group and stand to the column of the whole, in the relation of its base.

Vers. 2—3. In the first division, vers. 2—12, the disconsolate cry of anguish, beginning here in ver. 2 with the lamentation over prolonged desertion by God, struggles through to an incipient, trustfully inclined prayer. The question beginning with לָמָּה (instead of לָמָּה before the guttural, and perhaps to make the exclamation more piercing, *vid.* on vi. 5, x. 1) is not an expression of impatience and despair, but of alienation and yearning. The sufferer feels himself rejected of God; the feeling of divine wrath has completely enshrouded him; and still he knows himself to be joined to God in fear and love; his present condition belies the real nature of his relationship to God; and it is just this contradiction that urges him to the plaintive question, which comes up from the lowest depths: Why hast Thou forsaken me? But in spite of this feeling of desertion by God, the bond of love is not torn asunder; the sufferer calls God אֵלִי (*my* God), and urged on by the longing desire that God again would grant him to feel this love, he calls Him, אֵלִי אֵלִי. That complaining question: why hast Thou forsaken me? is not without example even elsewhere in the Psalms, lxxxviii. 15, cf. Isa. xlix. 14. The forsakenness of the Crucified One, however, is unique; and may not be judged by the standard of David or of any other sufferers who thus complain when passing through trial. That which is common to all is here, as there, this, viz. that behind the wrath that is felt, is hidden the love of God, which faith holds fast; and that he who thus complains even on account of it, is, considered in itself, not a subject of wrath, because in the midst of the feeling of wrath he keeps up his communion with God. The Crucified One is to His latest breath the Holy One of God; and the reconciliation for which He now offers himself is God's own eternal purpose of mercy, which is now being realised in the

fulness of times. But inasmuch as He places himself under the judgment of God with the sin of His people and of the whole human race, He cannot be spared from experiencing God's wrath against sinful humanity as though He were himself guilty. And out of the infinite depth of this experience of wrath, which in His case rests on no mere appearance, but the sternest reality*, comes the cry of His complaint which penetrates the wrath and reaches to God's love, ἠλὶ ἠλὶ λαμὰ σαβαχθανί, which the evangelists, omitting the additional πρόσχες μοι** of the LXX., render: Θεέ μου, θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες. He does not say עֲזַבְתָּנִי, but שְׁבַקְתָּנִי, which is the Targum word for the former. He says it in Aramaic, not in order that all may understand it, — for such a consideration was far from His mind at such a time, — but because the Aramaic was His mother tongue, for the same reason that He called God אַבָּא in prayer. His desertion by God, as ver. 2*b* says, consists in God's help and His cry for help being far asunder. שְׁאָגָה, prop. of the roar of the lion (Aq. βρύχημα), is the loud cry extorted by the greatest agony, xxxviii. 9; in this instance, however, as דִּבְרֵי shews, it is not an inarticulate cry, but a cry bearing aloft to God the words of prayer. רָחוֹק is not to be taken as an apposition of the subject of עזבתני: far from my help, (from) the words of my crying (Riehm); for דברי שאגתי would then also, on its part, in connection with the non-repetition of the מן, be in apposition to מישועתי. But to this it is not adapted on account of its heterogeneousness; hence Hitzig seeks to get over the difficulty by the conjecture מְשַׁוְעָתִי ("from my cry, from the words of my groaning"). Nor can it be explained, with Olshausen and Hupfeld, by adopting Aben-Ezra's interpretation, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me, far from my help? are the words of my crying." This violates the structure of the

* Eusebius observes on ver. 2 of this Psalm, δικαιοσύνης ὑπάρχων πηγὴ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνέλαβε καὶ εὐλογίας ὢν πέλαγος τὴν ἐπικειμένην ἡμῖν ἐδέξατο κατάραν, and: τὴν ὡρισμένην ἡμῖν παιδείαν ὑπῆλθεν ἑκών, παιδεία γὰρ εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ' αὐτόν, ᾗ φησὶν ὁ προφήτης.

** *Vid.* Jerome's *Ep. ad Pammachium de optimo genere interpretandi*, where he cries out to his critics, sticklers for tradition, *Reddant rationem, cur septuaginta translatores interposuerunt "respice in me"!*

verse, the rhythm, and the custom of the language, and gives to the Psalm a flat and unlyrical commencement. Thus, therefore, רחוק in the primary form, as in cxix. 155, according to Ges. § 146, 4, will be the predicate to דברי and placed before it: far from my salvation, *i. e.* far from my being rescued, are the words of my cry; there is a great gulf between the two, inasmuch as God does not answer him though he cries unceasingly. In ver. 3 the reverential name of God אֱלֹהַי takes the place of אֵלִי the name that expresses His might; it is likewise vocative and accordingly marked with *Rebia magnum*. It is not an accusative of the object after xviii. 4 (Hitzig), in which case the construction would be continued with וְלֹא יַעֲנֶה. That it is, however, God to whom he calls is implied both by the direct address אלהי, and by ולא תענה, since he from whom one expects an answer is most manifestly the person addressed. His uninterrupted crying remains unanswered, and unappeased. The clause וְלֹא־דוּמִיָּה לִי is parallel to ולא תענה, and therefore does not mean: without allowing me any repose (Jer. xiv. 17, Lam. iii. 49), but: without any rest being granted to me, without my complaint being appeased or stilled. From the sixth to the ninth hour the earth was shrouded in darkness. About the ninth hour Jesus cried, after a long and more silent struggle, ἠλί, ἠλί. The ἀνεβόησεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, Mat. xxvii. 46, and also the κραυγὴ ἰσχυρά of Hebr. v. 7, which does not refer exclusively to the scene in Gethsemane, calls to mind the שאגתי of ver. 2*b*. When His passion reached its climax, days and nights of the like wrestling had preceded it, and what then becomes audible was only an outburst of the second David's conflict of prayer, which grows hotter as it draws near to the final issue.

Vers. 4—6. The sufferer reminds Jahve of the contradiction between the long season of helplessness and His readiness to help so frequently and so promptly attested. וְאַתָּה opens an adverbial clause of the counterargument: although Thou art . . . Jahve is קָדוֹשׁ, absolutely pure, *lit.* separated (root קר, גש, to cut, part, just as *ṭahura*, the synonym of *ḳadusa*, is the intransitive of *ṭahara* = *ab'ada*, to remove to a distance, and בַּר pure, clean, radically distinct from *pû-rus*, goes back to בָּרַר to sever), viz. from that

which is worldly and common, in one word: holy. Jahve is holy, and has shewn Himself such as the תְּהִלּוֹת of Israel solemnly affirm, upon which or among which He sits enthroned. תהלות are the songs of praise offered to God on account of His attributes and deeds, which are worthy of praise (these are even called תהלות in lxxviii. 4, Exod. xv. 11, Isa. lxiii. 7), and in fact presented in His sanctuary (Isa. lxiv. 10). The combination יוֹשֵׁב תְּהִלּוֹת (with the accusative of the verbs of dwelling and tarrying) is like יוֹשֵׁב כְּרוּבִים, xcix. 1, lxxx. 2. The songs of praise, which resounded in Israel as the memorials of His deeds of deliverance, are like the wings of the cherubim, upon which His presence hovered in Israel. In vers. 5, 6, the praying one brings to remembrance this graciously glorious self-attestation of God, who as the Holy One always, from the earliest times, acknowledged those who fear Him in opposition to their persecutors and justified their confidence in Himself. In ver. 5 trust and rescue are put in the connection of cause and effect; in ver. 6 in reciprocal relation. פָּלַט and מָלַט are only distinguished by the harder and softer sibilants, cf. xvii. 13 with cxvi. 4. It need not seem strange that such thoughts were at work in the soul of the Crucified One, since His divine-human consciousness was, on its human side, thoroughly Israelitish; and the God of Israel is also the God of salvation; redemption is that which He himself determined, why, then, should He not speedily deliver the Redeemer?

Vers. 7—9. The sufferer complains of the greatness of his reproach, in order to move Jahve, who is Himself involved therein, to send him speedy succour. Notwithstanding his cry for help, he is in the deepest affliction without rescue. Every word of ver. 7 is echoed in the second part of the Book of Isaiah. There, as here, Israel is called a worm, ch. xli. 14; there all these traits of suffering are found in the picture of the Servant of God, ch. xlix. 7, liii. 3, cf. l. 6, and especially lii. 14 "so marred was His appearance, that He no longer looked like a man." תּוֹלַעַת is more particularly the kermes, or cochineal (*vermiculus*, whence *color vermiculi*, *vermeil*, *vermiglio*); but the point of comparison in the present instance is not the blood-red appear-

ance, but the suffering so utterly defenceless and even ignominious. עָם is *gen. subj.*, like גּוֹי, Isa. xlix. 7. Jerome well renders the ἐξουθένωμα λαοῦ of the LXX. by *abjectio* (Tertullian: *nullificamen*) *plebis*, not *populi*. The ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, by which the LXX. translates יִלְעֲגוּ לִי, is used by Luke, ch. xxiii. 35, cf. xvi. 14, in the history of the Passion; fulfilment and prediction so exactly coincide, that no more adequate expressions can be found in writing the gospel history than those presented by prophecy. In הֶפְטִיר בְּשָׂפָה, what appears in other instances as the object of the action (to open the mouth wide, *diducere labia*), is regarded as the means of its execution; so that the verbal notion being rendered complete has its object in itself: to make an opening with the mouth, cf. פָּעַר בְּפֶה, Job xvi. 10, נָתַן בְּקוֹל lxviii. 34; Ges. § 138, 1, rem. 3. The shaking of the head is, as in cix. 25, cf. xliv. 15, lxiv. 9, a gesture of surprise and astonishment at something unexpected and strange, not a προσνεύειν approving the injury of another, although נוּעַ, נוּד, נוּס, νεύ-ω, nu-t-o, nic-to, *neigen, nicken,* all form one family of roots. In ver. 9 the words of the mockers follow without לֵאמֹר. גֹּל is not the 3 *præt.* (LXX., cf. Mat. xxvii. 43) like אוֹר, בּוֹשׁ; it is not only in *Piel* (Jer. xi. 20, xx. 12, where גָּלַלְתִּי = גִּלַּלְתִּי, Ew. § 121,*a*) that it is transitive, but even in *Kal*; nor is it *inf. absol.* in the sense of the imperative (Hitz., Böttch.), although this infinitive form is found, but always only as an *inf. intens.* (Numb. xxiii. 25, Ruth ii. 16, cf. Isa. xxiv. 19); but, in accordance with the parallels xxxvii. 5 (where it is written גּוֹל), Prov. xvi. 3, cf. Ps. lv. 23, 1 Pet. v. 7, it is *imperat.:* roll, viz. thy doing and thy suffering to Jahve, *i. e.* commit it to Him. The mockers call out this גֹּל to the sufferer, and the rest they say of him with malicious looks askance. כִּי in the mouth of the foes is not confirmatory as in xviii. 20, but a conditional ἐάν (in case, provided that).

Vers. 10—12. The sufferer pleads that God should respond to his trust in Him, on the ground that this trust is made an object of mockery. With כִּי he establishes the reality of the loving relationship in which he stands to God, at which his foes mock. The intermediate thought, which is not expressed, "and so it really is", is confirmed; and thus

כִּי comes to have an affirmative signification. The verb גִּיחַ (גִּיחָה) signifies both intransitive: to break forth (from the womb), Job xxxviii. 8, and transitive: to push forward (cf. جحّ), more especially, the fruit of the womb, Mic. iv. 10. It might be taken here in the first signification: my breaking forth, equivalent to "the cause of my breaking forth" (Hengstenberg, Baur, and others); but there is no need for this metonymy. גֹּחִי is either *part.* equivalent to גָּחִי, my pusher forth, *i. e.* he who causes me to break forth, or, — since גוח in a causative signification cannot be supported, and participles like בּוּם stamping and לוּט veiling (Ges. § 72, rem. 1) are nowhere found with a suffix, — participle of a verb גָּחָה, to draw forth (Hitz.), which perhaps only takes the place, *per metaplasmum,* of the *Pil.* גִּחַח with the uneuphonic מְגַחֲחִי (Ewald S. 859, *Addenda*). Ps. lxxi. has גּוֹזִי (ver. 6) instead of גֹּחִי, just as it has מִבְטָחִי (ver. 5) instead of מַבְטִיחִי. The *Hiph.* הִבְטִיחַ does not merely mean to make secure (Hupf.), but to cause to trust. According to biblical conception, there is even in the new-born child, yea in the child yet unborn and only living in the womb, a glimmering consciousness springing up out of the remotest depths of unconsciousness (*Psychol.* S. 215; transl. p. 254). Therefore, when the praying one says, that from the womb he has been cast* upon Jahve, *i. e.* directed to go to Him, and to Him alone, with all his wants and care (lv. 23, cf. lxxi. 6), that from the womb onwards Jahve was his God, there is also more in it than the purely objective idea, that he grew up into such a relationship to God. Twice he mentions his mother. Throughout the Old Testament there is never any mention made of a human father, or begetter, to the Messiah, but always only of His mother, or her who bare Him. And the words of the praying one here also imply that the beginning of his life, as regards its outward circumstances, was amidst poverty, which like-

* The *Hoph.* has *o*, not *u*, perhaps in a more neuter sense, more closely approximating to the reflexive (cf. Ezek. xxxii. 19 with xxxii. 32), rather than a purely passive. Such is apparently the feeling of the language, *vid. B. Megilla* 13*a* (and also the explanation in *Tosefoth*).

wise accords with the picture of Christ as drawn both in the Old and New Testaments. On the ground of his fellowship with God, which extends so far back, goes forth the cry for help (ver. 12), which has been faintly heard through all the preceding verses, but now only comes to direct utterance for the first time. The two כִּי are alike. That the necessity is near at hand, *i. e.* urgent, refers back antithetically to the prayer, that God would not remain afar off; no one doth, nor can help except He alone. Here the first section closes.

Vers. 13—14. Looking back upon his relationship to God, which has existed from the earliest times, the sufferer has become somewhat more calm, and is ready, in vers. 13—22, to describe his outward and inner life, and thus to unburden his heart. Here he calls his enemies פָּרִים, bullocks, and in fact אַבִּירֵי בָשָׁן (cf. l. 13 with Deut. xxxii. 14), strong ones of Bashan, the land rich in luxuriant oak forests and fat pastures (בשׁן = *buthêne,* which in the Beduin dialect means rich, stoneless meadow-land, *vid. Job* S. 509 f.; tr. ii. pp. 399 sq.) north of Jabbok extending as far as to the borders of Hermon, the land of Og and afterwards of Manasseh (Num. xxx. 1). They are so called on account of their robustness and vigour, which, being acquired and used in opposition to God is brutish rather than human (cf. Amos iv. 1). Figures like these drawn from the animal world and applied in an ethical sense are explained by the fact, that the ancients measured the instincts of animals according to the moral rules of human nature; but more deeply by the fact, that according to the indisputable conception of Scripture, since man was made to fall by Satan through the agency of an animal, the animal and Satan are the two dominant powers in Adamic humanity. כִּתֵּר is a climacticsynonym of סָבַב. On ver. 14*a* compare the echoes in Jeremiah, Lam. ii. 16, iii. 46. Finally, the foes are all comprehended under the figure of a lion, which, as soon as he sights his prey, begins to roar, Amos iii. 4. The Hebrew טָרַף, *discerpere,* according to its root, belongs to חָרַף, *carpere.* They are *instar leonis dilaniaturi et rugientis.*

Vers. 15—16. Now he describes, how, thus encompassed round, he is still just living, but already as it were dead.

The being poured out like water reminds us of the ignominious abandonment of the Crucified One to a condition of weakness, in which His life, deprived of its natural support, is in the act of dissolution, and its powers dried up (2 Sam. xiv. 14); the bones being stretched out, of the forcible stretching out of His body (הִתְפָּרֵד, from פָּרַד to separate, cf. فرى according to its radical signification, which has been preserved in the common Arabic dialect: so to spread out or apart that the thing has no bends or folds,* Greek ἐξαπλοῦν); the heart being melted, recalls His burning anguish, the inflammation of the wounds, and the pressure of blood on the head and heart, the characteristic cause of death by crucifixion. נָמֵס, in pause נָמַס, is 3 *præt.*; wax, דונג, receives its name from its melting (דנג, root דג, דאג). In ver. 16 the comparison כַּחֶרֶשׂ has reference to the issue or result (*vid.* xviii. 43): my strength is dried up, so that it is become like a potsherd. חִכִּי (Saadia) instead of כֹּחִי commends itself, unless, כֹּחַ perhaps, like the Talmudic כֵּיחַ, also had the signification "spittle" (as a more dignified word for רֹק). לָשׁוֹן, with the exception perhaps of Prov. xxvi. 28, is uniformly feminine; here the predicate has the masculine ground-form without respect to the subject. The *part. pass.* has a tendency generally to be used without reference to gender, under the influence of the construction laid down in Ges. § 143, 1, *b*, according to which לִשְׁנִי may be treated as an accusative of the object; מַלְקוֹחָי, however, is *acc. loci* (cf. לְ cxxxvii. 6, Job xxix. 10; אֶל Lam. iv. 4, Ezek. iii. 26): my tongue is made to cleave to my jaws, *fauces meas.* Such is his state in consequence of outward distresses. His enemies, however, would not have power to do all this, if God had not given it to them. Thus it is, so to speak, God Himself who lays him low in death. שָׁפַת to put anywhere, to lay, with the accompanying idea of firmness and duration, ثبات, Isa. xxvi. 12; the future is used of that which is just taking place. Just in like manner, in Isa. liii., the death of the Servant of God is spoken of not merely as happening thus, but as decreed; and not merely as permitted by God, but as being in accordance with the divine will. David is per-

* *vid.* Boethor, *Dict. franç.-arabe*, *s. v. Étendre* and *Déployer.*

secuted by Saul, the king of His people, almost to the death; Jesus, however, is delivered over by the Sanhedrim, the authority of His people, to the heathen, under whose hands He actually dies the death of the cross: it is a judicial murder put into execution according to the conditions and circumstances of the age; viewed, however, as to its final cause, it is a gracious dispensation of the holy God, in whose hands all the paths of the world's history run parallel, and who in this instance makes sin subservient to its own expiation.

Vers. 17—19. A continuation, referring back to ver. 12, of the complaint of him who is dying and is already as it were dead. In the animal name כְּלָבִים, figuratively descriptive of character, beside shamelessness and meanness, special prominence is given to the propensity for biting and worrying, *i. e.* for persecuting; hence Symmachus and Theodotion render it θηράται, κυνηγέται. In ver. 17*b* עֲדַת מְרֵעִים takes the place of כלבים; and this again is followed by הִקִּיפוּ in the *plur.* (to do anything in a circle, to surround by forming a circle round, a climactic synonym, like כָּתַר to סָבַב) either *per attractionem* (cf. cxl. 10, 1 Sam. ii. 4), or on account of the collective עֲדָה. Tertullian renders it *synagoga maleficorum,* Jerome *concilium pessimorum.* But a faction gathered together for some evil purpose is also called עֲדָה, *e. g.* עֲדַת קֹרַח. In ver. 17*c* the meaning of כָּאֲרִי, *instar leonis,* is either that, selecting a point of attack, they make the rounds of his hands and feet, just as a lion does its prey upon which it springs as soon as its prey stirs; or, that, standing round about him like lions, they make all defence impossible to his hands, and all escape impossible to his feet. But whether we take this יָדַי וְרַגְלָי as accusative of the members beside the accusative of the person (*vid.* xvii. 11), or as the object of the הִקִּיפוּ to be supplied from ver. 17*b*, it still remains harsh and drawling so far as the language is concerned. Perceiving this, the Masora on Isa. xxxviii. 13 observes, that כָּאֲרִי, in the two passages in which it occurs (Ps. xxii. 17, Isa. xxxviii. 13), occurs in two different meanings (כתרי לישנו); just as the Midrash then also understands כארי in the Psalm as a verb used of marking with conjuring, magic cha-

racters.* Is the meaning of the Masora that כָּאֲרִי, in the passage before us, is equivalent to כָּאֲרִים? If so the form would be doubly Aramaic: both the participial form כָּאַר (which only occurs in Hebrew in verbs *med. E*) and the apocopated plural, the occurrence of which in Hebrew is certainly, with Gesenius and Ewald, to be acknowledged in rare instances (*vid.* xlv. 9, and compare on the other hand 2 Sam. xxii. 44), but which would here be a capricious form of expression most liable to be misapprehended. If כארי is to be understood as a verb, then it ought to be read כְּאָרֵי. Tradition is here manifestly unreliable. Even in MSS. the readings כָּאֲרִי and כָּאֲרֵי are found. The former is attested both by the Masora on Num. xxiv. 9 and by Jacob ben Chajim in the *Masora finalis* as a MS. *Chethîb.*** Even the Targum, which renders *mordent sicut leo manus et pedes meos,* bears witness to the ancient hesitancy between the substantival and verbal rendering of the כארי. The other ancient versions have, without any doubt, read כארו. Aquila in the 1st edition of his translation rendered it ὄρυγμαν (from the Aramaic and Talmudic כָּאַר = כָּעַר to soil, *part.* כָּאוּר, dirty, nasty); but this is not applicable to hands and feet, and therefore has nothing to stand upon. In the 2nd edition of his translation the same Aquila had instead of

---

* Hupfeld suspects this Masoretic remark (כָּאֲרִי ב׳ קמצין בתרי לישני) as a Christian interpolation, but it occurs in the alphabetical Masōreth register ב׳ ב׳ והרויהון בתרי לישני. Even Elias Levita speaks of it with astonishment (in his מסרת המסרת [*ed. Ginsburg*, p. 253]) without doubting its genuineness, which must therefore have been confirmed, to his mind, by MS. authority. Heidenheim also cites it in his edition of the Pentateuch, מאור עינים, on Num. xxiv. 9; and down to the present time no suspicion has been expressed on the part of Jewish critics, although all kinds of unsatisfactory attempts have been made to explain this Masoretic remark (*e. g.* in the periodical *Biccure ha-'Ittim*).

** The authenticity of this statement of the Masora כארי ידי ורגלי כארו כתיב may be disputed, especially since Jacob ben Chajim became a convert to Christianity, and other Masoretic testimonies do not mention a קרי וכתיב to כארי; nevertheless, in this instance, it would be premature to say that this statement is interpolated. Ant. Hulsius in his edition of the Psalter (1650) has written כארו in the margin according to the text of the Complutensis.

this, like Symmachus, "they have bound",* after כר, כֶּרֶר, to twist, lace; but this rendering is improbable since the Hebrew has other words for "to bind", *constringere*. On the other hand nothing of any weight can be urged against the rendering of the LXX. ὤρυξαν (Peshito בזעו, Vulg. *foderunt*, Jer. *fixerunt*); for (1) even if we do not suppose any special verb כָּאַר, כָּאֲרוּ can be expanded from כָּרוּ (כור) = כָּרוּ (כָּרָה) just in the same manner as רָאֲמָה, Zech. xiv. 10 from רָמָה, cf. קָאֲמָיָא Dan. vii. 16. And (2) that כור and כָּרָה can signify not merely to dig out and dig into, engrave, but also to dig through, pierce, is shewn, — apart from the derivative מַכֵּרָה (the similarity of the sound of which to μάχαιρα from the root μαχ, *maksh, mraksh,* is only accidental), — by the double meaning of the verbs נָקַר, ὀρύσσειν (*e. g.* ὀρύσσειν τὸν ἰσθμόν Herod. i. 174), *fodere* (*hastâ*); the LXX. version of Ps. xl. 7 would also support this meaning, if κατετρήσω (from κατατιτρᾶν) in that passage had been the original reading instead of κατηρτίσω. If כָּאֲרוּ be read, then ver. 17*c*, applied to David, perhaps under the influence of the figure of the attacking dogs (Böhl), says that the wicked bored into his hands and feet, and thus have made him fast, so that he is inevitably abandoned to their inhuman desires. The fulfilment in the nailing of the hands and (at least, the binding fast) of the feet of the Crucified One to the cross is clear. This is not the only passage in which it is predicted that the future Christ shall be murderously pierced; but it is the same in Isa. liii. 5 where He is said to be pierced (מְחֹלָל) on account of our sins, and in Zech. xii. 10, where Jahve describes Himself as ἐκκεντηθείς in Him.

Thus, therefore, the reading כָּאֲרוּ might at least have an equal right to be recognised with the present *recepta*, for which Hupfeld and Hitzig demand exclusive recognition; while Böttcher, — who reads כְּאֲרִי, and gives this the meaning

* Also in Jerome's independent translation the reading *vinxerunt* is found by the side of *fixerunt*, just as Abraham of Zante paraphrases it in his paraphrase of the Psalter in rhyme גַּם כְּאֲרִי יָדַי וְרַגְלַי אָסְרוּ. The want of a verb is too perceptible. Saadia supplies it in a different way "they compass me as a lion, to crush my hands and feet."

"springing round about (after the manner of dogs)", — regards the *sicut leo* as "a production of meagre Jewish wit"; and also Thenius after taking all possible pains to clear it up gives it up as hopeless, and with Meier, adopting a different division of the verse, renders it: "a mob of the wicked has encompassed me like lions. On my hands and feet I can count all my bones." But then, how כָּאֲרִי comes limping on after the rest! And how lamely does יָדַי וְרַגְלַי precede ver. 18! How unnaturally does it limit עַצְמוֹתָי, with which one chiefly associates the thought of the breast and ribs, to the hands and feet! אֲסַפֵּר is *potientialis*. Above in ver. 15 he has said that his bones are out of joint. There is no more reason for regarding this "I can count &c." as referring to emaciation from grief, than there is for regarding the former as referring to writhing with agony. He can count them because he is forcibly stretched out, and thereby all his bones stand out. In this condition he is a mockery to his foes. הִבִּיט signifies the turning of one's gaze to anything, רָאָה בְּ the fixing of one's sight upon it with pleasure. In ver. 19 a new feature is added to those that extend far beyond David himself: they part my garments among them . . . It does not say they purpose doing it, they do it merely in their mind, but they do it in reality. This never happened to David, or at least not in the literal sense of his words, in which it has happened to Christ. In Him ver. 19*a* and 19*b* are literally fulfilled. The parting of the בְּגָדִים by the soldiers dividing His ἱμάτια among them into four parts; the casting lots upon the לְבוּשׁ by their not dividing the χιτὼν ἄῤῥαφος, but casting lots for it, John xix. 23 sq. לְבוּשׁ is the garment which is put on the body that it may not be bare; בְּגָדִים the clothes, which one wraps around one's self for a covering; hence לבוּשׁ is punningly explained in *B. Sabbath* 77*b* by לא בושה (with which one has no need to be ashamed of being naked) in distinction from גלימא, a mantle (that through which one appears בגולם, because it conceals the outline of the body). In Job xxiv. 7, and frequently, לבוּשׁ is an undergarment, or shirt, what in Arabic is called absolutely ثَوْب *thôb* "the garment", or expressed according to the Roman distinction: the *tunica* in distinction from the *toga,* whose exact desig-

nation is מְעִיל. With ver. 19 of this Psalm it is exactly as with Zech. ix. 9, cf. Mat. xxi. 5; in this instance also, the fulfilment has realised that which, in both phases of the synonymous expression, is seemingly identical.*

Vers. 20—22. In ver. 19 the description of affliction has reached its climax, for the parting of, and casting lots for, the garments assumes the certain death of the sufferer in the mind of the enemies. In ver. 20, with וְאַתָּה the looks of the sufferer, in the face of his manifold torments, concentrate themselves all at once upon Jahve. He calls Him אֱיָלוּתִי *nom. abstr.* from אַיָל, lxxxviii. 5: the very essence of strength, as it were the idea, or the ideal of strength; *le-'ezrāthi* has the accent on the *penult.*, as in lxxi. 12 (cf. on the other hand xxxviii. 23), in order that two tone syllables may not come together. In ver. 21, חֶרֶב means the deadly weapon of the enemy and is used exemplificatively. In the expression מִיַּד כֶּלֶב, מִיַּד is not merely equivalent to מִן, but יָד is, according to the sense, equivalent to "paw" (cf. כַּף, Lev. xi. 27), as פִּי is equivalent to jaws; although elsewhere not only the expression "hand of the lion and of the bear", 1 Sam. xvii. 37, but also "hands of the sword", Ps. lxiii. 11, and even "hand of the flame", Isa. xlvii. 14 are used, inasmuch as יד is the general designation of that which acts, seizes, and subjugates, as the instrument of the act. Just as in connection with the dog יד, and in connection with the lion פי (cf., however, Dan. vi. 28) is mentioned as its weapon of attack, the horns, not the *horn* (also not in Deut. xxxiii. 17), are mentioned in connection with antilopes, רְמִים (a shorter form, occurring only in this passage, for רְאֵמִים, xxix. 6, Isa. xxxiv. 7). Nevertheless, Luther following the LXX. and Vulgate, renders it "rescue me from the unicorns" (*vid.* thereon on xxix. 6). יְחִידָה, as the parallel member here and in xxxv. 17 shews, is an epithet of נֶפֶשׁ. The LXX. in both instances renders it correctly τὴν μονογενῆ μου, Vulg. *unicam meam,* according to Gen. xxii. 2, Judges xi. 34, the one soul besides which man has no second, the

* On such fulfilments of prophecy, literal beyond all expectation, *vid. Saat auf Hoffnung* iii., 3, 47—51.

one life besides which man has no second to lose, applied subjectively, that is, soul or life as the dearest and most precious thing, cf. Homer's φίλον κῆρ. It is also interpreted according to xxv. 16, lxviii. 7: my solitary one, *solitarium*, the soul as forsaken by God and man, or at least by man, and abandoned to its own self (Hupfeld, Kamphausen, and others). But the parallel נַפְשִׁי, and the analogy of כְּבוֹדִי (= נַפְשִׁי), stamp it as an universal name for the soul: the single one, *i. e.* that which does not exist in duplicate, and consequently that which cannot be replaced, when lost. The *præt.* עֲנִיתָנִי might be equivalent to עֲנֵנִי, provided it is a *perf. consec.* deprived of its *Waw convers.* in favour of the placing of מִקַּרְנֵי רֵמִים first for the sake of emphasis; but considering the turn which the Psalm takes in ver. 23, it must be regarded as *perf. confidentiæ*, inasmuch as in the very midst of his supplication there springs up in the mind of the suppliant the assurance of being heard and answered. To answer from the horns of the antilope is equivalent to hearing and rescuing from them; cf. the equally pregnant expression עָנָה בְ cxviii. 5, perhaps also Hebr. v. 7.*

Vers. 23—24. In the third section, vers. 23—32, the great plaintive prayer closes with thanksgiving and hope. In certainty of being answered, follows the vow of thanksgiving. He calls his fellow-country men, who are connected with him by the ties of nature, but, as what follows, viz. "ye that fear Jahve" shews, also by the ties of spirit, "brethren". קָהָל (from קָהַל = קָל, καλ-έω, *cal-o*, Sanscr. *kal*, to resound) coincides with ἐκκλησία. The sufferer is conscious of the significance of his lot of suffering in relation to the working out of the history of redemption. Therefore he will make that salvation which he has experienced common property. The congregation or church shall hear the evangel of his rescue. In ver. 24 follows the introduction to this announcement, which is addressed to the whole of Israel, so far as it fears the God of revelation. Instead of וגורו the text of the Orientals (מדנחאי), *i. e.* Babylonians,

---

* Thrupp in his *Emendations on the Psalms* (*Journal of Classic and Sacred Philology*, 1860) suggests עֲנִיָּתִי, my poverty (my poor soul), instead of עניתני.

had here the *Chethîb* יגורו with the *Kerî* וְגוּרוּ; the introduction of the jussive (xxxiii. 8) after the two imperatives would not be inappropriate. גור מִן (= יָגֹר) is a stronger form of expression for יָרֵא מִן, xxxiii. 8.

Ver. 25. This tristich is the evangel itself. The *materia laudis* is introduced by כִּי . עֲנוּת (principal form עֲנוּת) bending, bowing down, affliction, from עָנָה, the proper word to denote the Passion. For in Isaiah, ch. liii. 4, 7, the Servant of God is also said to be מְעֻנֶּה and נַעֲנָה, and Zechariah, ch. ix. 9, also introduces Him as עָנִי and נוֹשָׁע. The LXX., Vulgate, and Targum erroneously render it "cry". עָנָה does not mean to cry, but to answer, ἀμείβεσθαι; here, however, as the stem-word of ענות, it means to be bent. From the שִׁקֵּץ (to regard as an abhorrence), which alternates with בָּזָה, we see that the sufferer felt the wrath of God, but this has changed into a love that sends help; God did not long keep His countenance hidden, He hearkened to him, for his prayer was well-pleasing to Him. שָׁמַע is not the verbal adjective, but, since we have the definite fact of the rescue before us, it is a pausal form for שָׁמַע, as in xxxiv. 7, 18, Jer. xxxvi. 13.

Vers. 26—27. The call to thanksgiving is now ended; and there follows a grateful upward glance towards the Author of the salvation; and this grateful upward glance grows into a prophetic view of the future. This fact, that the sufferer is able thus to glory and give thanks in the great congregation (xl. 10), proceeds from Jahve (מֵאֵת as in cxviii. 23, cf. lxxi. 6). The first half of the verse, according to Baer's correct accentuation, closes with בְּקָהָל רָב. יִרְאָיו does not refer to קָהָל, but, as everywhere else, is meant to be referred to Jahve, since the address of prayer passes over into a declarative utterance. It is not necessary in this passage to suppose, that in the mind of David the paying of vows is purely ethical, and not a ritualistic act. Being rescued he will bring the שַׁלְמֵי נֶדֶר, which it is his duty to offer, the thank-offerings, which he vowed to God when in the extremest peril. When the sprinkling with blood (זְרִיקָה) and the laying of the fat pieces upon the altar (הַקְטָרָה) were completed, the remaining flesh of the shelamim was used by the offerer to make a joyous meal;

and the time allowed for this feasting was the day of offering and on into the night in connection with the tôda-shelamim offering, and in connection with the shelamim of vows even the following day also (Lev. vii. 15 sq.). The invitation of the poor to share in it, which the law does not command, is rendered probable by these appointments of the law, and expressly commended by other and analogous appointments concerning the second and third tithes. Ver. 27 refers to this: he will invite the עניים, those who are outwardly and spiritually poor, to this "eating before Jahve"; it is to be a meal for which they thank God, who has bestowed it upon them through him whom He has thus rescued. Ver. 27*c* is as it were the host's blessing upon his guests, or rather Jahve's guests through him: "your heart live for ever", *i. e.* may this meal impart to you ever enduring refreshment. יְחִי optative of חָיָה, here used of the reviving of the heart, which is as it were dead (1 Sam. xxv. 37), to spiritual joy. The referrence to the ritual of the peace offerings is very obvious. And it is not less obvious, that the blessing, which, for all who can be saved, springs from the salvation that has fallen to the lot of the sufferer, is here set forth. But it is just as clear, that this blessing consists in something much higher than the material advantage, which the share in the enjoyment of the animal sacrifice imparts; the sacrifice has its spiritual meaning, so that its outward forms are lowered as it were to a mere figure of its true nature; it relates to a spiritual enjoyment of spiritual and lasting results. How natural, then, is the thought of the sacramental eucharist, in which the second David, like to the first, having attained to the throne through the suffering of death, makes us partakers of the fruits of His suffering!

Vers. 28—32. The long line closing strophe, which forms as it were the pedestal to the whole, shews how far not only the description of the affliction of him who is speaking here, but also the description of the results of his rescue, transcend the historical reality of David's experience. The sufferer expects, as the fruit of the proclamation of that which Jahve has done for him, the conversion of all peoples. The heathen have become forgetful and will again

recollect themselves; the object, in itself clear enough in ix. 18, becomes clear from what follows: there is a γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ (*Psychol.* S. 346 ff.; tr. pp. 407 sqq.) among the heathen, which the announcement of the rescue of this afflicted one will bring back to their consciousness.* This prospect (Jer. xvi. 19 sqq.) is, in ver. 29 (cf. Jer. x. 7), based upon Jahve's right of kingship over all peoples. A ruler is called מֹשֵׁל as being exalted above others by virtue of his office (מָשָׁל according to its primary meaning = مثل, *erectum stare*, synonymous with בָּהַן, *vid.* on ex. 4, cf. עָמַד Mic. v. 3). In וּמֹשֵׁל we have the *part.*, used like the 3 *præt.*, without any mark of the person (cf. vii. 10, lv. 20), to express the pure *præs.*, and, so to speak, as *tempus durans:* He rules among the nations (ἔθνη). The conversion of the heathen by that sermon will, therefore, be the realisation of the kingdom of God.

Ver. 30. The eating is here again brought to mind. The perfect, אָכְלוּ, and the future of sequence, וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ, stand to one another in the relation of cause and effect. It is, as is clear from ver. 27, an eating that satisfies the soul, a spiritual meal, that is intended, and in fact, one that is brought about by the mighty act of rescue God has wrought. At the close of Ps. lxix, where the form of the ritual thank-offering is straightway ignored, רָאוּ (ver. 33) takes the place of the אָכְלוּ. There it is the view of one who is rescued and who thankfully glorifies God, which leads to others sharing with him in the enjoyment of the salvation he has experienced; here it is an actual enjoyment of it, the joy, springing from thankfulness, manifesting itself not merely in words but in a thank-offering feast, at which, in Israel, those who long for salvation are the invited quests, for with them it is an acknowledgment of the mighty act of a God whom they already know; but among the heathen, men of the most diversified conditions, the richest and the poorest, for to them it is a favour unexpectedly brought to them, and which is all the more gratefully embraced by them on that account. So magnificent shall be the feast, that all דִּשְׁנֵי־אֶרֶץ, *i. e.*

* Augustin *De trinitate* xiv. 13, *Non igitur sic erant oblitæ istæ gentes Deum, ut ejus nec commemoratæ recordarentur.*

those who stand out prominently before the world and before their own countrymen by reason of the abundance of their temporal possessions (compare on the ascensive use of אֶרֶץ, lxxv. 9, lxxvi. 10, Isa. xxiii. 9), choose it before this abundance, in which they might revel, and, on account of the grace and glory which the celebration includes within itself, they bow down and worship. In antithesis to the "fat ones of the earth" stand those who go down to the dust (עָפָר, always used in this formula of the dust of the grave, like the Arabic *turâb*) by reason of poverty and care. In the place of the participle יוֹרְדֵי we now have with וְנַפְשׁוֹ (= וְאֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ) a clause with וְלֹא, which has the value of a relative clause (as in xlix. 21, lxxviii. 39, Prov. ix. 13, and frequently): and they who have not heretofore prolonged and could not prolong their life (Ges. § 123, 3, *c*). By comparing Phil. ii. 10 Hupfeld understands it to be those who are actually dead; so that it would mean, His kingdom extends to the living and the dead, to this world and the nether world. But any idea of a thankful adoration of God on the part of the dwellers in Hades is alien to the Old Testament; and there is nothing to force us to it here, since יוֹרְדֵי עָפָר, can just as well mean *descensuri* as *qui descenderunt*, and חִיָּה נַפְשׁוֹ (also in Ezek. xviii. 27) means to preserve his own life, — a phrase which can be used in the sense of *vitam sustentare* and of *conservare* with equal propriety. It is, therefore, those who are almost dead already with care and want, these also (and how thankfully do these very ones) go down upon their knees, because they are accounted worthy to be guests at this table. It is the same great feast, of which Isaiah, ch. xxv. 6, prophesies, and which he there accompanies with the music of his words. And the result of this evangel of the mighty act of rescue is not only of boundless universality, but also of unlimited duration: it propagates itself from one generation to another.

Formerly we interpreted ver. 31 "a seed, which shall serve Him, shall be reckoned to the Lord for a generation;" taking יִסָּפֵר as a metaphor applying to the census, 2 Chron. ii. 16, cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 6, and לַדּוֹר, according to xxiv. 6 and other passages, as used of a totality of one kind, as זֶרַע of the whole body of those of the same race. But the connec-

tion makes it more natural to take דור in a genealogical sense; and, moreover, with the former interpretation it ought to have been לְדוֹר instead of לַדּוֹר. We must therefore retain the customary interpretation: "a seed (posterity) shall serve Him, it shall be told concerning the Lord to the generation (to come)". Decisive in favour of this interpretation is לַדּוֹר with the following וְיָבֹאוּ, by which דור acquires the meaning of the future generation, exactly as in lxxi. 18, inasmuch as it at once becomes clear, that three generations are distinctly mentioned, viz. that of the fathers who turn unto Jahve, ver. 30, that of the coming דור, ver. 31, and עם נולד, to whom the news of the salvation is propagated by this דור, ver. 32: "They shall come (בוא as in lxxi. 18: to come into being), and shall declare His righteousness to the people that shall be born, that He hath finished." Accordingly זרע is the principal notion, which divides itself into דור (יבאו) and עם נולד; from which it is at once clear, why the expression could be thus general, "a posterity", inasmuch as it is defined by what follows. עם נולד is the people which shall be born, or whose birth is near at hand (lxxviii. 6); the LXX. well renders it: λαῷ τῷ τεχθησομένῳ (cf. cii. 19 עַם נִבְרָא *populus creandus*). צִדְקָתוֹ is the δικαιοσύνη of God, which has become manifest in the rescue of the great sufferer. That He did not suffer him to come down to the very border of death without snatching him out of the way of his murderous foes and raising him to a still greater glory, this was divine צְדָקָה. That He did not snatch him out of the way of his murderous foes without suffering him to be on the point of death — even this wrathful phase of the divine צְדָקָה, is indicated in ver. 16*c*, but then only very remotely. For the fact, that the Servant of God, before spreading the feast accompanying the shelamim (thank-offering) in which He makes the whole world participants in the fruit of His suffering, offered Himself as an asham (sin-offering), does not become a subject of prophetic revelation until later on, and then under other typical relationships. The nature of the עֲשִׂיָּה, which is in accordance with the determinate counsel of God, is only gradually disclosed in the Old Testament. This one word, so full of meaning (as in lii. 11, xxxvii. 5, Isa. xliv. 23),

implying the carrying through of the work of redemption, which is prefigured in David, comprehends everything within itself. It may be compared to the לַעֲשׂוֹת, Gen. ii. 3, at the close of the history of the creation. It is the last word of the Psalm, just as τετέλεσται is the last word of the Crucified One. The substance of the gospel in its preparatory history and its fulfilment, of the declaration concerning God which passes from generation to generation, is this, that God has accomplished what He planned when He anointed the son of Jesse and the Son of David as mediator in His work of redemption; that He accomplished it by leading the former through affliction to the throne, and making the cross to the latter a ladder leading up to heaven.

PSALM XXIII.

PRAISE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD.

1 JAHVE is my Shepherd, I shall not want.
2 In green pastures He maketh me to lie down,
Beside still waters He leadeth me.
3 My soul He restoreth,
He leadeth me in right paths —
For His Name's sake.

4 Yea, though I walk in the valley of the shadow of death:
I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me,
Thy rod and Thy staff — they comfort me.
5 Thou preparest me a table in the presence of mine oppressors,
Thou anointest my head with oil,
My cup is fulness.

6 Only prosperity and mercy shall follow me
All the days of my life,
And again shall I dwell in the house of Jahve
For length of days

The arrangement, by which a Psalm that speaks of a great feast of mercy prepared for mankind is followed by a Psalm that praises Jahve as the Shepherd and Host of His own people, could not possibly be more sensible and appropriate. If David is the author, and there is no reason for doubting it, then this Psalm belongs to the time of the rebellion under Absolom, and this supposition is confirmed on every hand. It is like an amplification of iv. 8; and iii. 7 is also echoed in it. But not only does it contain points of contact with this pair of Psalms of the time mentioned, but also with other Psalms belonging to same period, as xxvii. 4, and more especially lxiii., which is said to have been composed when David had retreated with his faithful followers over Kidron and the Mount of Olives into the plains of the wilderness of Judah, whither Hushai sent him tidings, which counselled him to pass over Jordan with all possible haste. It is characteristic of all these Psalms, that in them David yearns after the house of God as after the peculiar home of his heart, and, that all his wishes centre in the one wish to be at home again. And does not this short, tender song, with its depth of feeling and its May-like freshness, accord with David's want and wanderings to and fro at that time?

It consists of two hexastichs with short closing lines, resembling (as also in Isa. xvi. 9, 10) the Adonic verse of the strophe of Sappho, and a tetrastich made up of very short and longer lines intermixed.

Vers. 1—3. The poet calls Jahve רֹעִי, as He who uniformly and graciously provides for and guides him and all who are His. Later prophecy announces the visible appearing of this Shepherd, Isa. xl. 11, Ezek. xxxiv. 37, and other passages. If this has taken place, the יְהוָה רֹעִי from the mouth of man finds its cordial response in the words ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. He who has Jahve, the possessor of all things, himself has all things, he lacks nothing; viz. כָּל־טוּב, whatever is good in itself and would be good for him, xxxiv. 11, lxxxiv. 12. נְאוֹת דֶּשֶׁא are the pastures of fresh and tender grass, where one lies at ease, and rest and enjoyment are combined. נָאָה (נָוָה), according to its primary meaning, is a resting- or

dwelling-place, specifically an oasis, *i. e.* a verdant spot in the desert. מֵי מְנוּחוֹת are waters, where the weary finds a most pleasant resting-place (according to Hitzig, it is a plural brought in by the plural of the governing word, but it is at any rate a superlative plural), and can at the same time refresh himself. נָהַל is suited to this as being a pastoral word used of gentle leading, and more especially of guiding the herds to the watering-places, just as הִרְבִּיץ is used of making them to rest, especially at noon-tide, Cant. i. 7; cf. ὁδηγεῖν, Apoc. vii. 17. שׁוֹבֵב נַפְשִׁי (elsewhere הֵשִׁיב) signifies to bring back the soul that is as it were flown away, so that it comes to itself again, therefore to impart new life, *recreare*. This He does to the soul, by causing it amidst the dryness and heat of temptation and trouble, to taste the very essence of life which refreshes and strengthens it. The *Hiph.* הִנְחָה (Arabic: to put on one side, as perhaps in Job xii. 23) is, as in cxliii. 10 the intensive of נָחָה (lxxvii. 21). The poet glories that Jahve leads him carefully and without risk or wandering in מַעְגְּלֵי־צֶדֶק, straight paths and leading to the right goal, and this לְמַעַן שְׁמוֹ (for His Name's sake). He has revealed Himself as the gracious One, and as such He will prove and glorify Himself even in the need of him who submits to His guidance.

Vers. 4—5. Rod and staff are here not so much those of the pilgrim, which would be a confusing transition to a different figure, but those of Jahve, the Shepherd (שִׁבְטְךָ, as in Mic. vii. 14, and in connection with it, cf. Num. xxi. 18, מִשְׁעֶנֶת as the filling up of the picture), as the means of guidance and defence. The one rod, which the shepherd holds up to guide the flock and upon which he leans and anxiously watches over the flock, has assumed a double form in the conception of the idea. This rod and staff in the hand of God comfort him, *i. e.* preserve to him the feeling of security, and therefore a cheerful spirit. Even when he passes through a valley dark and gloomy as the shadow of death, where surprises and calamities of every kind threaten him, he fears no misfortune. The LXX. narrows the figure, rendering בגיא according to the Aramaic בְּגוֹא, Dan. iii. 25, ἐν μέσῳ. The noun צַלְמָוֶת, which occurs in this passage for the first time in the Old Testament literature,

is originally not a compound word; but being formed from a verb צלם, צָלַם (root צל, צָלַל), to overshadow, darken, after the form עַבְדוּת, but pronounced צַלְמָוֶת (cf. חַצַרְמָוֶת, *Hadramôt* = the court of death, בְּצַלְאֵל in-God's-shadow), it signifies the shadow of death as an epithet of the most fearful darkness, as of Hades, Job x. 21 sq., but also of a shaft of a mine, Job xxviii. 3, and more especially of darkness such as makes itself felt in a wild, uninhabited desert, Jer. ii. 6.

After the figure of the shepherd fades away in ver. 4, that of the host appears. His enemies must look quietly on (נֶגֶד as in xxxi. 20), without being able to do anything, and see how Jahve provides bountifully for His guest, anoints him with sweet perfumes as at a joyous and magnificent banquet (xcii. 11), and fills his cup to excess. What is meant thereby, is not necessarily only blessings of a spiritual kind. The king fleeing before Absolom and forsaken by the mass of his people was, with his army, even outwardly in danger of being destroyed by want; it is, therefore, even an abundance of daily bread streaming in upon them, as in 2 Sam. xvii. 27—29, that is meant; but even this, spiritually regarded, as a gift from heaven, and so that the satisfying, refreshing and quickening is only the outside phase of simultaneous inward experiences.* The future תְּעָרֹךְ is followed, according to the customary return to the perfect ground-form, by דִּשַּׁנְתָּ, which has, none the less, the signification of a present. And in the closing assertion, כוֹסִי, my cup, is metonymically equivalent to the contents of my cup. This is רְוָיָה, a fulness satiating even to excess.

Ver. 6. Foes are now pursuing him, but prosperity and favour alone shall pursue him, and therefore drive his present pursuers out of the field. אַךְ, originally affirmative, here restrictive, belongs only to the subject-notion in its signification *nil nisi* (xxxix. 6, 12, cxxxix. 11). The expression is remarkable and without example elsewhere: as good spirits Jahve sends forth טוֹב and חֶסֶד to overtake David's enemies, and to protect him against them to their shame,

* In the mouth of the New Testament saint, especially on the *dies viridium*, it is the table of the Lord's supper, as Apollinaris also hints when he applies to it the epithet ῥιγεδανῶν βρίθουσαν, *horrendorum onustam*.

and that all his life long (accusative of continuance). We have now no need, in connection with our reference of the Psalm to the persecution under Absolom, either to persuade ourselves that וְשַׁבְתִּי is equivalent to וְשִׁבְתִּי xxvii. 4, or that it is equivalent to וְיָשַׁבְתִּי. The infinitive is logically inadmissible here, and unheard of with the vowel *ă* instead of *i*, which would here (cf. on the other hand קָחָתִי) be confusing and arbitrary. Nor can it be shewn from Jer. xlii. 10 to be probable that it is contracted from וישבתי, since in that passage שׁוּב signifies *redeundo* = *rursus*. The LXX., certainly, renders it by καθίσαντες, as in 1 Sam. xii. 2 by καὶ καθήσομαι; but (since so much uncertainty attaches to these translators and their text) we cannot draw a safe inference as to the existing usage of the language, which would, in connection with such a contraction, go out of the province of one verb into that of another, which is not the case with תָּתָה = נָתַתָּה in 2 Sam. xxii. 41. On the contrary we have before us in the present passage a *constructio prægnans*: "and I shall return (*perf. consec.*) in the house of Jahve", *i. e.* again, having returned, dwell in the house of Jahve. In itself וְשַׁבְתִּי בּ might also even mean *et revertam ad* (cf. vii. 17, Hos. xii. 7), like עָלָה בְּ, xxiv. 3, *adscendere ad* (*in*). But the additional assertion of continuance, לְאֹרֶךְ יָמִים (as in xciii. 5, Lam. v. 20, אֹרֶךְ, root רך, extension, lengthening = length) favours the explanation, that בְּ is to be connected with the idea of וישבתי, which is involved in וְשִׁבְתִּי as a natural consequence.

PSALM XXIV.

PREPARATION FOR THE RECEPTION OF THE LORD WHO IS ABOUT TO COME.

A. Psalm on going up (below, on the hill of Zion).

Chorus of the festive procession.

1 JAHVE's is the earth, and its fulness,
The world, and they that dwell therein.
2 For He, He hath founded it upon the seas,
And upon streams did He set it fast.

A voice.

3 Who may ascend the hill of Jahve,
Who may stand in His holy place?

Another voice.

4 He that is of innocent hands and of pure heart,
He that doth not lift up his soul to vanity,
And doth not swear deceitfully —

Chorus.

5 He shall receive a blessing from Jahve,
And righteousness from the God of his salvation.
6 This is the generation of those who aspire after Him,
Who seek Thy face — Jacob. (*Sela*)

B. Psalm on entering (above, on the citadel of Zion).

Chorus of the festive procession.

7 Lift up, ye gates, your heads,
And raise yourselves, ye ancient doors,
That the King of Glory may come in.

A voice, as it were, from the gates.

8 Who is, then, the King of Glory?

Chorus.

Jahve, a mighty one and a hero,
Jahve, a hero in battle.
9 Lift up, ye gates, your heads,
And raise yourselves, ye ancient doors,
That the King of Glory may come in.

As it were, from the gates.

10 Who is He, then, the King of Glory?

Chorus.

Jahve of Hosts,
He is the King of Glory. (*Sela*)

Ps. xxiii. expressed a longing after the house of Jahve on Zion; Ps. xxiv. celebrates Jahve's entrance into Zion, and the true character of him who may enter with Him. It was composed when the Ark was brought from Kirjath Jearim to Mount Zion, where David had caused it to be set up in a tabernable built expressly for it, 2 Sam. vi. 17, cf. xi. 11, 1 Kings i. 39; or else, which is rendered the more probable by the description of Jahve as a warrior, at a time when the Ark was brought back to Mount Zion, after having been taken to accompany the army to battle (*vid.* Ps. lxviii.). Ps. xv. is very similar. But only xxiv. 1—6 is the counterpart of that Psalm; and there is nothing wanting to render the first part of Ps. xxiv. complete in itself. Hence Ewald divides Ps. xxiv. into two songs, belonging to different periods, although both old Davidic songs, viz. Ps. xxiv. 7—10, the song of victory sung at the removal of the Ark to Zion; and xxiv. 1—6, a purely didactic song pre-supposing this event which forms an era in their history. And it is relatively more natural to regard this Psalm rather than Ps. xix., as two songs combined and made into one; but these two songs have an internal coherence; in Jahve's coming to His temple is found that which occasioned them and that towards which They point; and consequently they form a whole consisting of two divisions. To the inscription לדוד מזמור the LXX. adds τῇς μιᾶς σαββάτου* (= של אחד בשבת, for the first day of the week), according to which this Psalm was a customary Sunday Psalm. This addition is confirmed by *B. Tamid extr., Rosh ha-Shana* 31*a*, *Sofrim* xviii. (cf. *supra* p. 32). In the second of these passages cited from the Talmud, R. Akiba seeks to determine the reasons for this choice by reference to the history of the creation.

Incorporated in Israel's hymn-book, this Psalm became, with a regard to its original occasion and purpose, an Old Testament Advent hymn in honour of the Lord who should come into His temple, Mal. iii. 1; and the cry: Lift up, ye

---

* The London Papyrus fragments, in Tischendorf *Monum.* i. 247, read TH MIA TΩN ΣABBATΩN. In the Hexaplarian text, this addition to the inscription was wanting.

gates, your heads, obtained a meaning essentially the same as that of the voice of the crier in Isaiah xl. 3: Prepare ye Jahve's way, make smooth in the desert a road for our God! In the New Testament consciousness, the second appearing takes the place of the first, the coming of the Lord of Glory to His church, which is His spiritual temple; and in this Psalm we are called upon to prepare Him a worthy reception. The interpretation of the second half of the Psalm of the entry of the Conqueror of death into Hades, — an interpretation which has been started by the Gospel of Nicodemus (*vid.* Tischendorf's *Evv. apocrypha* p. 306 sq.) and still current in the Greek church, — and the patristic interpretation of it of the εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψις τοῦ κυρίου, do as much violence to the rules of exegesis as to the parallelism of the facts of the Old and New Testaments.

Vers. 1—6. Jahve, whose throne of grace is now set upon Zion, has not a limited dominion, like the heathen deities: His right to sovereignty embraces the earth and its fulness (l. 12, lxxxix. 12), *i. e.* everything that is to be found upon it and in it.* For He, הוּא, is the owner of the world, because its Creator. He has founded it upon seas, *i. e.* the ocean and its streams, נְהָרוֹת, ῥέεθρα (Jon. ii. 4); for the waters existed before the dry land, and this has been cast up out of them at God's word, so that consequently the solid land, — which indeed also conceals in its interior a תְּהוֹם רַבָּה (Gen. vii. 11), — rising above the surface of the sea, has the waters, as it were, for its foundation (cxxxvi. 6), although it would more readily sink down into them than keep itself above them, if it were not in itself upheld by the creative power of God. Hereupon arises the question, who

* In 1 Cor. x. 26, Paul founds on this verse (cf. l. 12) the doctrine that a Christian (apart from a charitable regard for the weak) may eat whatever is sold in the shambles, without troubling himself to enquire whether it has been offered to idols or not. A Talmudic teacher, *B. Berachoth* 35*a*, infers from this passage the duty of prayer before meat: He who eats without giving thanks is like one who lays hands upon קדשׁי יי (the sacred things of God); the right to eat is only obtained by prayer.

may ascend the mountain of Jahve, and stand above in His holy place? The futures have a potential signification: who can have courage to do it? what, therefore, must he be, whom Jahve receives into His fellowship, and with whose worship He is well-pleased? Answer: he must be one innocent in his actions and pure in mind, one who does not lift up his soul to that which is vain (לַשָּׁוְא, according to the Masora with *Waw minusculum*). (לְ) נָשָׂא נֶפֶשׁ אֶל, to direct one's soul, xxv. 1, or longing and striving, towards anything, Deut. xxiv. 15, Prov. xix. 18, Hos. iv. 8. The *Kerî* נַפְשִׁי is old and acknowledged by the oldest authorities.* Even the LXX. *Cod. Alex.* translates: τὴν ψυχήν μου; whereas *Cod. Vat.* (Eus., Apollin., Theodor., et al.): τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Critically it is just as intangible, as it is exegetically incomprehensible; נַפְשִׁי might then be equivalent to שְׁמִי, Exod. xx. 7, an explanation, however, which does not seem possible even from Amos vi. 8, Jer. li. 14. We let this *Kerî* alone to its undisturbed critical rights. But that the poet did actual write thus, is incredible.

In ver. 5 (just as at the close of Ps. xv.), in continued predicates, we are told the character of the man, who is worthy of this privilege, to whom the question in ver. 3 refers. Such an one shall bear away, or acquire (נִשָּׂא, as *e.g.* Esth. ii. 17) blessing from Jahve and righteousness from

---

* The reading נַפְשִׁי is adopted by Saadia (in *Emunoth* ii, where נפשי is equivalent to שמי), Juda ha-Levi (*Cuzari* iii. 27), Abulwalid (*Rikma* p. 180), Rashi, Kimchi, the Sohar, the Codices (and among others by that of the year 1294) and most editions (among which, the *Complutensis* has נפשי in the text). Nor does Aben-Ezra, whom Norzi has misunderstood, by any means reverse the relation of the *Chethîb* and *Kerî;* to him נפשי is the *Keri*, and he explains it as a metaphor (an anthropomorphism): וכתוב נפשי דרך כנוי. Elias Levita is the only one who rejects the *Keri* נפשי; but he does so through misunderstanding a Masora (*vid.* Baer's *Psalterium* p. 130) and not without admitting Masoretic testimony in favour of it (וכן ראיתי ברוב נוסחאות המסורת). He is the only textual critic who rejects it. For Jacob b. Chajim is merely astonished that נַפְשִׁי is not to be found in the Masoreth register of words written with *Waw* and to be read with *Jod.* And even Norzi does not reject this *Keri*, which he is obliged to admit has greatly preponderating testimony in its favour, and he would only too gladly get rid of it.

the God of his salvation (xxv. 5, xxvii. 9). Righteousness, *i. e.* conformity to God and that which is well-pleasing to God, appears here as a gift, and in this sense it is used interchangeably with יֶשַׁע (*e. g.* cxxxii. 9, 16). It is the righteousness of God after which the righteous, but not the self-righteous, man hungers and thirsts; that moral perfection which is the likeness of God restored to him and at the same time brought about by his own endeavours; it is the being changed, or transfigured, into the image of the Holy One Himself. With ver. 5 the answer to the question of ver. 3 is at an end; ver. 6 adds that those thus qualified, who may accordingly expect to receive God's gifts of salvation, are the true church of Jahve, the Israel of God. דּוֹר (lit. a revolution, Arabic *dahr*, root דר, to turn, revolve) is used here, as in xiv. 5, lxxiii. 15, cxii. 2, of a collective whole, whose bond of union is not cotemporaneousness, but similarity of disposition; and it is an alliteration with the דֹּרְשָׁיו (*Chethîb* דרשו, without the *Jod plur.*) which follows. מְבַקְשֵׁי פָנֶיךָ is a second genitive depending on דּוֹר, as in xxvii. 8. Here at the close the predication passes into the form of invocation (Thy face). And יַעֲקֹב is a summarising predicate: in short, these are Jacob, not merely after the flesh, but after the spirit, and thus in truth (Isa. xliv. 2, cf. Rom. ix. 6, Gal. vi. 16). By interpolating אֱלֹהֵי, as is done in the LXX. and Peshîto, and adopted by Ewald, Olshausen, Hupfeld, and Böttcher, the nerve, as it were, of the assertion is cut through. The predicate, which has been expressed in different ways, is concentrated intelligibly enough in the one word יעקב, towards which it all along tends. And here the music becomes *forte*. The first part of this double Psalm dies away amidst the playing of the instruments of the Levitical priests; for the Ark was brought in בְּכָל־עֹז וּבְשִׁירִים, as 2 Sam. vi. 5 (cf. 14) is to be read.

Vers. 7—10. The festal procession has now arrived above at the gates of the citadel of Zion. These are called פִּתְחֵי עוֹלָם, doors of eternity (not "of the world" as Luther renders it contrary to the Old Testament usage of the language) either as doors which pious faith hopes will last for ever, as Hupfeld and Hitzig explain it, understanding them, in opposition to the inscription of the Psalm, to be the

gates of Solomon's Temple; or, what seems to us much more appropriate in the mouth of those who are now standing before the gates, as the portals dating back into the hoary ages of the past (עוֹלָם as *e. g.* in Gen. xlix. 26, Isa. lviii. 12), the time of the Jebusites, and even of Melchizedek, through which the King of Glory, whose whole being and acts is glory, is now about to enter. It is the gates of the citadel of Zion, to which the cry is addressed, to expand themselves in a manner worthy of the Lord who is about to enter, for whom they are too low and too strait. Rejoicing at the great honour, thus conferred upon them, they are to raise their heads (Job x. 15, Zech. ii. 4), *i. e.* lift up their portals (lintels); the doors of antiquity are to open high and wide.* Then the question echoes back to the festal procession from Zion's gates which are wont only to admit mighty lords: who, then (זֶה giving vividness to the question, Ges. § 122, 2), is this King of Glory; and they describe Him more minutely: it is the Hero-god, by whom Israel has wrested this Zion from the Jebusites with the sword, and by whom he has always been victorious in time past. The adjectival climactic form עִזּוּז (like לְמִיד, with *i* instead of the *ă* in חַנּוּן, קָשׁוּב) is only found in one other passage, viz. Isa. xliii. 17. גִּבּוֹר מִלְחָמָה refers back to Exod. xv. 3. Thus then shall the gates raise their heads and the ancient doors lift themselves, *i. e.* open high and wide; and this is expressed here by *Kal* instead of *Niph.* (נָשָׂא to lift one's self up, rise, as in Nah. i. 5, Hos. xiii. 1, Hab. i. 3), according to the well-known order in which recurring verses and refrain-like repetitions move gently onwards. The gates of Zion ask once more, yet now no longer hesitatingly, but in order to hear more in praise of the great King. It is now the enquiry seeking fuller information; and the heaping up of the pronouns (as in Jer. xxx. 21, cf. xlvi. 7, Esth. vii. 5) expresses its urgency (*quis tandem*, *ecquisnam*). The answer runs, "Jahve Tsebaoth, He is the King of Glory (now making His entry)". יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת is the proper name of Jahve as King, which had become His customary name in the time

* On the *Munach* instead of *Metheg* in וְהִנָּשְׂאוּ *vid.* Baer's *Accentsystem* vii. 2.

of the kings of Israel. צְבָאוֹת is a genitive governed by יְהוָה; and, while it is otherwise found only in reference to human hosts, in this combination it gains, of itself, the reference to the angels and the stars, which are called צְבָאִים in ciii. 21, cxlviii. 2: Jahve's hosts consisting of celestial heroes, Joel ii. 11, and of stars standing on the plain of the heavens as it were in battle array, Isa. xl. 26, — a reference for which experiences and utterances like those recorded in Gen. xxxii. 2 sq., Deut. xxxiii. 2, Judges v. 20, have prepared the way. It is, therefore, the Ruler commanding innumerable and invincible super-terrestrial powers, who desires admission. The gates are silent and open wide; and Jahve, sitting enthroned above the Cherubim of the sacred Ark, enters into Zion.

PSALM XXV.

PRAYER FOR GRACIOUS PROTECTION AND GUIDANCE.

1 א UNTO Thee, Jahve, do I lift up my soul.
2 ב My God in Thee do I trust, let me not be ashamed,
Let not mine enemies triumph over me.
3 ג Yea none that wait on Thee shall be ashamed,
They shall be ashamed who are faithless without cause.
4 ד Thy ways, Jahve, make known to me,
Thy paths teach Thou me.
5 ה Lead me in Thy truth, and teach me;
For Thou art the God of my salvation,
On Thee do I hope continually.
6 ו Remember, Jahve, Thy tender mercies and Thy loving-kindnesses,
For they are ever of old.
7 ח The sins of my youth and my transgressions remember not,
According to Thy mercy remember Thou me
For Thy goodness' sake, Jahve!
8 ט Good and upright is Jahve;
Therefore He instructeth sinners in the right way.
9 י He leadeth the humble in that which is right,
And teacheth the humble His way.

10 כ All the paths of Jahve are mercy and truth,
To such as keep His covenant and His testimonies.
11 ל For Thy name's sake, Jahve, pardon my sin,
For it is great.
12 מ What man is he that feareth Jahve?
Him shall He teach in the way of right choice.
13 נ His soul shall dwell in prosperity,
And his seed shall inherit the land.
14 ס The secret of Jahve is with them that fear Him,
And His covenant doth He make them know.
15 ע Mine eyes are ever towards Jahve,
For He will pluck my feet out of the net.
16 פ Turn Thee unto me and be gracious unto me,
For I am desolate and needy.
17 צ Troubles have spread over my heart,
Out of my distresses bring Thou me forth!
18 ר Look upon mine affliction and my trouble,
And forgive all my sins.
19 ר Look upon mine enemies, that they are many,
And with cruel hatred they hate me.
20 ש Keep my soul, and deliver me,
Let me not be ashamed, for I trust in Thee.
21 ת Let integrity and uprightness preserve me,
For I hope in Thee.
22 פ Redeem Israel, Elohim,
Out of all his troubles.

A question similar to the question, *Who may ascend the mountain of Jahve?* which Ps. xxiv. propounded, is thrown out by Ps. xxv., *Who is he that feareth Jahve?* in order to answer it in great and glorious promises. It is a calmly confident prayer for help against one's foes, and for God's instructing, pardoning, and leading grace. It is without any definite background indicating the history of the times in which it was composed; and also without any clearly marked traits of individuality. But it is one of the nine alphabetical Psalms of the whole collection, and the companion to Ps. xxxiv., to which it corresponds even in many peculiarities of the acrostic structure. For both Psalms

have no ו strophe; they are parallel both as to sound and meaning in the beginnings of the מ, ע, and the first פ strophes; and both Psalms, after having gone through the alphabet, have a פ strophe added as the concluding one, whose beginning and contents are closely related. This homogeneousness points to one common author. We see nothing in the alphabetical arrangement at least, which even here as in Ps. ix—x. is handled very freely and not fully carried out, to hinder us from regarding David as this author. But, in connection with the general ethical and religious character of the Psalm, it is wanting in positive proofs of this. In its universal character and harmony with the plan of redemption Ps. xxv. coincides with many post-exilic Psalms. It contains nothing but what is common to the believing consciousness of the church in every age; nothing specifically belonging to the Old Testament and Israelitish, hence Theodoret says: ἁρμόζει μάλιστα τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν κεκλημένοις. The introits for the second and third Quadragesima Sundays are taken from vers. 6 and 15; hence these Sundays are called *Reminiscere* and *Oculi*. Paul Gerhardt's hymn "*Nach dir, o Herr, verlanget mich*" is a beautiful poetical rendering of this Psalm.

Vers. 1—2. The Psalm begins, like Ps. xvi. xxiii., with a monostich. Ver. 2 is the ב strophe, אֱלֹהַי (unless one is disposed to read בְּךָ אֱלֹהַי according to the position of the words in xxxi. 2), after the manner of the interjections in the tragedians, *e. g.* ὤμοι, not being reckoned as belonging to the verse (J. D. Köhler). In need of help and full of longing for deliverance he raises his soul, drawn away from earthly desires, to Jahve (lxxxvi. 4, cxliii. 8), the God who alone can grant him that which shall truly satisfy his need. His ego, which has the soul within itself, directs his soul upwards to Him whom he calls אֱלֹהַי, because in believing confidence he clings to Him and is united with Him. The two אַל declare what Jahve is not to allow him to experience, just as in xxxi. 2, 18. According to xxxv. 19, 24, xxxviii. 17, it is safer to construe לִי with יַעֲלְצוּ (cf. lxxi. 10), as also in xxvii. 2, xxx. 2, Mic. vii. 8, although it

would be possible to construe it with אֵיבַי (cf. cxliv. 2). In ver. 3 the confident expectation of the individual is generalised.

Ver. 3. That wherewith the praying one comforts himself is no peculiar personal prerogative, but the certain, joyous prospect of all believers: ἡ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει, Rom. v. 5. These are called קַוֶּיךָ (קַוֶּה participle to קָוָה, just as דֹּבֵר is the participle to דִּבֶּר). Hope is the eye of faith which looks forth clear and fixedly into the future. With those who hope in Jahve, who do not allow themselves to be in any way disconcerted respecting Him, are contrasted those who act treacherously towards Him (cxix. 158, Aq., Symm., Theodot., οἱ ἀποστατοῦντες), and that רֵיקָם, *i. e.* — and it can only mean this — from vain and worthless pretexts, and therefore from wanton unconscientiousness.

Ver. 4. Recognising the infamy of such black ingratitude, he prays for instruction as to the ways which he must take according to the precepts of God (xviii. 22). The will of God, it is true, lies before us in God's written word, but the expounder required for the right understanding of that word is God Himself. He prays Him for knowledge; but in order to make what he knows a perfect and living reality, he still further needs the grace of God, viz. both His enlightening and also His guiding grace.

Ver. 5. His truth is the lasting and self-verifying fact of His revelation of grace. To penetrate into this truth and to walk in it (xxvi. 3, lxxxvi. 11) without God, is a contradiction in its very self. Therefore the psalmist prays, as in cxix. 35, ὁδήγησόν με ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου (LXX. *Cod. Alex.*; whereas *Cod. Vat.* ἐπὶ τὴν . . . , cf. John xvi. 13). He prays thus, for his salvation comes from Jahve, yea Jahve is his salvation. He does not hope for this or that, but for Him, all the day, *i. e.* unceasingly,* for everything worth hoping for, everything that can satisfy the longing of the soul, is shut up in Him. All mercy or grace, however,

* Hupfeld thinks the accentuation inappropriate; the first half of the verse, however, really extends to יְיֵשָׁעִי, and consists of two parts, of which the second is the confirmation of the first: the second half contains a relatively new thought. The sequence of the accents: *Rebia magnum, Athnach*, therefore fully accords with the matter.

which proceeds from Him, has its foundation in His compassion and condescension.

Ver. 6. The supplicatory *reminiscere* means, may God never forget to exercise His pity and grace towards him, which are (as the plurals imply) so rich and superabundant. The ground on which the prayer is based is introduced with כִּי (*nam,* or even *quoniam*). God's compassion and grace are as old in their operation and efficacy as man's feebleness and sin; in their counsels they are eternal, and therefore have also in themselves the pledge of eternal duration (c. 5, ciii. 17).

Ver. 7. May Jahve not remember the faults of his youth (חַטֹּאת), into which lust and thoughtlessness have precipitated him, nor the transgressions (פְּשָׁעִים), by which even in maturer and more thoughtful years he has turned the grace of God into licentiousness and broken off his fellowship with Him (בְּ, of defection); but may He, on the contrary, turn His remembrance to him (זָכַר לְ as in cxxxvi. 23) in accordance with His grace or loving-kindness, which אַתָּה challenges as being the form of self-attestation most closely corresponding to the nature of God. *Memor esto quidem mei,* observes Augustine, *non secundum iram, qua ego dignus sum, sed secundum misericordiam tuam, quae te digna est.* For God is טוֹב, which is really equivalent to saying, He is ἀγάπη. The next distich shews that טוּב is intended here of God's goodness, and not, as *e. g.* in Neh. ix. 35, of His abundance of possessions.

Ver. 8. The בְּ with הוֹרָה denotes the way, *i. e.* the right way (Job xxxi. 7), as the sphere and subject of the instruction, as in xxxii. 8, Prov. iv. 11, Job xxvii. 11. God condescends to sinners in order to teach them the way that leads to life, for He is טוֹב־וְיָשָׁר; well-doing is His delight, and, if His anger be not provoked (xviii. 27*b*), He has only the sincerest good intention in what He does.

Ver. 9. The shortened form of the future stands here, according to Ges. § 128, 2, rem., instead of the full form (which, viz. יְדִרְךְ, is perhaps meant); for the connection which treats of general facts, does not admit of its being taken as optative. The בּ (cf. ver. 5, cvii. 7, cxix. 35) denotes the sphere of the guidance. מִשְׁפָּט is the right so far as it is

traversed, *i. e.* practised or carried out. In this course of right He leads the עֲנָוִים, and teaches them the way that is pleasing to Himself. עֲנָוִים is the one word for the gentle, *mansueti,* and the humble, *modesti.* Jerome uses these words alternately in ver. 9*a* and 9*b*; but the poet designedly repeats the one word — the cardinal virtue of עֲנָוָה — here with the preponderating notion of lowliness. Upon the self-righteous and self-sufficient He would be obliged to force Himself even against their will. He wants disciples eager to learn; and how richly He rewards those who guard what they have learnt!

Ver. 10. The paths intended, are those which He takes with men in accordance with His revealed will and counsel. These paths are חֶסֶד [loving-kindness, mercy, or grace], for the salvation of men is their goal, and אֱמֶת [truth], for they give proof at every step of the certainty of His promises. But only they who keep His covenant and His testimonies faithfully and obediently shall share in this mercy and truth. To the psalmist the name of Jahve, which unfolds itself in mercy and truth, is precious. Upon it he bases the prayer that follows.

Ver. 11. The *perf. consec.* is attached to the יְהִי, which is, according to the sense, implied in לְמַעַן שִׁמְךָ, just as in other instances it follows adverbial members of a clause, placed first for the sake of emphasis, when those members have reference to the future, Ges. § 126, rem. 1. Separate and manifold sins (ver. 7) are all comprehended in עָוֹן, which is in other instances also the collective word for the corruption and the guilt of sin. כִּי gives the ground of the need and urgency of the petition. A great and multiform load of sin lies upon him, but the name of God, *i. e.* His nature that has become manifest in His mercy and truth, permits him to ask and to hope for forgiveness, not for the sake of anything whatever that he has done, but just for the sake of this name (Jer. xiv. 7, Isa. xliii. 25). How happy therefore is he who fears God, in this matter!

Ver. 12. The question: *quisnam est vir,* which resembles xxxiv. 13, cvii. 43, Isa. l. 10, is only propounded in order to draw attention to the person who bears the character described, and then to state what such an one has to expect.

In prose we should have a relative antecedent clause instead, viz. *qui* (*quisquis*) *talis est qui Dominum vereatur.** The attributive יִבְחָר, (*viam*) *quam eligat* (cf. Isa. xlviii. 17), might also be referred to God: in which He takes delight (LXX.); but parallels like cxix. 30, 173, favour the rendering: which he should chose. Among all the blessings which fall to the lot of him who fears God, the first place is given to this, that God raises him above the vacillation and hesitancy of human opinion.

Ver. 13. The verb לִין (לון), probably equivalent to לִיל (from לַיִל) signifies to tarry the night, to lodge. Good, *i. e.* inward and outward prosperity, is like the place where such an one turns in and finds shelter and protection. And in his posterity will be fulfilled what was promised to the patriarchs and to the people delivered from Egypt, viz. possession of the land, or as this promise runs in the New Testament, of the earth, Mat. v. 5 (cf. Ps. xxxvii. 11), Apoc. v. 10.

Ver. 14. The LXX. renders סוֹד, κραταίωμα, as though it were equivalent to יְסוֹד. The reciprocal נוֹסָד, ii. 2 (which see), leads one to the right primary signification. Starting from the primary meaning of the root סד," to be or to make tight, firm, compressed", סוֹד signifies a being closely pressed together for the purpose of secret communication and converse, confidential communion or being together, lxxxix. 8, cxi. 1 (Symm. ὁμιλία), then the confidential communication itself, lv. 15, a secret (Aquila ἀπόῤῥητον, Theod. μυστήριον). So here: He opens his mind without any reserve, speaks confidentially with those who fear Him; cf. the derivative passage Prov. iii. 32, and an example of the thing itself in Gen. xviii. 17. In ver. 14*b* the infinitive with לְ, according to Ges. § 132, rem. 1, as in Isa. xxxviii. 20, is an expression for the *fut. periphrast.: fœdus suum notum facturus est iis;* the position of the words is like Dan. ii. 16, 18, iv. 15. הוֹדִיעַ is used of the imparting of not merely intellectual, but experimental knowledge. Hitzig renders it differently, viz.

* The verb *ver-eri*, which signifies "to guard one's self, defend one's self from anything" according to its radical notion, has nothing to do with יָרֵא (וָרָא).

to enlighten them. But the *Hiph.* is not intended to be used thus absolutely even in 2 Sam. vii. 21. בְּרִיתוֹ is the object; it is intended of the rich and deep and glorious character of the covenant revelation. The poet has now on all sides confirmed the truth, that every good gift comes down from above, from the God of salvation; and he returns to the thought from which he started.

Ver. 15. He who keeps his eyes constantly directed towards God (cxli. 8, cxxiii. 1), is continually in a praying mood, which cannot remain unanswered. תָּמִיד corresponds to ἀδιαλείπτως in 1 Thess. v. 17. The aim of this constant looking upwards to God, in this instance, is deliverance out of the enemy's net. He can and will pull him out (xxxi. 5) of the net of complicated circumstances into which he has been ensnared without any fault of his own.

Ver. 16. The rendering "regard me", so far as פְּנֵה אֵל means God's observant and sympathising turning to any one (LXX. ἐπιβλέπειν), corresponds to lxxxvi. 16, Lev. xxvi. 9. For this he longs, for men treat him as a stranger and refuse to have anything to do with him. יָחִיד is the only one of his kind, one who has no companion, therefore the isolated one. The recurrence of the same sounds עָנִי אֲנִי is designedly not avoided. To whom could he, the isolated one, pour forth his affliction, to whom could he unveil his inmost thoughts and feelings? to God alone! To Him he can bring all his complaints, to Him he can also again and again always make supplication.

Ver. 17. The *Hiph.* הִרְחִיב signifies to make broad, and as a transitive denominative applied to the mind and heart: to make a broad space = to expand one's self (cf. as to the idea, Lam. ii. 13, "great as the sea is thy misfortune"), LXX. ἐπληθύνθησαν, perhaps originally it was ἐπλατύνθησαν. Accordingly הִרְחִיבוּ is admissible so far as language is concerned; but since it gives only a poor antithesis to צָרוֹת it is to be suspected. The original text undoubtedly was הרחיב (הִרְחִיב, as in lxxvii. 2, or הִרְחֵיב, as *e. g.* in 2 Kings viii. 6): the straits of my heart do Thou enlarge (cf. cxix. 32, 2 Cor. vi. 11) and bring me out of my distresses (Hitzig and others).

Vers. 18—19. The falling away of the ק is made up for

by a double ר strophe. Even the LXX. has ἴδε twice over. The seeing that is prayed for, is in both instances a seeing into his condition, with which is conjoined the notion of interposing on his behalf, though the way and manner thereof is left to God. נָשָׂא לְ, with the object in the dative instead of the accusative (*tollere peccata*), signifies to bestow a taking away, *i. e.* forgiveness, upon any one (synon. סָלַח לְ). It is pleasing to the New Testament consciousness that God's vengeance is not expressly invoked upon his enemies. כִּי is an expansive *quod* as in Gen. i. 4. שִׂנְאַת חָמָס with an attributive genitive is hatred, which springs from injustice and ents in injustice.

Ver. 20. He entreats for preservation and deliverance from God; and that He may not permit his hope to be disappointed (אַל־אֵבוֹשׁ, cf. 1 Chron. xxi. 13, instead of אַל־אבוֹשָׁה, which is usual in other instances). This his hope rests indeed in Him: he has taken refuge in Him and therefore He cannot forsake him, He cannot let him be destroyed.

Ver. 21. Devoutness that fills the whole man, that is not merely half-hearted and hypocritical, is called תֹּם; and uprightness that follows the will of God without any by-paths and forbidden ways is called יֹשֶׁר. These two radical virtues (cf. Job i. 1) he desires to have as his guardians on his way which is perilous not only by reason of outward foes, but also on account of his own sinfulness. These custodians are not to let him pass out of their sight, lest he should be taken away from them (cf. xl. 12, Prov. xx. 28). He can claim this for himself, for the cynosure of his hope is God, from whom proceed תם and יֹשֶׁר like good angels.

Ver. 22. His experience is not singular, but the enmity of the world and sin bring all who belong to the people of God into straits just as they have him. And the need of the individual will not cease until the need of the whole undergoes a radical remedy. Hence the intercessory prayer of this meagre closing distich, whose connection with what precedes is not in this instance so close as in xxxiv. 23. It looks as though it was only added when Ps. xxv. came to be used in public worship; and the change of the name of God favours this view. Both Psalms close with a פ in excess

of the alphabet. Perhaps the first ם represents the מ, and the second the ף; for xxv. 16, xxxiv. 17 follow words ending in a consonant, and xxv. 22, xxxiv. 23, words ending in a vowel. Or is it a propensity for giving a special representation of the final letters, just as these are sometimes represented, though not always perfectly, at the close of the hymns of the synagogue (*pijutim*)?

PSALM XXVI.

THE LONGING OF ONE WHO IS PERSECUTED INNOCENTLY, TO GIVE THANKS TO GOD IN HIS HOUSE.

1 VINDICATE my cause, Jahve, for I have walked in mine integrity,
And in Jahve have I trusted without wavering.
2 Prove me, Jahve, and try me,
Purify my reins and my heart.
3 For Thy loving-kindness is before mine eyes,
And I walk in Thy truth.

4 I have not sat with vain persons,
And with dissemblers I have no intercourse.
5 I hate the congregation of the wicked,
And I sit not with the ungodly.

6 I will wash my hands in innocency,
And I desire to compass Thine altar, Jahve;
7 That I may join in with the voice of thanksgiving,
And tell of all Thy wondrous works.
8 Jahve, I love the habitation of Thy house,
And the place where Thy glory dwelleth.

9 Gather not my soul with sinners,
Nor my life with men of blood,
10 In whose hands is infamy,
And whose right hand is full of bribery!
11 I, however, do walk in mine integrity —
Deliver me and be gracious unto me!

12 My foot is come to stand in a wide plain,
In the choirs of the congregation will I praise Jahve.

Ps. xxv. and xxvi. are bound together by similarity of thought and expression. In the former as in this Psalm, we find the writer's testimony to his trust in God (בָּטַחְתִּי, xxv. 2, xxvi. 1); there as here, the cry coming forth from a distressed condition for deliverance (פְּדֵהוּ, xxv. 22, xxvi. 11), and for some manifestation of mercy (חָנֵּנִי xxvi. 11, xxv. 16); and in the midst of these, other prominent points of contact (xxvi. 11, xxv. 21; xxvi. 3., xxv. 5). These are grounds sufficient for placing these two Psalms close together. But in Ps. xxvi. there is wanting the self-accusation that goes hand in hand with the self-attestation of piety, that confession of sin which so closely corresponds to the New Testament consciousness (*vid. supra* p. 72), which is thrice repeated in Ps. xxv. The harshness of the contrast in which the psalmist stands to his enemies, whose character is here more minutely described, does not admit of the introduction of such a lament concerning himself. The description applies well to the Absolomites. They are hypocrites, who, now that they have agreed together in their faithless and bloodly counsel, have thrown off their disguise and are won over by bribery to their new master; for Absolom had stolen the hearts of the men of Israel, 2 Sam. xv. 6. David at that time would not take the Ark with him in his flight, but said: If I shall find favour in the eyes of Jahve, He will bring me back, and grant me to see both it and His habitation, 2 Sam. xv. 25. The love for the house of God, which is expressed herein, is also the very heart of this Psalm.

Vers. 1—3. The poet, as one who is persecuted, prays for the vindication of his rights and for rescue; and bases this petition upon the relation in which he stands to God. שָׁפְטֵנִי, as in vii. 9, xxxv. 24, cf. xliii. 1. תֹּם (synon. תָּמִים, which, however, does not take any suffix) is, according to Gen. xx. 5 sq., 1 Kings xxii. 34, perfect freedom from all sinful intent, purity of character, pureness, guilelessness (ἀκακία, ἁπλότης). Upon the fact, that he has walked in a

harmless mind, without cherishing or provoking enmity, and trusted unwaveringly (לֹא אֶמְעָד, an adverbial circumstantial clause, cf. xxi. 8) in Jahve, he bases the petition for the proving of his injured right. He does not self-righteously hold himself to be morally perfect, he appeals only to the fundamental tendency of his inmost nature, which is turned towards God and to Him only. Ver. 2 also is not so much a challenge for God to satisfy Himself of his innocence, as rather a request to prove the state of his mind, and, if it be not as it appears to his consciousness, to make this clear to him (cxxxix. 23 sq). בָּחַן is not used in this passage of proving by trouble, but by a penetrating glance into the inmost nature (xi. 5, xvii. 3). נַסֵּה, not in the sense of πειράζειν, but of δοκιμάζειν. צָרַף, to melt down, *i. e.* by the agency of fire, the precious metal, and separate the dross (xii. 7, lxvi. 10). The *Chethîb* is not to be read צְרוּפָה (which would be in contradiction to the request), but צָרוּפָה, as it is out of pause also in Isa. xxxii. 11, cf. Judges ix. 8, 12, 1 Sam. xxviii. 8. The reins are the seat of the emotions, the heart is the very centre of the life of the mind and soul.

Ver. 3 tells how confidently and cheerfully he would set himself in the light of God. God's grace or loving-kindness is the mark on which his eye is fixed, the desire of his eye, and he walks in God's truth. חֶסֶד is the divine love, condescending to His creatures, and more especially to sinners (xxv. 7), in unmerited kindness; אֱמֶת is the truth with which God adheres to and carries out the determination of His love and the word of His promise. This lovingkindness of God has been always hitherto the model of his life, this truth of God the determining line and the boundary of his walk.

Vers. 4—5. He still further bases his petition upon his comportment towards the men of this world; how he has always observed a certain line of conduct and continues still to keep to it. With ver. 4*a* compare Jer. xv. 17. מְתֵי שָׁוְא (Job xi. 11, cf. xxxi. 5, where the parallel word is מִרְמָה) are "not-real," unreal men, but in a deeper stronger sense than we are accustomed to use this word. שָׁוְא (= שָׁוֶא, from שׁוא) is aridity, hollowness, worthlessness, and therefore

badness (שֹׁחַד) of disposition; the chaotic void of alienation from God; untruth white-washed over with the lie of dissimulation (xii. 3), and therefore nothingness: it is the very opposite of being filled with the fulness of God and with that which is good, which is the morally real (its synonym is אָוֶן, *e. g.* Job xxii. 15). נֶעְלָמִים, the veiled, are those who know how to keep their worthlessness and their mischievous designs secret and to mask them by hypocrisy; post-biblical צְבוּעִים, dyed (cf. ἀνυπόκριτος, Luther "*ungefärbt*", undyed). (אֶת) בּוֹא עִם, to go in with any one, is a short expression for: to go in and out with, *i. e.* to have intercourse with him, as in Prov. xxii. 24, cf. Gen. xxiii. 10. מֵרַע (from רָעַע) is the name for one who plots that which is evil and puts it into execution. On רָשָׁע see i. 1.

Vers. 6—8. The poet supports his petition by declaring his motive to be his love for the sanctuary of God, from which he is now far removed, without any fault of his own. The coloured future וְאֶסְבְּבָה, distinct from וְאסבבה (*vid.* on iii. 6 and lxxiii. 16), can only mean, in this passage, *et ambiam,* and not *et ambibam* as it does in a different connection (Isa. xliii. 26, cf. Judges vi. 9); it is the emotional continuation (cf. xxvii. 6, Cant. vii. 12, Isa. i. 24, v. 19, and frequently) of the plain and uncoloured expression אֶרְחַץ. He wishes to wash his hands in innocence (בְּ of the state that is meant to be attested by the action), and compass (lix. 7) the altar of Jahve. That which is elsewhere a symbolic act (Deut. xxi. 6, cf. Mat. xxvii. 24), is in this instance only a rhetorical figure made use of to confess his consciousness of innocence; and it naturally assumes this form (cf. lxxiii. 13) from the idea of the priest washing his hands preparatory to the service of the altar (Exod. xxxii. 20 sq.) being associated with the idea of the altar. And, in general, the expression of vers. 6 sq. takes a priestly form, without exceeding that which the ritual admits of, by virtue of the consciousness of being themselves priests which appertained even to the Israelitish laity (Exod. xix. 16). For סבב can be used even of half encompassing as it were like a semicircle (Gen. ii. 11, Num. xxi. 4), no matter whether it be in the immediate vicinity of, or at a prescribed distance

from, the central point. לְהַשְׁמִיעַ is a syncopated and defectively written *Hiph.*, for לְהַהַשְׁמִיעַ, like לְשַׁמֵּד, Isa. xxiii. 11. Instead of לְהַשְׁמִיעַ קוֹל תּוֹדָה, "to cause the voice of thanksgiving to be heard", since השׁמיע is used absolutely (1 Chron. xv. 19, 2 Chron. v. 13) and the object is conceived of as the instrument of the act (Ges. § 138, 1, rem. 3), it is "in order to strike in with the voice of thanksgiving". In the expression "all Thy wondrous works" is included the latest of these, to which the voice of thanksgiving especially refers, viz. the bringing of him home from the exile he had suffered from Absolom. Longing to be back again he longs most of all for the gorgeous services in the house of his God, which are performed around the altar of the outer court; for he loves the habitation of the house of God, the place, where His doxa, — revealed on earth, and in fact revealed in grace, — has taken up its abode. מָעוֹן does not mean refuge, shelter (Hupfeld), — for although it may obtain this meaning from the context, it has nothing whatever to do with عان, *med. Waw*, in the signification to help (whence *maʿûn*, *maʿûne*, *maʿâne*, help, assistance, succour or support), — but place, dwelling, habitation, like the Arabic *maʿân*, which the Kamus explains by *menzil*, a place to settle down in, and explains etymologically by محلّ العين, *i. e.* "a spot on which the eye rests as an object of sight"; for in the Arabic *maʿân* is traced back to عان *med. Je*, as is seen from the phrase *hum minka bi-maʿânin*, *i. e.* they are from thee on a point of sight (= on a spot where thou canst see them from the spot on which thou standest). The signification place, sojourn, abode (Targ. מְדוֹר) is undoubted; the primary meaning of the root is, however, questionable.

Vers. 9—11. It is now, for the first time, that the petition compressed into the one word שָׁפְטֵנִי (ver. 1) is divided out. He prays (as in xxviii. 3), that God may not connect him in one common lot with those whose fellowship of sentiment and conduct he has always shunned. אַנְשֵׁי דָמִים, as in v. 7, cf. ἄνδρωποι αἱμάτων, Sir. xxxi. 25. Elsewhere זִמָּה signifies purpose, and more particularly in a bad sense; but in this passage it means infamy, and not unnatural unchastity, to which בִּיהֶם is inappropriate, but

scum of whatever is vicious in general: they are full of cunning and roguery, and their right hand, which ought to uphold the right — David has the lords of his people in his eye — is filled (מָלְאָה, not מִלְאָה) with accursed (Deut. xxvii. 25) bribery to the condemnation of the innocent. He, on the contrary, now, as he always has done, walks in his uprightness, so that now he can with all the more joyful conscience intreat God to interpose judicially in his behalf.

Ver. 12. The epilogue. The prayer is changed into rejoicing which is certain of the answer that shall be given. Hitherto shut in, as it were, in deep trackless gorges, he even now feels himself to be standing בְּמִישׁוֹר,* upon a pleasant plain commanding a wide range of vision (cf. בַּמֶּרְחָב, xxxi. 9), and now blends his grateful praise of God with the song of the worshipping congregation, קָהָל (LXX. ἐν ἐκκλησίαις), and its full-voiced choirs.

PSALM XXVII.

TAKING HEART IN GOD, THE ALL-RECOMPENSING ONE.

1 JAHVE is my light and my salvation,
whom shall I fear?
Jahve is the defence of my life,
of whom shall I be afraid?
2 When the wicked come against me,
to eat up my flesh,
My oppressors and my enemies to me —
they have stumbled and fallen.
3 Though a host should encamp against me,
my heart shall not fear,
Though war should rise up against me,
in spite of it I will be confident.

---

* The first labial of the combination בְּמִ, בְּפִ, when the preceding word ends with a vowel and the two words are closely connected, receives the *Dagesh* contrary to the general rule; on this orthophonic *Dag. lene, vid. Luth. Zeitschr.*, 1863, S. 414.

4 One thing have I asked of Jahve,
that do I desire:
That I may dwell in the house of Jahve
all the days of my life,
To behold the graciousness of Jahve,
and to meditate in His temple.
5 For He concealeth me in His pavilion
in the day of evil,
He hideth me in the shelter of His tabernacle,
Upon a rock doth He raise me up.
6 Thus then shall my head be exalted above
mine enemies round about me,
And I will offer in His tabernacle sacrifices
of thankful joy.
I will sing and play the harp to Jahve.

7 Hear, Jahve, when I cry aloud; be gracious unto
me and answer me.
8 To Thee saith my heart: Seek ye My face —
This Thy face, Jahve, will I seek.

9 Hide not Thy face from me,
Put not Thy servant away in anger;
Thou art my help, cast me not away,
And forsake me not, O God of my salvation.
10 For my father and mother have forsaken me,
But Jahve taketh me up.

11 Teach me, Jahve, Thy way,
And lead me in an even path because of my liers
in wait.
12 Give me not over into the will of mine oppressors,
For false witnesses rise up against me and such as
breathe out violence.

13 Did I not believe to see Jahve's goodness in the land
of the living — !
14 Hope in Jahve,
Be of good courage, and let thine heart be strong,
And hope in Jahve.

The same longing after Zion meets us sounding forth from this as from the preceding Psalm. To remain his whole life long in the vicinity of the house of God, is here his only prayer; and that, rescued from his enemies, he shall there offer sacrifices of thanksgiving, is his confident expectation. The היכל of God, the King, is at present only a אהל which, however, on account of Him who sits enthroned therein, may just as much be called הֵיכָל as the היכל which Ezekiel beheld in remembrance of the Mosaic tabernacle, אֹהֶל, Ezek. xli. 1. Cut off from the sanctuary, the poet is himself threatened on all sides by the dangers of war; but he is just as courageous in God as in iii. 7, where the battle is already going on: "*I do not fear the myriads of people, who are encamped against me.*" The situation, therefore, resembles that of David during the time of Absolom. But this holds good only of the first half, vers. 1—6. In the second half, ver. 10 is not in favour of its being composed by David. In fact the two halves are very unlike one another. They form a *hysteron-proteron,* inasmuch as the *fides triumphans* of the first part changes into *fides supplex* in the second, and with the beginning of the δέησις in ver. 7, the style becomes heavy and awkward, the strophic arrangement obscure, and even the boundaries of the lines of the verses uncertain; so that one is tempted to regard vers. 7—14 as the appendage of another writer. The compiler, however, must have had the Psalm before him exactly as we now have it; for the grounds for his placing it to follow Ps. xxvi. are to be found in both portions, cf. ver. 7 with xxvi. 11; ver. 11 with xxvi. 12.

Vers. 1—3. In this first strophe is expressed the bold confidence of faith. It is a hexastich in the cæsural schema. Let darkness break in upon him, the darkness of night, of trouble, and of spiritual conflict, yet Jahve is his Light, and if he is in Him, he is in the light and there shines upon him a sun, that sets not and knows no eclipse. This sublime, infinitely profound name for God, אוֹרִי, is found only in this passage; and there is only one other expression that can be compared with it, viz. בָּא אוֹרֶךָ in Isa. lx. 1; cf. φῶς ἐλήλυθα, John xii. 46. יִשְׁעִי does not stand beside אוֹרִי

as an unfigurative, side by side with a figurative expression; for the statement that God is light, is not a metaphor. David calls Him his "salvation" in regard to everything that oppresses him, and the "stronghold (מָעוֹז from עָזַז, with an unchangeable *â*) of his life" in regard to everything that exposes him to peril. In Jahve he conquers far and wide; in Him his life is hidden as it were behind a fortress built upon a rock (xxxi. 3). When to the wicked who come upon him in a hostile way (קָרַב עַל differing from קָרַב אֶל), he attributes the intention of devouring his flesh, they are conceived of as wild beasts. To eat up any one's flesh signifies, even in Job xix. 22, the same as to pursue any one by evil speaking (in Aramaic by slander, back-biting) to his destruction. In בְּקָרֵב the *Shebâ* of the only faintly closed syllable is raised to a *Chateph*, as in וְלִשְׁכֵּנִי, xxxi. 12, לְשָׁאוֹל, and the like. The לִי of אֹיְבַי לִי may, as also in xxv. 2 (cf. cxliv. 2), be regarded as giving intensity to the notion of special, personal enmity; but a mere repetition of the subject (the enemy) without the repetition of their hostile purpose would be tame in the parallel member of the verse: לִי is a variation of the preceding עָלַי, as in Lam. iii. 60 sq. In the apodosis הֵמָּה כָּשְׁלוּ וְנָפָלוּ, the overthrow of the enemy is regarded beforehand as an accomplished fact. The holy boldness and imperturbable repose are expressed in ver. 3 in the very rhythm. The thesis or downward movement in ver. 3*a* is spondaic: he does not allow himself to be disturbed; the thesis in ver. 3*b* is iambic: he can be bold. The rendering of Hitzig (as of Rashi): "in this do I trust, viz. that Jahve is my light, &c.," is erroneous. Such might be the interpretation, if בּוֹאת אני בּוֹטח closed ver. 2; but it cannot refer back over ver. 2 to ver. 1; and why should the poet have expressed himself thus materially, instead of saying ביהוה? The fact of the case is this, בּוֹטח signifies even by itself "of good courage", *c. g.* Prov. xi. 15; and בּוֹאת "in spite of this" (Coccejus: *hoc non obstante*), Lev. xxvi. 27, cf. Ps. lxxviii. 32, begins the apodosis, at the head of which we expect to find an adversative conjunction.

Vers. 4—5. There is only one thing, that he desires, although he also has besides full satisfaction in Jahve in the midst of strangers and in trouble. The future is used

side by side with the perfect in ver. 4*a*, in order to express an ardent longing which extends out of the past into the future, and therefore runs through his whole life. The one thing sought is unfolded in שִׁבְתִּי וגו׳. A life-long dwelling in the house of Jahve, that is to say intimate spiritual intercourse with the God, who has His dwelling (בית), His palace (היכל) in the holy tent, is the one desire of David's heart, in order that he may behold and feast upon (חָזָה בְּ of a clinging, lingering, chained gaze, and consequently a more significant form of expression than חָזָה with an accusative, lxiii. 3) נֹעַם ה׳ (xc. 17), the pleasantness (or gracefulness) of Jahve, *i. e.* His revelation, full of grace, which is there visible to the eye of the spirit. The interpretation which regards *amœnitas* as being equivalent to *amœnus cultus* takes hold of the idea from the wrong side. The assertion that בָּקַר בְּ is intended as a synonym of חָזָה בְּ, of a pleased and lingering contemplation (Hupf., Hitz.), is contrary to the meaning of the verb, which signifies "to examine (with לְ to seek or spie about after anything, Lev. xiii. 36), to reflect on, or consider"; even the post-biblical signification to visit, more especially the sick (whence בִּקּוּר חוֹלִים), comes from the primary meaning *investigare*. An appropriate sense may be obtained in the present instance by regarding it as a denominative from בֹּקֶר and rendering it as Dunash and Rashi have done, "and to appear early in His temple"; but it is unnecessary to depart from the general usage of the language. Hengstenberg rightly retains the signification "to meditate on". בְּהֵיכָלוֹ is a designation of the place consecrated to devotion, and לְבַקֵּר is meant to refer to contemplative meditation that loses itself in God who is there manifest. In ver. 5 David bases the justification of his desire upon that which the sanctuary of God is to him; the futures affirm what Jahve will provide for him in His sanctuary. It is a refuge in which he may hide himself, where Jahve takes good care of him who takes refuge therein from the storms of trouble that rage outside: there he is far removed from all dangers, he is lifted high above them and his feet are upon rocky ground. The *Chethîb* may be read בְּסֻכָּה, as in xxxi. 21 and with Ewald § 257,*d*; but, in this passage, with אֹהֶל alternates סֵתֶר, which takes the place

of סֵבָה in the poetic style (lxxvi. 3, Lam. ii. 6), though it does not do so by itself, but always with a suffix.*

Ver. 6. With וְעַתָּה the poet predicts inferentially (cf. ii. 10) the fulfilment of what he fervently desires, the guarantee of which lies in his very longing itself. זִבְחֵי תְרוּעָה do not mean sacrifices in connection with which the trumpets are blown by the priests; for this was only the case in connection with the sacrifices of the whole congregation (Num. x. 10), not with those of individuals. תְּרוּעָה is a synonym of תּוֹדָה, xxvi. 7; and וְזִבְחֵי תְרוּעָה is a stronger form of expression for זִבְחֵי תוֹדָה (cvii. 22), *i. e.* (cf. וְזִבְחֵי צֶדֶק, iv. 6, li. 21) sacrifices of jubilant thanksgiving: he will offer sacrifices in which his gratitude plays a prominent part, and will sing songs of thanksgiving, accompanied by the playing of stringed instruments, to his Deliverer, who has again and so gloriously verified His promises.

Vers. 7—8. Vows of thanksgiving on the assumption of the answering of the prayer and the fulfilment of the thing supplicated, are very common at the close of Psalms. But in this Psalm the prayer is only just beginning at this stage. The transition is brought about by the preceding conception of the danger that threatens him from the side of his foes who are round about him. The reality, which, in the first part, is overcome and surmounted by his faith, makes itself consciously felt here. It is not to be rendered, as has been done by the Vulgate, *Exaudi Domine vocem quæ clamavi* (rather, *clamo*) *ad te* (the introit of the *Dominica exspectationis* in the interval of preparation between Ascension and Pentecost). שְׁמַע has *Dechî*, and accordingly קוֹלִי אֶקְרָא, *voce mea* (as in iii. 5) *clamo*, is an adverbial clause equivalent to *voce mea clamante me*. In ver. 8 לְךָ cannot

---

* Just in like manner they say in poetic style צִיָּה, cxxxii. 15, פָּנָה, Prov. vii. 8; מָדָה, Job xi. 9; גָּלָה, Zech. iv. 2; and perhaps even נָצָה, Gen. xl. 10; for צִיָּתָה, פָּנָתָה, מָדָתָה, גָּלָתָה, and נָצָתָה; as, in general, shorter forms are sometimes found in the inflexion, which do not occur in the corresponding principal form, *e. g.* צוֹרָם, xlix. 15, for צוּרָתָם; מְגוֹרָם, lv. 16, for מְגוֹרָתָם; בְּעָרָמָם, Job v. 13, for בְּעָרְמָתָם; בְּחָבוֹנָם, Hos. xiii. 2, for בְּחָבוֹנָתָם; פְּחָם; Neh. v. 14, for פַּחֲתָם; cf. Hitzig on Hos. xiii. 2, and Böttcher's *Neue Aehrenlese*, No. 693.

possibly be so rendered that לְ is treated as *Lamed auctoris* (Dathe, Olshausen): Thine, saith my heart, is (the utterance:) seek ye my face. The declaration is opposed to this sense, thus artificially put upon it. לְךָ אָמַר are undoubtedly to be construed together; and what the heart says to Jahve is not: Seek ye my face, but by reason of this, and as its echo (Calvin: *velut Deo succinens*): I will therefore seek Thy face. Just as in Job xlii. 3, a personal inference is drawn from a directly quoted saying of God. In the periodic style it would be necessary to transpose בַּקְּשׁוּ פָנָי thus: since Thou hast permitted and exhorted us, or in accordance with Thy persuasive invitation, that we should seek Thy face, I do seek Thy face (Hupfeld). There is no retrospective reference to any particular passage in the Tôra, such as Deut. iv. 29. The prayer is not based upon any single passage of Scripture, but upon God's commands and promises in general.

Vers. 9—10. The requests are now poured forth with all the greater freedom and importunity, that God may be willing to be entreated and invoked. The *Hiph.* הִטָּה signifies in this passage standing by itself (cf. Job xxiv. 4): to push aside. The clause עֶזְרָתִי הָיִיתָ does not say: be Thou my help (which is impossible on syntactical grounds), nor is it to be taken relatively: Thou who wast my help (for which there is no ground in what precedes); but on the contrary the *præt.* gives the ground of the request that follows "Thou art my help (lit. Thou has become, or hast ever been) — cast me, then, not away", and it is, moreover, accented accordingly. Ver. 10, as we have already observed, does not sound as though it came from the lips of David, of whom it is only said during the time of his persecution by Saul, that at that time he was obliged to part from his parents, 1 Sam. xxii. 3 sq. The words certainly might be David's, if ver. 10*a* would admit of being taken hypothetically, as is done by Ewald, § 362,*b*: should my father and my mother forsake me, yet Jahve will &c. But the entreaty "forsake me not" is naturally followed by the reason: for my father and my mother have forsaken me; and just as naturally does the consolation: but Jahve will take me up, prepare the way for the entreaties which begin anew in

ver. 11. Whereas, if כִּי is taken hypothetically, ver. 11 stands disconnectedly in the midst of the surrounding requests. On יַּאַסְפֻנִי cf. Josh. xx. 4.

Vers. 11—12. He is now wandering about like a hunted deer; but God is able to guide him so that he may escape all dangers. And this is what he prays for. As in cxliii. 10, מִישׁוֹר is used in an ethical sense; and differs in this respect from its use in xxvi. 12. On שׁוֹרְרִים, see the primary passage v. 9, of which this is an echo. Wily spies dodge his every step and would gladly see what they have invented against him and wished for him, realised. Should he enter the way of sin leading to destruction, it would tend to the dishonour of God, just as on the contrary it is a matter of honour with God not to let His servant fall. Hence he prays to be led in the way of God, for a oneness of his own will with the divine renders a man inaccessible [to evil]. נֶפֶשׁ, ver. 12, is used, as in xvii. 9, and in the similar passage, which is genuinely Davidic, xli. 3, in the signification passion or strong desire; because the soul, in its natural state, is selfishness and inordinate desire. יָפֵחַ is a collateral form of יָפִיחַ; they are both adjectives formed from the future of the verb פּוּחַ (like עָרֵב, עָרִיב): accustomed to breathe out (exhale), *i.e.* either to express, or to snort, breathe forth (cf. πνεῖν, or ἐμπνεῖν φόνον and φόνοῦ, θυμοῦ, and the like, Acts ix. 1). In both Hitzig sees participles of יָפַח (Jer. iv. 31); but x. 5 and Hab. ii. 3 lead back to פּוּחַ (פִּיחַ); and Hupfeld rightly recognises such nouns formed from futures to be, according to their original source, circumlocutions of the participle after the manner of an elliptical relative clause (the صِفَة of the Arabic syntax), and explains יָפִיחַ כְּזָבִים, together with יָפֵחַ חֲמָס, from the verbal construction which still continues in force.

Vers. 13—14. Self-encouragement to firmer confidence of faith. Joined to ver. 12 (Aben-Ezra, Kimchi), ver. 13 trails badly after it. We must, with Geier, Dachselt, and others, suppose that the apodosis is wanting to the protasis with its לוּלֵא pointed with three points above,* and four

* The ו has not any point above it, because it might be easily mistaken for a *Cholem*, *vid.* Baer's *Psalterium* p. 130.

below, according to the Masora (cf. *B. Berachoth* 4*a*), but a word which is indispensably necessary, and is even attested by the LXX. (ἑαυτῇ) and the Targum (although not by any other of the ancient versions); cf. the protasis with לוּלֵי, which has no apodosis, in Gen. l. 15, and the apodoses with כִּי after לוּלֵי in Gen. xxxi. 42, xliii. 10, 1 Sam. xxxv. 34, 2 Sam. ii. 27 (also Num. xxii. 33, where אוּלַי = אִם לֹא = לוּלֵי), which are likewise to be explained *per aposiopesin*. The perfect after לוּלֵא (לוּלֵי) has sometimes the sense of a *plusquamperfectum* (as in Gen. xliii. 10, *nisi cunctati essemus*), and sometimes the sense of an *imperfect*, as in the present passage (cf. Deut. xxxii. 29, *si saperent*). The poet does not speak of a faith that he once had, a past faith, but, in regard to the danger that is even now abiding and present, of the faith he now has, a present faith. The apodosis ought to run something like this (cxix. 92, xciv. 17): did I not believe, were not confidence preserved to me . . . then (אָז or כִּי אָז) I should perish; or: then I had suddenly perished. But he has such faith, and he accordingly in ver. 14 encourages himself to go on cheerfully waiting and hoping; he speaks to himself, it is, as it were, the believing half of his soul addressing the despondent and weaker half. Instead of וְאֶמַּץ (Deut. xxxi. 7) the expression is, as in xxxi. 25, וְיַאֲמֵץ לְבָבֶךָ, let thy heart be strong, let it give proof of strength. The rendering "May He (Jahve) strengthen thy heart" would require יְאַמֵּץ; but הֶאֱמִיץ, as *e.g.* הֶרְחִיב xxv. 17, belongs to the transitive denominatives applying to the mind or spirit, in which the Hebrew is by no means poor, and in which the Arabic is especially rich.

PSALM XXVIII.

CRY FOR HELP AND THANKSGIVING, IN A TIME OF REBELLION.

1 TO Thee, O Jahve, do I cry;
My Rock, remain not deaf to me,
Lest, if Thou be silent to me, I be like them that go down to the pit.

2 Hear the voice of my supplication, when I cry unto Thee,
When I lift up my hands to Thy holy sanctuary.

3 Carry me not away with the ungodly and with the workers of iniquity,

Who speak peace with their neigbbours,
While evil is in their hearts.

4 Give to them according to their work and the wickedness of their deeds;
According to the work of their hands give to them,
Requite them what they have done!

5 For they regard not the doings of Jahve,
Nor the work of His hands —
He shall pull them down, not build them up.

6 Blessed be Jahve,
Because He hath heard my loud supplication!

7 Jahve is my defence and my shield,
In Him my heart trusted and I was helped —
Therefore my heart exulteth, and with my song do I praise Him.

8 Jahve is a defence to them,
And the saving defence of His anointed one is He.

9 O help Thy people
And bless Thy heritage,
And feed them, and bear them up for ever!

To Ps. xxvi. and xxvii. a third Psalm is here added, belonging to the time of the persecution by Absolom. In this Psalm, also, the drawing towards the sanctuary of God cannot be lost sight of; and in addition thereto we have the intercession of the anointed one, when personally imperilled, on behalf of the people who are equally in need of help, — an intercession which can only be rightly estimated in connection with the circumstances of that time. Like Ps. xxvii. this, its neighbour, also divides into two parts; these parts, however, though their lines are of a different order, nevertheless bear a similar poetic impress. Both are composed of verses consisting of two and three lines. There are many points of contact between this Psalm and Ps. xxvii.; *e. g.* in the epithet applied to God, מעז; but compare also ver. 3 with xxvi. 9; ver 2 with xxxi. 23; ver. 9 with xxix. 11. The echoes of this Psalm in Isaiah are very many, and also in Jeremiah.

Vers. 1—5. This first half of the Psalm (vers. 1—5) is supplicatory. The preposition מִן in connection with the verbs חָרַשׁ, to be deaf, dumb, and חָשָׁה, to keep silence, is a pregnant form of expression denoting an aversion or turning away which does not deign to give the suppliant an answer. Jahve is his צוּר, his ground of confidence; but if He continues thus to keep silence, then he who confides in Him will become like those who are going down (xxii. 30), or are gone down (Isa. xiv. 19) to the pit. The participle of the past answers better to the situation of one already on the brink of the abyss. In the double sentence with פֶּן, the chief accent falls upon the second clause, for which the first only paratactically opens up the way (cf. Isa. v. 4, xii. 1); in Latin it would be *ne, te mihi non respondente, similis fiam.* Olshausen, and Baur with him, believes that because וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי has not the accent on the *ultima* as being *perf. consec.*, it must be interpreted according to the accentuation thus, "in order that Thou mayst no longer keep silence, whilst I am already become like . ." But this ought to be וְאֲנִי נִמְשָׁל, or at least וְאֲנִי נִמְשַׁלְתִּי. And if ונמשלתי were to be taken as a real perfect, it would then rather have to be rendered "and I should then be like." But, notwithstanding וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי is *Milel*, it is still *perf. consecutivum* ("and I am become like"); for if, in a sentence of more than one member following upon פֶּן, the *fut.*, as is usually the case (*vid.* on xxxviii. 17), goes over into the *perf.*, then the latter, in most instances, has the tone of the *perf. consec.* (Deut. iv. 19, Judges xviii. 25, Prov. v. 9—12, Mal. iii. 24), but not always. The *penultima*-accentuation is necessarily retained in connection with the two great pausal accents, *Silluk* and *Athnach*, Deut. viii. 12, Prov. xxx. 9; in this passage in connection with *Rebia mugrash*, just as we may say, in general, the *perf. consec.* sometimes retains its *penultima*-accentuation in connection with distinctives instead of being accented on the *ultima*; *e. g.* in connection with *Rebia mugrash*, Prov. xxx. 9; with *Rebia*, xix. 14 (cf. Prov. xxx. 9 with Ezek. xiv. 17); with *Zakeph.* 1 Sam. xxix. 8; and even with *Tiphcha* Obad. ver. 10, Joel iv. 21. The national grammarians are ignorant of any law on this subject.*

* Aben-Ezra (*Moznajim* 36*b*) explains the perfect accented on the

The point towards which the psalmist stretches forth his hands in prayer is Jahve's holy דְּבִיר. Such is the word (after the form בְּרִיחַ, בְּלִיא, עֲטִין) used only in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, with the exception of this passage, to denote the Holy of Holies, not as being χρηματιστήριον (Aquila and Symmachus), or λαλητήριον, *oraculum* (Jerome), as it were, Jahve's audience chamber (Hengstenberg) — a meaning that is not in accordance with the formation of the word,—but as the hinder part of the tent, from דָּבַר, Arabic *dabara*, to be behind, whence *dubr* (Talmudic דּוּבַר), that which is behind (opp. *kubl, kibal*, that which is in the front), cf. *Jesurun* p. 87 sq. In vers. 3, 4 the prayer is expanded. מָשַׁךְ (instead of which we find אָסַף in xxvi. 9), to draw any one down forcibly to destruction, or to drag him to the place of judgment, Ezek. xxxii. 20. cf. x. 9, Job. xxiv. 22. The delineation of the ungodly David borrows from his actual foes. Should he succumb to them, then his fate would be like that which awaits them, to whom he is conscious that he is radically unlike. He therefore prays that God's recompensing justice may anticipate him, *i. e.* that He may requite them according to their desert, before he succumbs, to whom they have feigned שָׁלוֹם, a good understanding, or being on good terms, whereas they cherished in their heart the רָעָה that is now unmasked (cf. Jer. ix. 7). נָתַן, used of an official adjudication, as in Hos. ix. 14, Jer. xxxii. 19. The *epanaphora* of תֵּן־לָהֶם is like xxvii. 14.* The phrase הֵשִׁיב גְּמוּל (שָׁלֵם), which occurs frequently in the prophets, signifies to recompense or repay to any one his accomplishing, his manifestation, that is to say, what he has done and merited; the thoughts and expression call to mind more particularly Isa. iii. 8—11, i. 16. The right to pray for recompense (vengeance) is grounded, in ver. 5, upon their blindness to God's just and merciful rule as it is to be seen in human history (cf. Isa. v. 12, xxii. 11). The contrast of בָּנָה and הָרַס, to pull down (with a personal object, as in

penult. in Prov. xxx. 9 from the conformity of sound, and Kimchi (*Michlol* 6*b*) simply records the phenomenon.

* This repetition, at the end, of a significant word that has been used at the beginning of a verse, is a favourite custom of Isaiah's (*Comment.* S. 387; transl. ii. 134).

Exod. xv. 7), is like Jeremiah's style (ch. xlii. 10, cf. i. 10, xviii. 9, and frequently, Sir. xlix. 7). In ver. 5*a*, the prominent thought in David's mind is, that they shamefully fail to recognise how gloriously and graciously God has again and again acknowledged him as His anointed one. He has (2 Sam. vii.) received the promise, that God would build him a house, *i.e.* grant perpetual continuance to his kingship. The Absolomites are in the act of rebellion against this divine appointment. Hence they shall experience the very reverse of the divine promise given to David: Jahve will pull them down and not build them up, He will destroy, at its very commencement, this dynasty set up in opposition to God.

Vers. 6—9. The first half of the Psalm prayed for deliverance and for judgment; this second half gives thanks for both. If the poet wrote the Psalm at one sitting then at this point the certainty of being answered dawns upon him. But it is even possible that he added this second part later on, as a memorial of the answer he experienced to his prayer (Hitzig, Ewald). It sounds, at all events, like the record of something that has actually taken place. Jahve is his defence and shield. The conjoined perfects in ver. 7*b*. denote that which is closely united in actual realisation; and in the *fut. consec.*, as is frequently the case, *e. g.* in Job. xiv. 2, the historical signification retreats into the background before the more essential idea of that which has been produced. In מִשִּׁירִי, the song is conceived as the spring whence the הוֹדוֹת bubble forth; and instead of אוֹדֶנּוּ we have the more impressive form אֲהוֹדֶנּוּ, as in xlv. 18, cxvi. 6, 1 Sam. xvii. 47, the syncope being omitted. From suffering (*Leid*) springs song (*Lied*), and from song springs the praise (*Lob*) of Him, who has "turned" the suffering, just as it is attuned in vers. 6 and 8.* The αὐτοί, who are intended by לָמוֹ in ver. 8*a*, are those of Israel, as in xii. 8, Isa. xxxiii. 2 (Hitzig). The LXX. (κραταίωμα τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ) reads לְעַמּוֹ, as in xxix. 11, which is approved by Böttcher, Olshausen and Hupfeld; but לָמוֹ yields a similar sense. First of all

* There is a play of words and an alliteration in this sentence which we cannot fully reproduce in the English. — TR.

David thinks of the people, then of himself; for his private character retreats behind his official, by virtue of which he is the head of Israel. For this very reason his deliverance is the deliverance of Israel, to whom, so far as they have become unfaithful to His anointed, Jahve has not requited this faithlessness, and to whom, so far as they have remained true to him, He has rewarded this fidelity. Jahve is a עֹז to them, inasmuch as He preserves them by His might from the destruction into which they would have precipitated themselves, or into which others would have precipitated them; and He is the מָעוֹז יְשׁוּעוֹת of His anointed. inasmuch as He surrounds him as an inaccessible place of refuge which secures to him salvation in all its fulness instead of the destruction anticipated. Israel's salvation and blessing were at stake; but Israel is in fact God's people and God's inheritance — may He, then, work salvation for them in every future need and bless them. Apostatised from David, it was a flock in the hands of the hireling — may He ever take the place of shepherd to them and carry them in His arms through the destruction. The נְשָׂאֵם coupled with וְרוֹמְמֵם (thus it is to be pointed according to Ben-Asher) calls to mind Deut. i. 31, "Jahve carried Israel as a man doth carry his son", and Exod. xix. 4, Deut. xxxii. 11, "as on eagles' wings." The *Piel*, as in Isa. lxiii. 9, is used of carrying the weak, whom one lifts up and thus removes out of its helplessness and danger. Ps. iii. closes just in the same way with an intercession; and the close of Ps. xxix. is similar, but promissory, and consequently it is placed next to Ps. xxviii.

PSALM XXIX.

THE PSALM OF THE SEVEN THUNDERS.

1 GIVE unto Jahve, ye sons of God,
Give unto Jahve glory and might!
2 Give unto Jahve the glory of His name,
Do homage to Jahve in holy attire!

3 The voice of Jahve is upon the waters,
The God of Glory thundereth,

Jahve is upon the great waters.
4 The voice of Jahve goeth forth in power,
The voice of Jahve goeth forth in majesty.

5 The voice of Jahve breaketh the cedars,
Yea, Jahve breaketh the cedars of Lebanon.
6 And He maketh them to skip like a calf,
Lebanon and Sirion like a young antelope.
7 The voice of Jahve flameth forth quivering fire.

8 The voice of Jahve shaketh the wilderness,
Jahve shaketh the wilderness of Kadesh.
9 The voice of Jahve maketh the hinds to travail,
He strippeth the forest —
And in His temple everything saith: "Glory!"

10 Jahve hath sat at the Flood,
And Jahve sitteth a King for ever.
11 Jahve will give power to His people,
Jahve will bless His people with peace.

The occasion of this Psalm is a thunderstorm; it is not, however, limited to the outward natural phenomena, but therein is perceived the self-attestation of the God of the redemptive history. Just as in the second part of Ps. xix. the God of the revelation of salvation is called יהוה seven times in distinction from the God revealed in nature, so in this Psalm of thunders, קול ה׳ is repeated seven times, so that it may be called the Psalm of the ἑπτὰ βρονταί (Apoc. x. 3 sq.). During the time of the second Temple, as the addition to the inscription by the LXX. ἐξοδίου (ἐξόδου) σκηνῆς (= σκηνοπηγίας) seems to imply *, it was sung on the *Shemini Azereth*, the last day (ἐξόδιον, Lev. xxiii. 36) of the feast of tabernacles. Between two tetrastichs, in each of which the name

* The שיר of the Temple liturgy of the *Shemini Azereth* is not stated in the Talmud (*vid. Tosefoth* to *B. Succa* 47*a*, where, according to *Sofrim* xix. § 2 and a statement of the Jerusalem Talmud, Ps. vi., or xii, is guessed at). We only know, that Ps. xxix. belongs to the Psalm-portions for the intervening days of the feast of tabernacles, which are

יהוה occurs four times, lie three pentastichs, which, in their sevenfold קול ה׳, represent the peals of thunder which follow in rapid succession as the storm increases in its fury.

Vers. 1—2. The opening strophe calls upon the celestial spirits to praise Jahve; for a revelation of divine glory is in preparation, which, in its first movements, they are accounted worthy to behold, for the roots of everything that takes place in this world are in the invisible world. It is not the mighty of the earth, who are called in lxxxii. 6 בְּנֵי עֶלְיוֹן, but the angels, who are elsewhere called בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (*e.g.* Job ii. 1), that are here, as in lxxxix. 7, called בְּנֵי אֵלִים. Since אֵלִים never means God, like אֱלֹהִים (so that it could be rendered sons of the deity), but gods, Exod. xv. 11, Dan. ix. 36, the expression בְּנֵי אֵלִים must be translated as a double plural from בֶּן־אֵל, after the analogy of בָּתֵּי כְלָאִים, Isa. xlii. 22, from בֵּית כֶּלֶא (Ges. § 108, 3), "sons of God", not "sons of gods." They, the God-begotten, *i.e.* created in the image of God, who form with God their Father as it were one family (*vid. Genesis* S. 121), are here called upon to give unto God glory and might (the primary passage is Deut. xxxii. 3), *i.e.* to render back to Him cheerfully and joyously in a laudatory recognition, as it were by an echo, His glory and might, which are revealed and to be revealed in the created world, and to give unto Him the glory of His name, *i.e.* to praise His glorious name (lxxii. 19) according its deserts. הָבוּ in all three instances has the accent on the *ultima* according to rule (cf., on the other hand, Job vi. 22). הַדְרַת קֹדֶשׁ is holy vestments, splendid festal attire, 2 Chron.

---

comprehended in the *vox memorialis* הומ"בהי (*Succa* 55*a*, cf. Rashi on *Joma* 3*a*), viz. Ps. xxix. (ה); l. 16 (ו); xciv. 16 (מ); xciv. 8 (ב); lxxxi. 7 (ה); lxxxii. 5*b* (י). Besides this the treatise *Sofrim* xviii. § 3 mentions Ps. xxix. as the Psalm for the festival of Pentecost and the tradition of the synagogue which prevails even at the present day recognises it only as a festival Psalm of the first day of Shabuoth [Pentecost]; the Psalm for Shemini Azereth is the 65th. The only confirmation of the statement of the LXX. is to be found in the Sohar; for there (section צ) Ps. xxix. is referred to the pouring forth of the water on the seventh day of the feast of tabernacles (*Hosianna rabba*), since it is said, that by means of the seven קולות (corresponding to the seven compassings of the altar) seven of the *Sephiroth* open the flood-gates of heaven.

xx. 21, cf. Ps. cx. 3.* A revelation of the power of God is near at hand. The heavenly spirits are to prepare themselves for it with all the outward display of which they are capable. If ver. 2 were a summons to the church on earth, or, as in xcvi. 9, to the dwellers upon the earth, then there ought to be some expression to indicate the change in the parties addressed; it is, therefore, in ver. 2 as in ver. 1, directed to the priests of the heavenly היכל. In the Apocalypse, also, the songs of praise and trumpeting of the angels precede the judgments of God.

Vers. 3—9. Now follows the description of the revelation of God's power, which is the ground of the summons, and is to be the subject-matter of their praise. The All-glorious One makes Himself heard in the language (Apoc. x. 3 sq.) of the thunder, and reveals Himself in the storm. There are fifteen lines, which naturally arrange themselves into three five-line strophes. The chief matter with the poet, however, is the sevenfold קול ה׳. Although קיל is sometimes used almost as an ejaculatory "Hark!" (Gen. iv. 10, Isa. lii. 8), this must not, with Ewald (§ 286, *f*), be applied to the קול ה׳ of the Psalm before us, the theme of which is the voice of God, who announces Himself from heaven, — a voice which moves the world. The dull sounding קול serves not merely to denote the thunder of the storm, but even the thunder of the earthquake, the roar of the tempest, and in general, every low, dull, rumbling sound, by which God makes Himself audible to the world, and more especially from the wrathful side of His doxa. The waters in ver. 3 are not the lower waters. Then the question arises what are they? Were the waters of the Mediterranean intended, they would be more definitely denoted in such a vivid description. It is, however, far more appropriate to the commencement of this description to understand them to mean the mass of water gathered together in the thick, black storm-clouds (*vid.* xviii. 12, Jer. x. 13). The rumb-

* The reading proposed in *B. Berachoth* 30*b* בְּחִרְדָּה (with holy trembling) has never been a various reading; nor has בְּחַצְרוֹת, after which the LXX. renders it ἐν αὐλῇ ἁγίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

ling* of Jahve is, as the poet himself explains in ver. 3*b*, the thunder produced on high by the אֵל הַכָּבוֹד (cf. מלך הכבוד, xxiv. 7 sqq.), which rolls over the sea of waters floating above the earth in the sky. Ver. 4*a* and 4*b*, just like ver. 3*a* and 3*b*, are independent substantival clauses. The rumbling of Jahve is, issues forth, or passes by; ב with the abstract article as in lxxvii. 14, Prov. xxiv. 5 (cf. Prov. viii. 8, Luke iv. 32, ἐν ἰσχύϊ Apoc. xviii. 2), is the ב of the distinctive attribute. In ver. 3 the first peals of thunder are heard; in ver. 4 the storm is coming nearer, and the peals become stronger, and now it bursts forth with its full violence: ver. 5*a* describes this in a general form, and ver. 5*b* expresses by the *fut. consec.*, as it were inferentially, that which is at present taking place: amidst the rolling of the thunder the descending lightning flashes rive the cedars of Lebanon (as is well-known, the lightning takes the outermost points). The suffix in ver. 6*a* does not refer proleptically to the mountains mentioned afterwards, but naturally to the cedars (Hengst., Hupf., Hitz.), which bend down before the storm and quickly rise up again. The skipping of Lebanon and Sirion, however, is not to be referred to the fact, that their wooded summits bend down and rise again, but, according to cxiv. 4, to their being shaken by the crash of the thunder, — a feature in the picture which certainly does not rest upon what is actually true in nature, but figuratively describes the apparent quaking of the earth during a heavy thunderstorm. שריון, according to Deut. iii. 9, is the Sidonian name of Hermon, and therefore side by side with Lebanon it represents Anti-Lebanon. The word, according to the Masora, has ש *sinistrum*, and consequently is שִׂרְיֹן, wherefore Hitzig correctly derives it from سَرَى, *fut. i.*, to gleam, sparkle, cf. the passage from an Arab poet at cxxxiii. 3. The lightning makes these mountains bound (Luther, *lecken, i.e.* according to his

* The simple rendering of קוֹל by "voice" has been retained in the text of the Psalm, as in the Authorised Version. The word, however, which Dr. Delitzsch uses is *Gedrohn*, the best English equivalent of which is a "rumbling." — TR.

explanation: to spring, skip) like young antelopes. רְאֵם*, like βούβαλος, βούβαλις, is a generic name of the antelope, and of the buffalo that roams in herds through the forests beyond the Jordan even at the present day; for there are antelopes that resemble the buffalo and also (except in the formation of the head and the cloven hoofs) those that resemble the horse. The LXX. renders: ὡς υἱὸς μονοκερώτων. Does this mean the unicorn [Germ. one-horn] depicted on Persian and African monuments? Is this unicorn distinct from the one horned antelope? Neither an unicorn nor an one horned antelope have been seen to the present day by any traveller. Both animals, and consequently also their relation to one another, are up to the present time still undefinable from a scientific point of view.**

Each peal of thunder is immediately followed by a flash of lightning; Jahve's thunder cleaveth flames of fire, *i. e.* forms (as it were λατομεῖ) the fire-matter of the storm-clouds into cloven flames of fire, into lightnings that pass swiftly along; in connection with which it must be remembered that קוֹל יי denotes not merely the thunder as a phenomenon, but at the same time it denotes the omnipotence of God expressing itself therein. The brevity and threefold division of ver. 7 depicts the incessant, zigzag, quivering movement

---

* On رئم *vid.* Seetzen's *Reisen* iii. 339 and also iv. 496.

** By רְאֵם Ludolf in opposition to Bochart understands the rhinoceros; but this animal, belonging to the swine tribe, is certainly not meant, or even merely associated with it. Moreover, the rhinoceros [Germ. nose-horn] is called in Egypt *charnin* (from خرن = قرن), but the unicorn, *charnit.* "In the year 1862 the French archæologist, M. Waddington, was with me in Damascus when an antiquary brought me an ancient vessel on which a number of animals were engraved, their names being written on their bellies. Among the well known animals there was also an unicorn, exactly like a zebra or a horse, but with a long horn standing out upon its forehead; on its body was the word خرنيت. M. Waddington wished to have the vessel and I gave it up to him; and he took it with him to Paris. We talked a good deal about this unicorn, and felt obliged to come to the conclusion that the form of the fabulous animal might have become known to the Arabs at the time of the crusades, when the English coat of arms came to Syria." — Wetzstein.

of the lightning (*tela trisulca, ignes trisulci*, in Ovid). From the northern mountains the storm sweeps on towards the south of Palestine into the Arabian desert, viz. as we are told in ver. 8*b* (cf. ver. 5, according to the schema of "parallelism by reservation"), the wilderness region of *Kadesh* (*Kadesh Barnea*), which, however we may define its position, must certainly have lain near the steep western slope of the mountains of Edom toward the Arabah. Jahve's thunder, viz. the thunderstorm, puts this desert in a state of whirl, inasmuch as it drives the sand (חוּל) before it in whirlwinds; and among the mountains it, viz. the strong lightning and thundering, makes the hinds to writhe, inasmuch as from fright they bring forth prematurely. Both the *Hiph.* יַחֵיל and the *Pil.* יְחוֹלֵל are used with a causative meaning (root חו, חי, to move in a circle, to encircle). The poet continues with וַיֶּחֱשֹׂף, since he makes one effect of the storm to develope from another, merging as it were out of its chrysalis state. יְעָרוֹת is a poetical plural form; and חָשַׂף describes the effect of the storm which "shells" the woods, inasmuch as it beats down the branches of the trees, both the tops and the foliage. While Jahve thus reveals Himself from heaven upon the earth in all His irresistible power, בְּהֵיכָלוֹ, in His heavenly palace (xi. 4, xviii. 7), כֻּלּוֹ (note how בהיכלו resolves this כלו out of itself), *i. e.* each of the beings therein, says: כָּבוֹד. That which the poet, in vers. 1—2, has called upon them to do, now takes place. Jahve receives back His glory, which is immanent in the universe, in the thousand-voiced echo of adoration.

Vers. 10—11. Luther renders it: "The Lord sitteth to prepare a Flood", thus putting meaning into the unintelligible rendering of the Vulgate and LXX.; and in fact a meaning that accords with the language — for יָשַׁב לְ is most certainly intended to be understood after the analogy of ישב למשפט, cxxii. 5, cf. ix. 8 — just as much as with the context; for the poet has not thus far expressly referred to the torrents of rain, in which the storm empties itself. Engelhardt also (*Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1861, 216 f.), Kurtz (*Bibel und Astronomie*, S. 568, Aufl. 4), Riehm (*Liter.-Blatt* of the *Allgem. Kirchen-Zeit.*, 1864, S. 110), and others understand by מבול the quasi-flood of the torrent of rain accompanying

the lightning and thunder. But the word is not לְמַבּוּל, but לַמַּבּוּל, and הַמַּבּוּל (Syr. *momûl*) occurs exclusively in Gen. vi.—xi. as the name of the great Flood. Every tempest, however, calls to mind this judgment and its merciful issue, for it comes before us in sacred history as the first appearance of rain with lightning and thunder, and of the bow in the clouds speaking its message of peace (*Genesis*, S. 276). The retrospective reference to this event is also still further confirmed by the aorist וַיֵּשֶׁב which follows the perfect יָשַׁב (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* i. 208). Jahve — says the poet — sat (upon His throne) at the Flood (to execute it), and sits (enthroned) in consequence thereof, or since that time, as this present revelation of Him in the tempest shews, as King for ever, inasmuch as He rules down here upon earth from His throne in the heavens (cxv. 16) in wrath and in mercy, judging and dispensing blessing. Here upon earth He has a people, whom from above He endows with a share of His own might and blesses with peace, while the tempests of His wrath burst over their foes. How expressive is בַּשָּׁלוֹם as the closing word of this particular Psalm! It spans the Psalm like a rain-bow. The opening of the Psalm shews us the heavens opened and the throne of God in the midst of the angelic songs of praise, and the close of the Psalm shews us, on earth, His people victorious and blessed with peace (בְּ as in Gen. xxiv. 1*), in the midst of Jahve's voice of anger, which shakes all things. *Gloria in excelsis* is its beginning, and *pax in terris* its conclusion.

PSALM XXX.

SONG OF THANKSGIVING AFTER RECOVERY FROM DANGEROUS SICKNESS.

2 I WILL extol Thee, Jahve, that Thou hast raised me up,
And hast not made mine enemies to rejoice over me.
3 Jahve, my God, I cried to Thee, then Thou didst heal me;

---

* The Holy One, blessed be He — says the Mishna, *Uksin* iii. 12, with reference to this passage in the Psalms — has not found any other vessel (כְּלִי) to hold the blessing specially allotted to Israel

4 Jahve, Thou hast brought up my soul from Hades,
Thou hast revived me, that I should not go down to the grave.

5 Sing unto Jahve, ye saints of His,
And give thanks to His holy name.
6 For His anger endureth but for a moment, His favour for a life long;
At eventide weeping cometh in for the night —
And in the morning cometh a shout of joy.

7 I, however, thought in my security:
"I shall not totter for ever."
8 Jahve, by Thy favour hadst Thou made my mountain to stand strong;
Thou hast hidden Thy face, — I became troubled.

9 To Thee, Jahve, did I cry,
And to Jahve, made I supplication:
10 "What profit is there in my blood, in my going down to the grave?
"Shall the dust praise Thee? shall it declare Thy truth?
11 "Hear, Jahve, and be gracious unto me!
"Jahve, be Thou my helper!"

12 Thou hast turned for me my mourning into dancing,
Thou hast put off my sackcloth and didst gird me with joy;
13 To the end that my glory might sing of Thee, and not be silent —
Jahve, my God, for ever will I praise Thee.

The summons to praise God which is addressed to the angels above in Ps. xxix., is directed in Ps. xxx. to the pious here below. There is nothing against the adoption of the לדוד. Hitzig again in this instance finds all kinds of indications of Jeremiah's hand; but the parallels in Jeremiah are echoes of the Psalms, and דִּלִּיתָנִי in ver. 2 does not need to be explained of a lowering into a tank or dungeon, it is a metaphorical expression for raising up out of the depths

of affliction. Even Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving in Isa. xxxviii. has grown out of the two closing strophes of this Psalm under the influence of an intimate acquaintance with the Book of Job. We are therefore warranted in supposing that it is David, who here, having in the midst of the stability of his power come to the verge of the grave, and now being roused from all carnal security, as one who has been rescued, praises the Lord, whom he has made his refuge, and calls upon all the pious to join with him in his song. The Psalm bears the inscription: *A Song-Psalm at the Dedication of the House, by David.* This has been referred to the dedication of the site of the future Temple, 2 Sam. xxiv., 1 Chron. xxi.; but although the place of the future Temple together with the altar then erected on it, can be called בֵּית יהוה (1 Chron. xxii. 1), and might also at any rate be called absolutely הַבַּיִת (as הר הבית, the Temple hill); yet we know that David did not himself suffer (2 Sam. xxiv. 17) from the pestilence, which followed as a punishment upon the numbering of the people which he instituted in his arrogant self-magnification. The Psalm, however, also does not contain anything that should point to a dedication of a sanctuary, whether Mount Moriah, or the tabernacle, 2 Sam. vi. 17. It might more naturally be referred to the re-consecration of the palace, that was defiled by Absolom, after David's return; but the Psalm mentions some imminent peril, the gracious averting of which does not consist in the turning away of bloodthirsty foes, but in recovery from some sickness that might have proved fatal. Thus then it must be the dedication of the citadel on Zion, the building of which was just completed. From 2 Sam. v. 12 we see that David regarded this building as a pledge of the stability and exaltation of his kingdom; and all that is needed in order to understand the Psalm is, with Aben-Ezra, Flaminius, Crusius, and Vaihinger, to infer from the Psalm itself, that David had been delayed by some severe illness from taking possession of the new building. The situation of Ps. xvi. is just like it. The regular official title אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַבַּיִת (majordomo) shews, that הבית, used thus absolutely, may denote the palace just as well as the Temple. The LXX. which renders it τοῦ ἐγκαινισμοῦ τοῦ οἴκου (τοῦ) Δαυίδ, understands the pal-

ace, not the Temple. In the Jewish ritual, Ps. xxx. is certainly, as is even stated in the Tractate *Sofrim* xviii. § 2, the Psalm for the feast of *Chanucca*, or Dedication, which refers to 1 Macc. iv. 52 sqq.

Vers. 2—4. The Psalm begins like a hymn. The *Piel* דִּלָּה (from דָּלָה, Arab. دلا, to hold anything long, loose and pendulous, whether upwards or downwards, conj. V. تدلّى, to dangle) signifies to lift or draw up, like a bucket (דְּלִי, Greek ἀντλίον, Latin *tollo*, *tolleno* in Festus). The poet himself says what that depth is into which he had sunk and out of which God had drawn him up without his enemies rejoicing over him (לִי as in xxv, 2), *i. e.* without allowing them the wished for joy at his destruction: he was brought down almost into Hades in consequence of some fatal sickness. חִיָּה (never: to call into being out of nothing) always means to restore to life that which has apparently or really succumbed to death, or to preserve anything living in life. With this is easily and satisfactorily joined the *Kerî* מִיָּרְדִי בוֹר (without *Makkeph* in the correct text), *ita ut non descenderem*; the infinitive of יָרַד in this instance following the analogy of the strong verb is יִרְד, like יִבְשׁ, יְשֹׁן, and with suffix *jordi* (like *josdi*, Job xxxviii. 4) or *jār*^{e}*di*, for here it is to be read thus, and not *jordi* (*vid.* on xvi. 1, lxxxvi. 2).* The *Chethîb* מיורדי might also be the infinitive, written with *Cholem plenum*, as an infinitive Gen. xxxii. 20, and an imperative Num. xxiii. 8, is each pointed with *Cholem* instead of *Kametz chatuph*; but it is probably intended to be read as a participle, מְיוֹרְדֵי: Thou hast revived me from those who sink away into the grave (xxviii. 1), or out of the state of such (cf. xxii. 22*b*) — a perfectly admissible and pregnant construction.

Vers. 5—6 call upon all the pious to praise this God, who after a short season of anger is at once and henceforth gracious. Instead of שֵׁם of Jahve, we find the expression

---

* The Masora does not place the word under אלין תיבותא יתירין ו"ו וחטפין קמצין (Introduction 28*b*), as one would expect to find it if it were to be read *mijordi*, and proceeds on the assumption that *mijārdi* is infinitive like עָמְדָה (read *'amādcha*) Obad. ver 11, not participle (Ewald, S. 533).

זֵכֶר in this instance, as in xcvii. 12 after Exod. iii. 15. Jahve, by revealing Himself, renders Himself capable of being both named and remembered, and that in the most illustrious manner. The history of redemption is, as it were, an unfolding of the Name of Jahve and at the same time a setting up of a monument, an establishment of a memorial, and in fact the erection of a זֵכֶר קֹדֶשׁ; because all God's self-attestations, whether in love or in wrath, flow from the sea of light of His holiness. When He manifests Himself to His own love prevails; and wrath is, in relation to them, only a vanishing moment: *a moment passes in His anger, a* (whole) *life in His favour, i. e.* the former endures only for a moment, the latter the whole life of a man. "*Alles Ding währt seine Zeit, Gottes Lieb' in Ewigkeit.*" All things last their season, God's love to all eternity. The preposition בְּ does not here, as in the beautiful parallel Isa. liv. 7 sq., cf. lx. 10, denote the time and mode of that which takes place, but the state in which one spends the time. Ver. 6*bc* portrays the rapidity with which love takes back wrath (cf. Isa. xvii. 14): in the evening weeping takes up its abode with us for the night, but in the morning another guest, viz. רִנָּה, appears, like a rescuing angel, before whom בֶּכִי disappears. The predicate יָלִין does not belong to ver. 6*c* as well (Hupfeld, Hitzig). The substantival clause: and in the morning joy = joy is present, depicts the unexpectedness and surprise of the help of Him who sends בכי and רנה.

Vers. 7—8. David now relates his experience in detail, beginning with the cause of the chastisement, which he has just undergone. In וַאֲנִי אָמַרְתִּי (as in xxxi. 23, Psa. xlix. 4) he contrasts his former self-confidence, in which (like the רשׁע, x. 6) he thought himself to be immoveable, with the God-ward trust he has now gained in the school of affliction. Instead of confiding in the Giver, he trusted in the gift, as though it had been his own work. It is uncertain, — but it is all the same in the end, — whether שַׁלְוִי is the inflected infinitive שַׁלְוֹ of the verb שָׁלַו (which we adopt in our translation), or the inflected noun שַׁלְוִי (שַׁלְוֹ) = שַׁלְוֹ, after the form שַׁחְוִי, a swimming, Ezek. xlvii. 5, = שַׁלְוָה, Jer. xxii. 21. The inevitable consequence of such carnal security, as it is more minutely described in Deut. viii. 11—18, is some

humbling divine chastisement. This intimate connection is expressed by the perfects in ver. 8, which represent God's pardon, God's withdrawal of favour, which is brought about by his self-exaltation, and the surprise of his being undeceived, as synchronous. הֶעֱמִיד עֹז, to set up might is equivalent to: to give it as a lasting possession; cf. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 8, which passage is a varied, but not (as Riehm supposes) a corrupted, repetition of 2 Kings xxi. 8. It is, therefore, unnecessary, as Hitzig does, to take לְ as accusatival and עֹז as adverbial: in Thy favour hadst Thou made my mountain to stand firm. The mountain is Zion, which is strong by natural position and by the additions of art (2 Sam. v. 9); and this, as being the castle-hill, is the emblem of the kingdom of David: Jahve had strongly established his kingdom for David, when on account of his trust in himself He made him to feel how all that he was he was only by Him, and without Him he was nothing whatever. The form of the inflexion הָרֵרִי, instead of הָרִי = *harri*, is defended by Gen. xiv. 6 and Jer. xvii. 3 (where it is הָרַרִי as if from הָרַר). The reading להררי (LXX., Syr.), *i. e.* to my kingly dignity is a happy substitution; whereas the reading of the Targum לְהַרְרֵי, "placed (me) on firm mountains", at once refutes itself by the necessity for supplying "me."

Vers. 9—11. Nevertheless he who is thus chastened prayed fervently. The futures in ver. 9, standing as they do in the full flow of the narration, have the force of imperfects, of "the present in the past" as the Arabian grammarians call it. From the question "What profit is there (the usual expression for τί ὄφελος, *quid lucri*) in my blood?", it is not to be inferred that David was in danger of death by the hand of a foe; for ותרפאני in ver. 3 teaches us very different, "what profit would there be in my blood?" is therefore equivalent to (cf. Job xvi. 18) what advantage would there be in Thy slaying me before my time? On the contrary God would rob Himself of the praise, which the living one would render to Him, and would so gladly render. His request that his life may be prolonged was not, therefore, for the sake of worldly possessions and enjoyment, but for the glory of God. He feared death as being the end of the praise of God. For beyond the grave there will be no more psalms

sung, vi. 6. In the Old Testament, Hades was as yet unvanquished, Heaven was not yet opened. In Heaven are the בני אלים, but as yet no blessed בני אדם.

Vers. 12—13. In order to express the immediate sequence of the fulfilling of the prayer upon the prayer itself, the otherwise (*e.g.* xxxii. 5) usual ו of conjunction is omitted; on הָסַכְתָּ וגו׳ cf. the echoes in Jer. xxxi. 13, Lam. v. 15. According to our interpretation of the relation of the Psalm to the events of the time, there is as little reason for thinking of 2 Sam. vi. 14 in connection with מָחוֹל, as of 1 Chron. xxi. 16 in connection with שַׂקִּי. In place of the garment of penitence and mourning (cf. מְחֻגֶּרֶת שָׂק, Isa. iii. 24) slung round the body (perhaps fastened only with a cord) came a girding up (אָזַר, synon. חָגַר lxv. 13, whence אֵזוֹר, חֲגֹרָה) with joy. The designed result of such a speedy and radical change in his affliction, after it had had the salutary effect of humbling him, was the praise of Jahve: in order that my glory (כְּבוֹד for כְּבוֹדִי = נַפְשִׁי, as in vii. 6, xvi. 9, cviii. 2) may sing Thy praises without ceasing (יְזַמֵּר *fut. Kal*). And the praise of Jahve for ever is moreover his resolve, just as he vows, and at the same time carries it out, in this Psalm.

PSALM XXXI.

SURRENDER OF ONE SORELY PERSECUTED INTO THE HAND OF GOD.

2 IN Thee, Jahve, have I hidden —
Let me not be ashamed for ever;
In Thy righteousness set me free.
3 Bow down Thine ear to me, deliver me speedily;
Be Thou to me a rock of refuge,
A house of fortresses, to save me.
4 For my rock and my fortress art Thou,
And for Thy Name's sake wilt Thou lead me and guide me.
5 Thou wilt pull me out of the net they have laid privily for me,
For Thou art my defence.
6 Into Thy hand do I commend my spirit,
Thou redeemest me, Jahve, God of truth!

7 Hateful to me are the worshippers of vain idols,
Whereas I cleave to Jahve.
8 I will exult and rejoice in Thy mercy,
That Thou hast regarded my poverty,
That Thou hast taken knowledge of the distresses of my soul.
9 And hast not shut me up in the hand of the enemy,
Thou hast set my feet in a broad place.

10 Be gracious unto me, Jahve, for I am straitened:
Consumed with grief is mine eye, and my soul, and my body.
11 For spent is my life with sorrow,
And my years with sighing;
My strength has failed by reason of mine iniquity,
And my bones are consumed.
12 Because of all mine adversaries I am become a reproach,
And a burden to my neighbours, and a terror to my friends;
Those who see me in the streets flee from me.
13 I am forgotten as a dead man out of mind;
I am become like a broken vessel.
14 For I hear the slander of many,
Fear on every side;
While they take counsel together against me—
They devise to take away my life.

15 But I — in Thee do I trust, Jahve,
I say: Thou art my God.
16 In Thy hand are my times,
Deliver me out of the hand of mine enemies, and from my persecutors!
17 Make Thy face to shine upon Thy servant,
Save me in Thy mercy.
18 Jahve, I shall not be ashamed, for on Thee do I call;
The wicked shall be ashamed, they shall be silent in Hades.
19 Lying lips shall be put to silence,
Which speak insolently of the righteous,
With pride and contempt.

20 How great is Thy goodness, which Thou hast reserved
for them that fear Thee,
Which Thou dost effect for them that hide in Thee in
the presence of the children of men.
21 Thou protectest them in the hiding-place of Thy presence
from the factions of man;
Thou keepest them in a pavilion from the strife of
tongues.
22 Blessed be Jahve,
That He hath shewed me marvellous lovingkindness in
a strong city,
23 Whilst I said in my feeble faith:
"I am cut off from the vision of Thine eyes." —
Nevertheless Thou heardest the cry of my supplication
when I cried to Thee.
24 O love Jahve, all ye His saints;
The faithful doth Jahve preserve,
And plentifully rewardeth the proud doer.
25 Be strong and let your heart take courage,
All ye that wait on Jahve!

In Ps. xxxi. the poet also, in וַאֲנִי אָמַרְתִּי (ver. 23), looks back upon a previous state of mind, viz. that of conflict, just as in xxx. 7 upon that of security. And here, also, he makes all the חֲסִידִים partakers with him of the healthful fruit of his deliverance (cf. xxxi. 24 with xxx. 5). But in other respects the situation of the two Psalms is very different. They are both Davidic. Hitzig, however, regards them both as composed by Jeremiah. With reference to Ps. xxxi., which Ewald also ascribes to "Jéremjá", this view is well worthy of notice. Not only do we find ver. 14*a* recurring in Jeremiah, ch. xx. 10, but the whole Psalm, in its language (cf., *e. g.*, ver. 10 with Lam. i. 20; ver. 11 with Jer. xx. 18; ver. 18 with Jer. xvii. 18; ver. 23 with Lam. iii. 54) and its plaintive tenderness, reminds one of Jeremiah. But this relationship does not decide the question. The passage Jer. xx. 10, like many other passages of this prophet, whose language is so strongly imbued with that of the Psalter, may be just as much a reminiscence as Jon. ii. 5, 9; and as regards its plaintive tenderness there are no two

characters more closely allied naturally and in spirit than David and Jeremiah; both are servants of Jahve, whose noble, tender spirits were capable of strong feeling, who cherished earnest longings, and abounded in tribulations. We abide, though not without some degree of hesitation, by the testimony of the inscription; and regard the Psalm as a song springing from the outward and inward conflict (LXX. ἐκστάσεως, probably by a combination of ver. 23, ἐν ἐκστάσει, בחפזי, with Sam. xxiii. 26) of the time of Saul. While ver. 12*c* is not suited to the mouth of the captive Jeremiah (Hitzig), the Psalm has much that is common not only to Ps. lxix. (more especially lxix. 9, 33), a Psalm that sounds much like Jeremiah's, but also to others, which we regard as Davidic; viz. the figures corresponding to the life of warfare which David then lived among the rocks and caves of the wilderness; the cheering call, xxxi. 25, cf. xxii. 27, xxvii. 14; the rare use of the *Hiph.* הִפְלִיא xxxi. 22, xvii. 7; the desire to be hidden by God, xxxi. 21, cf. xvii. 8, lxiv. 3; etc. In common with Ps. xxii. this may be noted, that the crucified Christ takes His last word from this Psalm, just as He takes His last utterance but three from that Psalm. But in xxxi. 10—14, the prefigurement of the Passion is confined within the limits of the type and does not undergo the same prophetical enhancement as it does in that unique Ps. xxii., to which only Ps. lxix. is in any degree comparable. The opening, vers. 2—4, is repeated in the centonic Ps. lxxi., the work of a later anonymous poet, just as ver. 23 is in part repeated in cxvi. 11. The arrangement of the strophes is not very clear.

Vers 2—9. The poet begins with the prayer for deliverance, based upon the trust which Jahve, to whom he surrenders himself, cannot possibly disappoint; and rejoices beforehand in the protection which he assumes will, without any doubt, be granted. Out of his confident security in God (חָסִיתִי) springs the prayer: may it never come to this with me, that I am put to confusion by the disappointment of my hope. This prayer in the form of intense desire is followed by prayers in the direct form of supplication. The supplicatory פַּלְּטֵנִי is based upon God's righteousness, which cannot

refrain from repaying conduct consistent with the order of redemption, though after prolonged trial, with the longed for tokens of deliverance. In the second paragraph, the prayer is moulded in accordance with the circumstances of him who is chased by Saul hither and thither among the mountains and in the desert, homeless and defenceless. In the expression צוּר מָעוֹז, מָעוֹז is *genit. appositionis*: a rock of defence (מָעוֹז from עָזַז, as in xxvii. 1), or rather: of refuge (מָעוֹז = معاذ, from עוּז, עוּז = عاذ, as in xxxvii. 39, lii. 9, and probably also in Isa. xxx. 2 and elsewhere);* a rock-castle, *i. e.* a castle upon a rock, would be called מָעוֹז צוּר, reversing the order of the words. צוּר מָעוֹז in lxxi. 3, a rock of habitation, *i. e.* of safe sojourn, fully warrants this interpretation. מְצוּדָה, prop. *specula*, signifies a mountain height or the summit of a mountain; a house on the mountain height is one that is situated on some high mountain

---

* It can hardly be doubted, that, in opposition to the pointing as we have it, which only recognises one מָעַז (מַעַז) from עָזַז, to be strong, there are two different substantives having this principal form, viz. מָעוֹז a fortress, secure place, bulwark, which according to its derivation is inflected מָעֲזִי, etc., and מָעוֹז equivalent to the Arabic *ma'âdh*, a hiding-place, defence, refuge, which ought to have been declined מָעְזִי or מָעֲזִי like the synonymous מָנְסִי (Olshausen § 201, 202). Moreover עוּז, عاذ, like חָסָה, of which it is the parallel word in Isa. xxx. 2, means to hide one's self anywhere (*Piel* and *Hiph.*, Hebrew הֶעִיז, according to the Kamus, Zamachshari and Neshwân: to hide any one, *e. g.* Koran iii. 31); hence عَائِذ, a plant that grows among bushes (*bên esh-shôk* according to the Kamus) or in the crevices of the rocks (*fi-l-ḥazn* according to Neshwân) and is thus inaccessible to the herds; عُوذ, gazelles that are invisible, *i. e.* keep hidden, for seven days after giving birth, also used of pieces of flesh of which part is hidden among the bones; عُوذَة, an amulet with which a man covers himself (*protegit*), and so forth. — Wetzstein.

Consequently מָעוֹז (formed like معاذ, according to Neshwân equivalent to مَعْوَذ) is prop. a place in which to hide one's self, synonymous with מַחֲסֶה, מָנוֹס, ملاذ, مَلْجَاء, and the like. True, the two substantives from עוּז and עוּז meet in their meanings like *praesidium* and *asylum*, and according to passages like Jer. xvi. 19 appear to be blended in the genius of the language, but they are radically distinct.

top and affords a safe asylum (*vid.* on xviii. 3). The thought "shew me Thy salvation, for Thou art my Saviour", underlies the connection expressed by כִּי in vers. 4 and 5*b*. Köster considers it to be illogical, but it is the logic of every believing prayer. The poet prays that God would become to him, *actu reflexo*, that which to the *actus directus* of his faith He is even now. The futures in vers. 4, 5 express hopes which necessarily arise out of that which Jahve is to the poet. The interchangeable notions הְנָחֶה and נַחֵל, with which we are familiar from Ps. xxiii., stand side by side, in order to give urgency to the utterance of the longing for God's gentle and safe guidance. Instead of translating it "out of the net, which etc.," according to the accents (cf. x. 2, xii. 8) it should be rendered "out of the net there", so that טָמְנוּ לִי is a relative clause without the relative.

Into the hand of this God, who is and will be all this to him, he commends his spirit; he gives it over into His hand as a trust or deposit (פִּקָּדוֹן); for whatsoever is deposited there is safely kept, and freed from all danger and all distress. The word used is not נַפְשִׁי, which Theodotion substitutes when he renders it τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ ψυχὴν τῇ σῇ παρατίθημι προμηθείᾳ, but רוּחִי; and this is used designedly. The language of the prayer lays hold of life at its root, as springing directly from God and as also living in the believer from God and in God; and this life it places under His protection, who is the true life of all spirit-life (Isa. xxxviii. 16) and of all life. It is the language of prayer with which the dying Christ breathed forth His life, Luke xxiii. 46. The period of David's persecution by Saul is the most prolific in types of the Passion; and this language of prayer, which proceeded from the furnace of affliction through which David at that time passed, denotes, in the mouth of Christ, a crisis in the history of redemption in which the Old Testament receives its fulfilment. Like David, He commends His spirit to God; but not, that He may not die, but that dying He may not die, *i. e.* that He may receive back again His spirit-corporeal life, which is hidden in the hand of God, in imperishable power and glory. That which is so ardently desired and hoped for is regarded by him, who thus in faith commends himself to God, as having already taken place,

"Thou hast redeemed me, Jahve, God of truth." The perfect פָּדִיתָה is not used here, as in iv. 2, of that which is past, but of that which is already as good as past; it is not precative (Ew. § 223,*b*), but, like the perfects in vers. 8, 9, an expression of believing anticipation of redemption. It is the *præt. confidentiæ* which is closely related to the *præt. prophet.*; for the spirit of faith, like the spirit of the prophets, speaks of the future with historic certainty. In the notion of אֵל אֱמֶת it is impossible to exclude the reference to false gods which is contained in אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת, 2 Chron. xv. 3, since, in ver. 7, "vain illusions" are used as an antithesis. הַבָּלִים, ever since Deut. xxxii. 21, has become a favourite name for idols, and more particularly in Jeremiah (*e. g.* ch. viii. 19). On the other hand, according to the context, it may also not differ very greatly from אֵל אֱמוּנָה, Deut. xxxii. 4; since the idea of God as a depositary or trustee still influences the thought, and אֱמֶת and אֱמוּנָה are used interchangeably in other passages as personal attributes. We may say that אמת is being that lasts and verifies itself, and אמונה is sentiment that lasts and verifies itself. Therefore אל אמת is the God, who as the true God, maintains the truth of His revelation, and more especially of His promises, by a living authority or rule.

In ver. 7, David appeals to his entire and simple surrender to this true and faithful God: hateful to him are those, who worship vain images, whilst he, on the other hand, cleaves to Jahve. It is the false gods, which are called הַבְלֵי־שָׁוְא, as beings without being, which are of no service to their worshippers and only disappoint their expectations. Probably (as in v. 6) it is to be read שֹׂנֵאתָ with the LXX., Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic versions (Hitzig, Ewald, Olshausen, and others). In the text before us, which gives us no corrective *Kerî* as in 2 Sam. xiv. 21, Ruth iv. 5, ואני is not an antithesis to the preceding clause, but to the member of that clause which immediately precedes it. In Jonah's psalm, ch. ii. 9, this is expressed by מְשַׁמְּרִים הַבְלֵי־שָׁוְא; in the present instance the *Kal* is used in the signification *observare, colere,* as in Hos. iv. 10, and even in Prov. xxvii. 18. In the waiting of service is included, according to lix. 10, the waiting of trust. The word בָּטַח which denotes the

fiducia fidei is usually construed with בְּ of adhering to, or עַל of resting upon; but here it is combined with אֶל of hanging on. The cohortatives in ver. 8 express intentions. Olshausen and Hitzig translate them as optatives: may I be able to rejoice; but this, as a continuation of ver. 7, seems less appropriate. Certain that he will be heard, he determines to manifest thankful joy for Jahve's mercy, that (אֲשֶׁר as in Gen. xxxiv. 27) He has regarded (ἐπέβλεψε, Luke i. 48) his affliction, that He has known and exerted Himself about his soul's distresses. The construction יָדַע בְּ, in the presence of Gen. xix. 33, 35, Job xii. 9, xxxv. 15, cannot be doubted (Hupfeld); it is more significant than the expression "to know of anything"; בְּ is like ἐπί in ἐπιγιγνώσκειν used of the perception or comprehensive knowledge, which grasps an object and takes possession of it, or makes itself master of it. הִסְגִּיר, ver. 9, συγκλείειν, as in 1 Sam. xxiii. 11 (in the mouth of David) is so to abandon, that the hand of another closes upon that which is abandoned to it, *i. e.* has it completely in its power. מֵרָהָב, as in xviii. 20, cf. xxvi. 12. The language is David's, in which the language of the Tôra, and more especially of Deuteronomy (xxxii. 30, xxiii. 16), is re-echoed.

Vers. 10—14. After the pæan before victory, which he has sung in the fulness of his faith, in this second part of the Psalm (with groups, or strophes, of diminishing compass: 6. 5. 4) there again breaks forth the petition, based upon the greatness of the suffering which the psalmist, after having strengthened himself in his trust in God, now all the more vividly sets before Him. צַר־לִי, *angustum est mihi*, as in lxix. 18, cf. xviii. 7. Ver. 10*b* is word for word like vi. 8, except that in this passage to עֵינִי, the eye which mirrors the state of suffering in which the sensuous perception and objective receptivity of the man are concentrated, are added נַפְשִׁי, the soul forming the *nexus* of the spirit and the body, and בִּטְנִי, the inward parts of the body reflecting the energies and feelings of the spirit and the soul. חַיַּי, with which is combined the idea of the organic intermingling of the powers of soul and body, has the predicate in the plural, as in lxxxviii. 4. The fact that the poet makes mention of his iniquity as that by which his physical strength has be-

come tottering (כָּשַׁל as in Neh. iv. 4), is nothing surprising even in a Psalm that belongs to the time of his persecution by Saul; for the longer this persecution continued, the more deeply must David have felt that he needed this furnace of affliction.

The text of ver. 12*ab* upon which the LXX. rendering is based, was just the same as ours: παρὰ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου ἐγενήθην ὄνειδος, καὶ τοῖς γείτοσί μου σφόδρα καὶ φόβος τοῖς γνωστοῖς μου. But this σφόδρα (Jerome *nimis*) would certainly only be tolerable, if it could be rendered, "I am become a reproach even to my neighbours exceedingly" — in favour of this position of מְאֹד we might compare Judges xii. 2, — and this rendering is not really an impossible one; for not only has וְ frequently the sense of "even" as in 2 Sam. i. 23, but (independently of passages, in which it may even be explained as "and that", an expression which takes up what has been omitted, as in Amos iv. 10) it sometimes has this meaning direct (like καί, *et* = *etiam*), Isa. xxxii. 7, Hos. viii. 6 (according to the accents), 2 Chron. xxvii. 5, Eccl. v. 5 (cf. Ew. § 352,*b*). Inasmuch, however, as this usage, in Hebrew, was not definitely developed, but was only as it were just developing, it may be asked whether it is not possible to find a suitable explanation without having recourse to this rendering of the וְ as equivalent to גַּם, a rendering which is always hazardous. Olshausen places ולשכני after לְמִידָעַי, a change which certainly gets rid of all difficulty. Hitzig alters מְאֹד into מָגֹר, frightened, scared. But one naturally looks for a parallel substantive to חֶרְפָּה, somewhat like "terror" (Syriac) or "burden". Still מָגוֹר (dread) and מַשָּׂאֵת (a burden) do not look as though מאד could be a corruption of either of those words. Is it not perhaps possible for מאד itself to be equivalent in meaning to משאת? Since in the signification σφόδρα it is so unsuited to this passage, the expression would not be ambiguous, if it were here used in a special sense. J. D. Michaelis has even compared the Arabic أود (وَدَّ) in the sense of *onus*. We can, without the hesitation felt by Maurer and Hupfeld, suppose that מאד has indeed this meaning in this passage, and without any necessity for its being pointed מָאֹד; for even the adverb מְאֹד is originally a sub-

stantive derived from אוּר, אֹז (after the form מְצָד from צוּר) *gravitas, firmitas,* which is then used in the sense of *graviter, firmiter* (cf. the French *ferme*). אוּר, אָזַז, however, has the radical signification to be compressed, compact, firm, and solid, from which proceed the significations, which are divided between *âda, jaîdu,* and *âda, jaûdu,* to be strong, powerful, and to press upon, to burden, both of which meanings אָזַז unites within itself (cf. on xx. 9).

The number of opponents that David had, at length made him a reproach even in the eyes of the better disposed of his people, as being a revolter and usurper. Those among whom he found friendly shelter began to feel themselves burdened by his presence because they were thereby imperilled; and we see from the sad fate of Abimelech and the other priests of Nob what cause, humanly speaking, they, who were not merely slightly, but even intimately acquainted with him (מְיֻדָּעִים as in lv. 14, lxxxviii. 9, 19), had for avoiding all intercourse with him. Thus, then, he is like one dead, whom as soon as he is borne out of his home to the grave, men are wont, in general, to put out of mind also (נִשְׁכַּחַת מֵלֵב, *oblivione extingui ex corde;* cf. מְפֻקָּה, Deut. xxxi. 21). All intimate connection with him is as it were sundered, he is become כְּכֶלִי אֹבֵד, — a phrase, which, as we consider the confirmation which follows in ver. 14, has the sense of *vas periens* (not *vas perditum*), a vessel that is in the act of אָבַד, *i. e.* one that is set aside or thrown away, being abandoned to utter destruction and no more cared for (cf. Hos. viii. 8, together with Jer. xlviii. 38, and Jer. xxii. 28). With כִּי he gives the ground for his comparison of himself to a household vessel that has become worthless. The insinuations and slanders of many brand him as a transgressor, dread surrounds him on every side (this is word for word the same as in Jer. xx. 10, where the prophet, with whom in other passages also מָגוֹר מִסָּבִיב is a frequent and standing formula, under similar circumstances uses the language of the psalmist); when they come together to take counsel concerning him (according to the accents the second half of the verse begins with בְּהִוָּסְדָם), they think only how they may get rid of him. If the construction of בְּ with its infinitive were intended to be

continued in ver. 14*d*, it would have been וְזָמְמוּ לִקְחַת נַפְשִׁי or לִקְחַת נַפְשִׁי יָזֹמּוּ.

Vers. 15—19. But, although a curse of the world and an offscouring of all people, he is confident in God, his Deliverer and Avenger. By וַאֲנִי prominence is given to the subject by way of contrast, as in ver. 7. It appears as though Jahve had given him up in His anger; but he confides in Him, and in spite of this appearance, he even confides in Him with the prayer of appropriating faith. עִתִּים or עִתּוֹת (1 Chron. xxix. 30) are the appointed events and circumstances, the vicissitudes of human life; like the Arabic *ʿidât* (like עֵת from ועד), the appointed rewards and punishments. The times, with whatsoever they bring with them, are in the Lord's hand, every lot is of His appointment or sending. The Vulgate follows the LXX., *in manibus tuis sortes meæ*. The petitions of vers. 16*b*, 17, spring from this consciousness that the almighty and faithful hand of God has moulded his life. There are three petitions; the middle one is an echo of the Aaronitish blessing in Num. vi. 25. כִּי קְרָאתִיךָ, which gives the ground of his hope that he shall not be put to shame (cf. ver. 2), is to be understood like אָמַרְתִּי in ver. 15, according to Ges. § 126, 3. The expression of the ground for אַל־אֵבוֹשָׁה, favours the explanation of it not so much as the language of petition (let me not be ashamed) as of hope. The futures which follow might be none the less regarded as optatives, but the order of the words does not require this. And we prefer to take them as expressing hope, so that the three petitions in vers. 16, 17, correspond to the three hopes in vers. 18, 19. He will not be ashamed, but the wicked shall be ashamed and silenced for ever. The form יִדְמוּ, from דָּמַם, is, as in Jer. viii. 14, the plural of the *fut. Kal* יִדֹּם, with the doubling of the first radical, which is customary in Aramaic (other examples of which we have in יָקֹם, יָשֹׁם, יָתֹם), not of the *fut. Niph.* יִדַּם, the plural of which would be יִדָּמוּ, as in 1 Sam. ii. 9; *conticescere in orcum* is equivalent to: to be silent, *i. e.* being made powerless to fall a prey to hades. It is only in accordance with the connection, that in this instance נֶאֱלָמִים, ver. 19, just like דָּמַם, denotes that which is forcibly laid upon them by the judicial intervention of God: all lying lips shall be dumb, *i. e.* made dumb.

עָתָק prop. that which is unrestrained, free, insolent (cf. Arabic *ʿâtik*, *ʿatik*, unrestrained, free*) is the accusative of the object, as in xciv. 4, and as it is the nominative of the subject in 1 Sam. ii. 3.

Vers. 20—25. In this part well-grounded hope expands to triumphant certainty; and this breaks forth into grateful praise of the goodness of God to His own, and an exhortation to all to wait with steadfast faith on Jahve. The thought: how gracious hath Jahve been to me, takes a more universal form in ver. 20. It is an exclamation (מָה, as in xxxvi. 8) of adoring admiration. טוּב יהוה is the sum of the good which God has treasured up for the constant and ever increasing use and enjoyment of His saints. צָפַן is used in the same sense as in xvii. 14; cf. τὸ μάννα τὸ κεκρυμμένον, Apoc. ii. 17. Instead of פָּעַלְתָּ it ought strictly to be נָתַתָּ; for we can say פָּעַל טוּב, but not פָּעַל טוּב. What is meant is, the doing or manifesting of טוּב springing from this טוּב, which is the treasure of grace. Jahve thus makes Himself known to His saints for the confounding of their enemies and in defiance of all the world besides, xxiii. 5. He takes those who are His under His protection from the רֻכְסֵי אִישׁ, confederations of men (from רָכַס, כָּסַס, *magna copia*), from the wrangling, *i. e.* the slanderous scourging, of tongues. Elsewhere it is said, that God hides one in סֵתֶר אָהֳלוֹ (xxvii. 5), or in סֵתֶר כְּנָפָיו (lxi. 5), or in His shadow (צֵל, xci. 1); in this passage it is: in the defence and protection of His countenance, *i. e.* in the region of the unapproachable light that emanates from His presence. The סֻכָּה is the safe and comfortable protection of the Almighty which spans over the persecuted one like an arbour of rich foliage. With בָּרוּךְ ה' David again passes over to his own personal experience. The unity of the Psalm requires us to refer the praise to the fact of the deliverance which is anticipated by faith. Jahve has shewn him wondrous favour, inasmuch as He has given him a עִיר מָצוֹר as a place of abode. מָצוֹר, from צוּר to shut in (Arabic *misr* with the denominative verb *maṣṣara*, to found a fortified city), signifies both a siege, *i. e.* a shutting in by siege-

* But these Arabic words do not pass over into the signification 'insolent'.

works, and a fortifying (cf. lx. 11 with cviii. 11), *i. e.* a shutting in by fortified works against the attack of the enemy, 2 Chron. viii. 5. The fenced city is mostly interpreted as God Himself and His powerful and gracious protection. We might then compare Isa. xxxiii. 21 and other passages. But why may not an actual city be intended, viz. Ziklag? The fact, that after long and troublous days David there found a strong and sure resting-place, he here celebrates beforehand, and unconsciously prophetically, as a wondrous token of divine favour. To him Ziklag was indeed the turning-point between his degradation and exaltation. He had already said in his trepidation (חָפַזְתִּי, *trepidare*), cf. cxvi. 11: I am cut away from the range of Thine eyes. נִגְרַזְתִּי is explained according to גַּרְזֶן, an axe; Lam. iii. 54, נִגְזְרוּ, and Jonah ii. 5, נִגְרַשְׁתִּי, favour this interpretation. He thought in his fear and despair, that God would never more care about him. אָכֵן, *verum enim vero*, but Jahve heard the cry of his entreaty, when he cried unto Him (the same words as in xxviii. 2). On the ground of these experiences he calls upon all the godly to love the God who has done such gracious things, *i. e.* to love Love itself. On the one hand, He preserves the faithful (אֱמוּנִים, from אֱמוּן = אֱמוּן, πιστοί, as in xii. 2), who keep faith with Him, by also proving to them His faithfulness by protection in every danger; on the other hand, not scantily, but plentifully (עַל as in Isa. lx. 7, Jer. vi. 14: κατὰ περισσείαν) He rewardeth those that practise pride — in the sight of God, the Lord, the sin of sins. An animating appeal to the godly (metamorphosed out of the usual form of the expression חֲזַק יֶאֱמַץ, *macte esto*), resembling the animating call to his own heart in xxvii. 14, closes the Psalm. The godly and faithful are here called "those who wait upon Jahve". They are to wait patiently, for this waiting has a glorious end; the bright, spring sun at length breaks through the dark, angry aspect of the heavens, and the *esto mihi* is changed into *halleluja*. This eye of hope patiently directed towards Jahve is the characteristic of the Old Testament faith. The substantial unity, however, of the Old Testament order of grace, or mercy, with that of the New Testament, is set before us in Ps. xxxii.,

which, in its New Testament and Pauline character, is the counterpart of Ps. xix.

PSALM XXXII.

THE WAY TO THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

1 BLESSED is he whose transgression is taken away,
whose sin is covered.
2 Blessed is the man to whom Jahve doth not reckon iniquity,
And in whose spirit there is no guile.

3 When I kept silence, my bones rotted
Through my constant groaning.
4 For day and night Thy hand was heavy upon me,
My moisture was changed with the drought of summer.
(*Sela*)
5 I acknowledged my sin unto Thee and did not cover my guilt;
I said: "I will confess my transgressions unto Jahve" —
And Thou, Thou hast taken away the guilt of my sin.
(*Sela*)

6 For this cause let every godly man pray unto Thee in a time when Thou mayest be found;
Surely, when the great waters rise —
They shall not reach him.
7 Thou art my hiding-place, from trouble Thou wilt guard me,
With songs of deliverance wilt Thou compass me about
(*Sela*)

8 I will instruct thee and teach thee concerning the way thou shalt go.
I will give counsel, keeping mine eye upon thee.
9 Be ye not as horses, as mules without understanding,
With bit and bridle is their mouth to be curbed,
Otherwise they will not come near unto thee.

10 Many sorrows are to the ungodly,
But whoso trusteth in Jahve, with favour doth He compass him about.

11 Be glad in Jahve, and rejoice, ye righteous,
And shout for joy all ye that are upright in heart!

There are several prominent marks by which this Psalm is coupled with the preceding (*vid. Symbolæ* § 52). In both Psalms, with the word אָמַרְתִּי, the psalmist looks back upon some fact of his spiritual life; and both close with an exhortation to the godly, which stands in the relation of a general inference to the whole Psalm. But in other respects the two Psalms differ. For Ps. xxxi. is a prayer under circumstances of outward distress, and Ps. xxxii. is a didactic Psalm, concerning the way of penitence which leads to the forgiveness of sins; it is the second of the seven *Psalmi pœnitentiales* of the church, and Augustine's favourite Psalm. We might take Augustine's words as its motto: *intelligentia prima est ut te noris peccatorem.* The poet bases it upon his own personal experience, and then applies the general teaching which he deduces from it, to each individual in the church of God. For a whole year after his adultery David was like one under sentence of condemnation. In the midst of this fearful anguish of soul he composed Ps. li., whereas Ps. xxxii. was composed after his deliverance from this state of mind. The former was written in the very midst of the penitential struggle; the latter after he had recovered his inward peace. The theme of this Psalm is the precious treasure which he brought up out of that abyss of spiritual distress, viz. the doctrine of the blessedness of forgiveness, the sincere and unreserved confession of sin as the way to it, and the protection of God in every danger, together with joy in God, as its fruits.

In the signification *psalmus didascalicus s. informatorius* (Reuchlin: *ut si liceret dicere intellectificum vel resipiscentificum*), מַשְׂכִּיל would after all be as appropriate a designation as we could have for this Psalm which teaches the way of salvation. This meaning, however, cannot be sustained. It is improbable that מַשְׂכִּיל, which, in all other instances,

signifies *intelligens,* should, as a technical term, mean *intelligentem faciens;* because the *Hiph.* הַשְׂכִּיל, in the causative meaning "to impart understanding", occurs only in solitary instances (ver. 8, Prov. xxi. 11) in the Hebrew of the period before the Exile, and only came into common use in the later language (in Daniel, Chronicles, and Nehemiah). But, that which is decisive against the meaning "a didactic poem" is the fact, that among the thirteen Psalms which are inscribed מַשְׂכִּיל, there are only two (xxxii. and lxxviii.) which can be regarded as didactic poems. Ps. xlv. is called, in addition, שִׁיר יְדִידֹת, and Ps. cxlii., תְּפִלָּה, two names which ill accord with a didactic intention and plan. Even Ps. xlvii. 8, a passage of importance in the determining of the right idea of the word, in which מַשְׂכִּיל occurs as an accusative of the object, excludes the meaning "didactic poem". Ewald observes (*Dichter des Alten Bundes*, i, 31) that "in Ps. xlvii. 8 we have the safest guide to the correct meaning of the word; in this passage מַשְׂכִּיל stands side by side with זַמֵּר as a more exact definition of the singing and there can be no doubt, that an *intelligent,* melodious song must be equivalent to a *choice* or *delicate*, skillfully composed song". But in all other cases, מַשְׂכִּיל is only found as an attribute of persons, because it is not that which makes prudent, but that which is in itself intelligent, that is so named. Even in 2 Chron. xxx. 22, where allusion is made to the *Maskîl* Psalms, it is the Levite musicians themselves who are called (שֵׂכֶל טוֹב) הַמַּשְׂכִּילִים (*i. e.* those who play skillfully with delicate tact). Thus then we are driven to the Hiphil meaning of pensive meditation in cvi. 7, cf. xli. 2, Prov. xvi. 20; so that מַשְׂכִּיל signifies that which meditates, then meditation, just like מַכְבִּיר, that which multiplies, and then fulness; מַשְׁחִית, that which destroys, and then destruction. From the *Maskîl* Psalms, as *e. g.* from liv. and cxlii., we cannot discover anything special as to the technical meaning or use of the word. The word means just *pia meditatio*, a devout meditation, and nothing more.

Vers. 1—2. The Psalm begins with the celebration of the happiness of the man who experiences God's justifying grace, when he gives himself up unreservedly to Him. Sin is called פֶּשַׁע, as being a breaking loose or tearing away

from God; חַטָּאה, as a deviation from that which is well-pleasing to God; עָוֹן, as a perversion, distortion, misdeed. The forgiveness of sin is styled נָשָׂא (Exod. xxxiv. 7), as a lifting up and taking away, αἴρειν and ἀφαιρεῖν, Exod. xxxiv. 7; כָּסָה (lxxxv. 3, Prov. x. 12, Neh. iii. 37), as a covering, so that it becomes invisible to God, the Holy One, and is as though it had never taken place; לֹא חָשַׁב (2 Sam. xix. 20, cf. حسب, to number, reckon, οὐ λογίζεσθαι, Rom. iv. 6—9), as a non-imputing; the δικαιοσύνη χωρὶς ἔργων is here distinctly expressed. The justified one is called נְשׁוּי־פֶּשַׁע, as being one who is exempted from transgression, *prævaricatione levatus* (Ges. § 135, 1); נְשׁוּי, instead of נָשׂא, Isa. xxxiii. 24, is intended to rhyme with כְּסוּי (which is the *part.* to כָּסָה, just as בָּרוּךְ is the participle to בֵּרַךְ); *vid.* on Isa. xxii. 13. One "covered of sin" is one over whose sin lies the covering of expiation (כֹּפֶר, root כפּ, to cover, cogn. غفر, خفر, خمر, غمر) before the holy eyes of God. The third designation is an attributive clause: "to whom Jahve doth not reckon misdeed", inasmuch as He, on the contrary, regards it as discharged or as settled. He who is thus justified, however, is only he in whose spirit there is no רְמִיָּה, no deceit, which denies and hides, or extenuates and excuses, this or that favourite sin. One such sin designedly retained is a secret ban, which stands in the way of justification.

Vers. 3—5. For, as his own experience has taught the poet, he who does not in confession pour out all his corruption before God, only tortures himself until he unburdens himself of his secret curse. Since ver. 3 by itself cannot be regarded as the reason for the proposition just laid down, כִּי signifies either "because, *quod*" (*e. g.* Prov. xxii. 22) or "when, *quum*" (Judges xvi. 16, Hos. xi. 1). The שְׁאָגָה was an outburst of the tortures which his accusing conscience prepared for him. The more he strove against confessing, the louder did conscience speak; and while it was not in his power to silence this inward voice, in which the wrath of God found utterance, he cried the whole day, viz. for help; but while his heart was still unbroken, he cried yet received no answer. He cried all day long, for God's punishing right hand (xxxviii. 3, xxxix. 11) lay heavy upon him day and

night; the feeling of divine wrath left him no rest, cf. Job xxxiii. 14 sqq. A fire burned within him which threatened completely to devour him. The expression is בְּחָרְבֹנַי (like בעשן in xxxvii. 20, cii. 4), without כ, inasmuch as the fears which burn fiercely within him even to his heart and, as it were, scorch him up, he directly calls the droughts of summer. The בְּ is the *Beth* of the state or condition, in connection with which the change, *i. e.* degeneration (Job xx. 14), took place; for *mutare in aliquid* is expressed by הָפַךְ לְ. The ל (which Saadia and other have mistaken) in לְשַׁדִּי is part of the root; לָשַׁד (from לָשַׁשׁ, لسس, to suck), inflected after the analogy of גָּמַל and the like, signifies *succus*. In the summer-heat of anxiety his vital moisture underwent a change: it burned and dried up. Here the music becomes louder and does its part in depicting these torments of the awakened conscience in connection with a heart that still remains unbroken. In spite of this διάψαλμα, however, the historical connection still retains sufficient influence to give אוֹדִיעֲךָ the force of the imperfect (cf. xxx. 9): "I made known my sin and my guilt did I not cover up (כָּסָה used here as in Prov. xxviii. 13, Job xxxi. 33); I made the resolve: I will confess my transgressions to the Lord (הוֹדָה = הִתְוַדָּה, Neh. i. 6, ix. 2; elsewhere construed with the accusative, *vid.* Prov. xxviii. 13) — then Thou forgavest", etc. Hupfeld is inclined to place אמרתי before חטאתי אודיעך, by which אודיעך and אודה would become futures; but ועוני לא כסיתי sounds like an assertion of a fact, not the statement of an intention, and ואתה נשאת is the natural continuation of the אמרתי which immediately precedes. The form ואתה נשאת is designedly used instead of וַתִּשָּׂא. Simultaneously with his confession of sin, made *fide supplice,* came also the absolution: then Thou forgavest the guilt (עָוֹן, misdeed, as a deed and also as a matter of fact, *i. e.* guilt contracted, and penance or punishment, cf. Lam. iv. 6, Zech. xiv. 19) of my sin. *Vox nondum est in ore,* says Augustine, *et vulnus sanatur in corde.* The סלה here is the antithesis of the former one. There we have a shrill lament over the sinner who tortures himself in vain, here the clear tones of joy at the blessed experience of one who pours forth his soul to God — a musical Yea and Amen to the great truth of justifying grace.

Vers. 6—7. For this mercy, which is provided for every sinner who repents and confesses his sin, let then, every חסיד, who longs for חסד, turn in prayer to Jahve לְעֵת מְצֹא, at the time (xxi. 10, 1 Chron. xii. 22; cf. בְּעֵת, Isa. xlix. 8) when He, and His mercy, is to be found (cf. Deut. iv. 29 with Jer. xxix. 13, Isa. lv. 6, בְּהִמָּצְאוֹ). This hortatory wish is followed by a promissory assurance. The fact of לְשֶׁטֶף מַיִם רַבִּים being virtually a protasis: *quum inundant aquæ magnæ* (ל of the time), which separates רַק from אֵלָיו, prohibits our regarding רק as belonging to אֵלָיו in this instance, although like אַף, אַךְ, גַּם, and פֶּן, רַק is also placed *per hypallage* at the head of the clause (as in Prov. xiii. 10: with pride there is only contention), even when belonging to a part of the clause that follows further on. The restrictive meaning of רק here, as is frequently the case (Deut. iv. 6, Judges xiv. 16, 1 Kings xxi. 25, cf. Ps. xci. 8), has passed over to the affirmative: *certo quum,* etc. Inundation or flooding is an exemplificative description of the divine judgment (cf. Nah. i. 8); ver. 6*bc* is a brief form of expressing the promise which is expanded in Ps. xci. In ver. 7, David confirms it from his own experience. The assonance in מִצַּר תִּצְּרֵנִי (Thou wilt preserve me, so that צר, *angustum* = *angustiæ*, does not come upon me, cxix. 143) is not undesigned; and after תצרני comes רני, just like כלו after בהיכלו in xxix. 9. There is no sufficient ground for setting aside רני, with Houbigant and others, as a repetition of the half of the word תצרני. The infinitive רֹן (Job xxxviii. 7) might, like רֹב, *plur.* רַבִּי, חֹק, *plur.* חֻקִּי, with equal right be inflected as a substantive; and פַּלֵּט (as in lvi. 8), which is likewise treated as a substantive, cf. נַפִּיץ, Dan. xii. 7, presents, as a genitive, no more difficulty than does רעת in the expression אִישׁ דַּעַת. With songs of deliverance doth Jahve surround him, so that they encompass him on all sides, and an occasion of exulting meets him in whatever direction he turns. The music here again for the third time becomes *forte,* and that to express the highest feeling of delight.

Vers. 8—10. It is not Jahve, who here speaks in answer to the words that have been thus far addressed to Him. In this case the person addressed must be the poet, who, however, has already attained the knowledge here treated of.

It is he himself who now directly adopts the tone of the teacher (cf. xxxiv. 12). That which David, in Ps. li. 15, promises to do, he here takes in hand, viz. the instruction of sinners in the way of salvation. It is unnecessary to read אִיעֲצָךְ instead of אִיעָצָה, as Olshausen does; the suffix of אַשְׁכִּילְךָ and אוֹרְךָ (for אוֹרֶךָּ) avails also for this third verb, to which עָלֶיךָ עֵינִי, equivalent to שָׂם עָלֶיךָ עֵינִי (fixing my eye upon thee, *i. e.* with sympathising love taking an interest in thee), stands in the relation of a subordinate relative clause. The LXX. renders it by ἐπιστηριῶ ἐπὶ σὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, so that it takes יָעַץ, in accordance with its radical signification *firmare*, as the *regens* of עיני (I will fix my eye steadfastly upon thee); but for this there is no support in the general usage of the language. The accents give a still different rendering; they apparently make עֵינִי an *accus. adverb.* (since אועצה עליך עיני is transformed from איעצה עליך עיני): I will counsel thee with mine eye; but in every other instance, יָעַץ עַל means only a hostile determination against any one, *e. g.* Isa. vii. 5. The form of address, without changing its object, passes over, in ver. 9, into the plural and the expression becomes harsh in perfect keeping with the perverted character which it describes. The sense is on the whole clear: not constrained, but willing obedience is becoming to man, in distinction from an irrational animal which must be led by a bridle drawn through its mouth. The asyndeton clause: like a horse, a mule (פֶּרֶד as an animal that is isolated and does not pair; cf. פֶּרֶן alone of its kind, single, unlike, the opposite of which is זוֹג, a pair, equal number), has nothing remarkable about it, cf. xxxv. 14, Isa. xxxviii. 14. But it is not clear what עֶדְיִי is intended to mean. We might take it in its usual signification "ornament", and render "with bit and bridle, its ornament", and perhaps at once recognise therein an allusion to the senseless servility of the animal, viz. that its ornament is also the means by which it is kept in check, unless עֶדְיִי, ornament, is perhaps directly equivalent to "harness". Still the rendering of the LXX. is to be respected: *in camo et fræno* — as Jerome reproduces it — *maxillas eorum constringere qui non approximant ad te.* If עֶדְיִי means jaw, mouth or cheek, then עֶדְיִי לְבֶלּוֹם is equivalent to *ora*

eorum obturanda sunt (Ges. § 132, rem. 1), which the LXX. expresses by ἄγξαι, *constringe*, or, following the *Cod. Alex.*, ἄγξις (ἄγξεις), *constringes*. Like Ewald and Hitzig (on Ezek. xvi. 7), we may compare with עֶדְיִי, the cheek, the Arabic خَدٌّ, which, being connected with גְּדוֹר, a furrow, signifies properly the furrow of the face, *i. e.* the indented part running downwards from the inner corners of the eyes to both sides of the nose, but then by synecdoche the cheek. If עדיו refers to the mouth or jaws, then it looks as if בַּל קְרֹב אֵלֶיךָ must be translated: in order that they may not come too near thee, viz. to hurt thee (Targ., Syriac, Rashi, etc.); but this rendering does not produce any point of comparison corresponding to the context of this Psalm. Therefore, it is rather to be rendered: otherwise there is no coming near to thee. This interpretation takes the emphasis of the בל into account, and assumes that, according to a usage of the language that is without further support, one might, for instance, say: בַּל לֶכְתִּי שָׁמָּה, "I will never go thither." In Prov. xxiii. 17, בל also includes within itself the verb to be. So here: by no means an approaching to thee, *i. e.* there is, if thou dost not bridle them, no approaching or coming near to thee. These words are not addressed to God, but to man, who is obliged to use harsh and forcible means in taming animals, and can only thus keep them under his control and near to him. In the antitype, it is the sinner, who will not come to God, although God only is his help, and who, as David has learned by experience, must first of all endure inward torture, before he comes to a right state of mind. This agonising life of the guilty conscience which the ungodly man leads, is contrasted in ver. 10 with the mercy which encompasses on all sides him, who trusts in God. רַבִּים, in accordance with the treatment of this adjective as if it were a numeral (*vid.* lxxxix. 51), is an attributive or adjective placed before its noun. The final clause might be rendered: mercy encompasses him; but the *Poel* and ver. 7 favour the rendering: with mercy doth He encompass him.

Ver. 11. After the doctrine of the Psalm has been unfolded in three unequal groups of verses, there follows, cor-

responding to the brief introduction, a still shorter close, which calls upon those whose happy state is there celebrated, to join in songs of exultant joy.

PSALM XXXIII.

PRAISE OF THE RULER OF THE WORLD AS BEING THE DEFENDER OF HIS PEOPLE.

1 SHOUT for joy, O ye righteous, in Jahve,
For the upright praise is comely.
2 Praise Jahve with cithern,
With a ten-stringed nabla play unto Him.
3 Sing unto Him a new song,
Play merrily with a joyful noise.

4 For upright is the word of Jahve,
And all His working is in faithfulness.
5 He loveth righteousness and judgment;
The earth is full of the mercy of Jahve.

6 By the word of Jahve were the heavens made,
And by the breath of His mouth all their host.
7 He gathereth the waters of the sea together as a heap,
He layeth up the depths in storehouses.

8 Let all the earth fear before Jahve,
Let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of Him.
9 For He spake, and it was done;
He commanded, and it stood fast.

10 Jahve hath brought the counsel of the heathen to nought,
He hath made the thoughts of the people of none effect.
11 The counsel of Jahve standeth for ever,
The thoughts of His heart to all generations.

12 Blessed is the nation whose God is Jahve,
The people whom He chooseth for His own inheritance.

13 From heaven Jahve looketh down,
He seeth all the children of men.

14 From the place of His habitation He looketh
Upon all the inhabitants of the earth,
15 He, who fashioneth their heart together,
Who considereth all their works.

16 A king doth not triumph by great strength,
A mighty man is not delivered by great power.
17 A vain thing is a horse for victory,
And its great strength cannot deliver.

18 Behold, the eye of Jahve is upon them that fear Him,
Upon them that hope in His mercy,
19 To deliver their soul from death,
And to keep them alive in famine.

20 Our soul waiteth for Jahve,
Our help and our shield is He.
21 For in Him shall our heart rejoice,
Because we trust in His holy Name
22 Let, then, Thy mercy, O Jahve, be upon us,
According as we hope in Thee!

The Davidic Maskîl, Ps. xxxii., is followed by an anonymous congregational song of a hymnic character, which begins just like the former closes. It owes its composition apparently to some deliverance of the nation from heathen oppression, which had resulted from God's interposition and without war. Moreover it exhibits no trace of dependence upon earlier models, such as might compel us to assign a late date to it; the time of Jeremiah, for instance, which Hitzig adopts. The structure is symmetrical. Between the two hexastichs, vers. 1—3, 20—22, the *materia laudis* is set forth in eight tetrastichs.

Vers. 1—3. The call contained in this hexastich is addressed to the righteous and upright, who earnestly seek

to live a godly and God-pleasing life, and the sole determining rule of whose conduct is the will and good pleasure of God. These alone know God, whose true nature finds in them a clear mirror; so on their part they are joyfully to confess what they possess in Him. For it is their duty, and at the same time their honour, to praise him, and make their boast in Him. נָאוָה is the feminine of the adjective נָאוֶה (formed out of נָאֲוִי), as in cxlvii. 1, cf. Prov. xix. 10. On כִּנּוֹר (LXX. κιθάρα, κινύρα) and נֵבֶל (LXX. ψαλτήριον, νάβλα, ναῦλα, etc.) *vid.* Introduction § II. נֵבֶל is the name given to the harp or lyre on account of its resemblance to a skin bottle or flask (root נב, to swell, to be distended), and נֵבֶל עָשׂוֹר, "harp of the decade", is the ten-stringed harp, which is also called absolutely עָשׂוֹר, and distinguished from the customary נֵבֶל, in xcii. 4. By a comparison of the asyndeton expressions in xxxv. 14, Jer. xi. 19, Aben-Ezra understands by נבל עשור two instruments, contrary to the tenour of the words. Gecatilia, whom he controverts, is only so far in error as that he refers the ten to holes (נקבים) instead of to strings. The ב is *Beth instrum.*, just like the expression κιθαρίζειν ἐν κιθάραις, Apoc. xiv. 2. A "new song" is one which, in consequence of some new mighty deeds of God, comes from a new impulse of gratitude in the heart, xl. 4, and frequently in the Psalms, Isa. xlii. 10, Judith vi. 13, Apoc. v. 9. In הֵיטִיבוּ the notions of *scite* and *strenue*, *suaviter* and *naviter*, blend. With בְּתָרוּעָה, referring back to רַנְּנוּ, the call to praise forms, as it were, a circle as it closes.

Vers. 4—5. Now begins the body of the song. The summons to praise God is supported (1) by a setting forth of His praiseworthiness* (*a*) as the God of revelation in the kingdom of Grace. His word is יָשָׁר, upright in intention, and, without becoming in any way whatever untrue to itself, straightway fulfilling itself. His every act is an act in אֱמוּנָה, truth, which verifies the truth of His word, and one which accomplishes itself. On אֹהֵב, equivalent to אֹהֵב הוּא, *vid.* vii. 10, xxii. 29. צְדָקָה is righteousness as

* We have adopted the word "praiseworthiness" for the sake of conciseness of expression, in order to avoid an awkward periphrasis, in the sense of being worthy to be praised. — TR.

conduct; מִשְׁפָּט is right as a rule of judgment and a state or condition. חֶסֶד is an accusative, as in cxix. 64: *misericordiâ Domini plena est terra* (the introit for Misercordias Sunday or the second Sunday after Easter).

Vers. 6—9. God's praiseworthiness (*b*) as the Creator of the world in the kingdom of Nature. Jahve's דְּבַר is His almighty "Let there be"; and רוּחַ פִּיו (inasmuch as the breath is here regarded as the material of which the word is formed and the bearer of the word) is the command, or in general, the operation of His commanding omnipotence (Job xv. 30, cf. iv. 9; Isa. xxxiv. 16, cf. xi. 4). The heavens above and the waters beneath stand side by side as miracles of creation. The display of His power in the waters of the sea consists in His having confined them within fixed bounds and keeping them within these. נֵד is a pile, *i. e.* a piled up heap (Arabic *nadd*), and more especially in reference to harvest: like such a heap do the convex waters of the sea, being firmly held together, rise above the level of the continents. The expression is like that in Josh. iii. 13, 16, cf. Exod. xv. 8; although there the reference is to a miracle occurring in the course of history, and in this passage to a miracle of creation. כֹּנֵס refers to the heap itself, not to the walls of the storehouses as holding together. This latter figure is not introduced until ver. 7*b*: the bed of the sea and those of the rivers are, as it were, אוֹצָרוֹת, treasuries or storehouses, in which God has deposited the deep, foaming waves or surging mass of waters. The inhabitants (יֹשְׁבֵי, not יוֹשְׁבֵי) of the earth have cause to fear God who is thus omnipotent (מִן, in the sense of falling back *from* in terror); for He need only speak the word and that which He wills comes into being out of nothing, as we see from the hexaëmeron or history of Creation, but which is also confirmed in human history (Lam. iii. 37). He need only command and it stands forth like an obedient servant, that appears in all haste at the call of his lord, cxix. 91.

Vers. 10—11. His praiseworthiness (*c*) as the irresistible Ruler in the history of men. Since in 2 Sam. xv. 34, xvii. 14, and frequently, הֵפֵר עֵצָה is a common phrase, therefore הֵפִיר as in lxxxix. 34, Ezek. xvii. 19, is equivalent to הֵפֵר (Ges. § 67, rem. 9). The perfects are not used in the abstract,

but of that which has been experienced most recently, since the "new song" presupposes new matter. With ver. 11 compare Prov. xix. 21. The עֲצַת of God is the unity of the "thoughts of His heart," *i. e.* of the ideas, which form the inmost part, the ultimate motives of everything that takes place. The whole history of the world is the uninterrupted carrying out of a divine plan of salvation, the primary object of which is His people, but in and with these are included humanity at large.

Vers. 12—19. Hence the call to praise God is supported (2) by a setting forth of that which His people possess in Him. This portion of the song is like a paraphrase of the אַשְׁרֶי in Deut. xxxiii. 29. The theme in ver. 12 is proved in vers. 13—15 by the fact, that Jahve is the omniscient Ruler, because He is the Creator of men, without whose knowledge nothing is undertaken either secretly or openly, and especially if against His people. Then in vers. 16—19 it is supported by the fact, that His people have in Jahve a stronger defence than the greatest worldly power would be. Jahve is called the fashioner of all the hearts of men, as in Zech. xii. 1, cf. Prov. xxiv. 12, as being their Maker. As such He is also the observer of all the works of men; for He is acquainted with their origin in the laboratory of the heart, which He as Creator has formed. Hupfeld takes יַחַד as an equalisation (*pariter ac*) of the two appositions; but then it ought to be וּמֵבִין (cf. xlix. 3, 11). The LXX. correctly renders it κατα-μόνας, *singillatim*. It is also needless to translate it, as Hupfeld does: He who formed, *qui finxit*; for the hearts of men were not from the very first created all at one time, but the primeval impartation of spirit-life is continued at every birth in some mysterious way. God is the Father of spirits, Hebr. xii. 9. For this very reason everything that exists, even to the most hidden thing, is encompassed by His omniscience and omnipotence. He exercises an omniscient control over all things, and makes all things subservient to the designs of His plan of the universe, which, so far as His people are concerned, is the plan of salvation. Without Him nothing comes to pass; but through Him everything takes place. The victory of the king, and the safety of the warrior, are not their own works. Their great military power and bodily

strength can accomplish nothing without God, who can also be mighty in the feeble. Even for purposes of victory (תְּשׁוּעָה, cf. יְשׁוּעָה, xxi. 2) the war-horse is שֶׁקֶר, *i. e.* a thing that promises much, but can in reality do nothing; it is not its great strength, by which it enables the trooper to escape (יְמַלֵּט). "The horse", says Solomon in Prov. xxi. 31, "is equipped for the day of battle, but לה הַתְּשׁוּעָה, Jahve's is the victory", He giveth it to whomsoever He will. The ultimate ends of all things that come to pass are in His hands, and — as vers. 18 sq. say, directing special attention to this important truth by הִנֵּה — the eye of this God, that is to say the final aim of His government of the world, is directed towards them that fear Him, is pointed at them that hope in His mercy (לְמַיְחֲלִים). In ver. 19, the object, לְחַסְדּוֹ, is expanded by way of example. From His mercy or loving-kindness, not from any acts of their own, conscious of their limited condition and feebleness, they look for protection in the midst of the greatest peril, and for the preservation of their life in famine. Ps. xx. 8 is very similar; but the one passage sounds as independent as the other.

Vers. 20—22. Accordingly, in this closing hexastich, the church acknowledges Him as its help, its shield, and its source of joy. Besides the passage before us, חָכָה occurs in only one other instance in the Psalter, viz. cvi. 13. This word, which belongs to the group of words signifying hoping and waiting, is perhaps from the root חכ (حكى, حكّى, *firmiter constringere* sc. *nodum*), to be firm, compact, like קָוָה from קָוַה, to pull tight or fast, cf. the German *harren* (to wait) and *hart* (hard, compact). In ver. 20*b* we still hear the echo of the primary passage Deut. xxxiii. 29 (cf. ver. 26). The emphasis, as in cxv. 9—11, rests upon הוּא, into which בּוֹ, in ver. 21, puts this thought, viz. He is the unlimited sphere, the inexhaustible matter, the perennial spring of our joy. The second כִּי confirms this subjectively. His holy Name is His church's ground of faith, of love, and of hope; for from thence comes its salvation. It can boldly pray that the mercy of the Lord may be upon it, for it waits upon Him, and man's waiting or hoping and God's giving are reciprocally conditioned. This is the meaning of the

בְּאֱמֶת. God is true to His word. The *Te Deum laudamus* of Ambrose closes in the same way.

PSALM XXXIV.

THANKSGIVING AND TEACHING OF ONE WHO HAS EXPERIENCED DELIVERANCE.

2 א I WILL bless Jahve at all times,
Continually let His praise be in my mouth.
3 ב In Jahve shall my soul make her boast,
The patient shall hear thereof and be glad.
4 ג O magnify Jahve with me,
And let us exalt His name together.
5 ד I sought Jahve, and He answered me,
And out of all my fears did He deliver me.
6 ה Looking unto Him they are lightened,
And their faces shall not be ashamed.
7 ו This afflicted one cried, and Jahve heard,
And saved him out of all his troubles.
8 ח The Angel of Jahve encampeth round about them that fear Him,
And delivereth them.
9 ט Taste and see, that Jahve is good —
Blessed is the man that trusteth in Him.
10 י Fear Jahve, ye His saints!
For there is no want to them that fear Him.
11 כ Young lions do lack and suffer hunger,
But they that seek Jahve do not want any good thing.
12 ל Come, ye children, hearken unto me!
The fear of Jahve will I teach you.
13 מ Whosoever thou art, dost thou desire long life,
Dost thou love days that thou mayst see good —:
14 נ Keep thy tongue from evil,
And thy lips from deceitful speaking.
15 ס Depart from evil and do good,
Seek peace, and pursue it.
16 ע The eyes of Jahve observe the righteous,
And His ears their cry.

17 פ The face of Jahve is against the evil doers,
To cut off their remembrance from the earth.
18 צ The former cry unto Jahve, and He heareth,
And out of all their troubles He delivereth them.
19 ק Jahve is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart,
And saveth such as be of a contrite spirit.
20 ר Many are the afflictions of the righteous,
But out of them all doth Jahve deliver him.
21 ש He preserveth all his bones,
Not one of them is broken.
22 ת Evil shall slay the wicked,
And they that hate the righteous shall be punished.
23 פ Jahve redeemeth the soul of His servant,
And they shall not be punished who trust in Him.

In Ps. xxxiii. 18 we heard the words, "*Behold, the eye of Jahve is directed towards them that fear Him*", and in xxxiv. 16 we hear this same grand thought, "*the eyes of Jahve are directed towards the righteous*". Ps. xxxiv. is one of the eight Psalms which are assigned, by their inscriptions, to the time of David's persecution by Saul, and were composed upon that weary way of suffering extending from Gibea of Saul to Ziklag. (The following is an approximation to their chronological order: vii., lix., lvi., xxxiv., lii., lvii., cxlii., liv.). The inscription runs: *Of David, when he disguised his understanding* (טַעְמוֹ with *Dag.*, lest it should be pronounced טַעֲמוֹ) *before Abimelech, and he drove him away* (וַיְגָרְשֵׁהוּ, with *Chateph Pathach*, as is always the case with verbs whose second radical is ר, if the accent is on the third radical) *and he departed*. David, being pressed by Saul, fled into the territory of the Philistines; here he was recognised as the man who had proved such a dangerous enemy to them years since and he was brought before Achish, the king. Ps. lvi. is a prayer which implores help in the trouble of this period (and its relation to Ps. xxiv. resembles that of Ps. li. to xxxii.). David's life would have been lost had not his desperate attempt to escape by playing the part of a madman been successful. The king commanded him to depart, and David betook himself to a place of concealment in his own country, viz. the cave of Adullam in the wilderness of Judah.

The correctness of the inscription has been disputed. Hupfeld maintains that the writer has blindly taken it from 1 Sam. xxi. 14. According to Redslob, Hitzig, Olshausen, and Stähelin, he had reasons for so doing, although they are invalid. The טַעֲמוּ of the Psalm (ver. 9) seemed to him to accord with טַעְמָן, 1 Sam. xxi. 14; and in addition to this, he combined תִּתְהַלֵּל, *gloriaris,* of the Psalm (ver. 3) with וַיִּתְהוֹלֵל, *insanivit*, 1 Sam. xxi 14. We come to a different conclusion. The Psalm does not contain any express reference to that incident in Philistia, hence we infer that the writer of the inscription knew of this reference from tradition. His source of information is not the Books of Samuel; for there the king is called אָכִישׁ, whereas he calls him אֲבִימֶלֶךְ, and this, as even Basil has perceived (*vid.* Euthymius Zigadenus' introduction to this Psalm), is the title of the Philistine kings, just as *Pharaoh* is title of the Egyptian, *Agag* of the Amalekite, and *Lucumo* of the Etruscan kings. His source of information, as a comparison of 2 Sam. xxii. 1 with Ps. xviii. 1 shews, is a different work, viz. the Annals of David, in which he has traced the Psalm before us and other Psalms to their historical connection, and then indicated it by an inscription in words taken from that source. The fact of the Psalm being alphabetical says nothing against David as its author (*vid.* on Ps. ix.—x.). It is not arranged for music; for although it begins after the manner of a song of praise, it soon passes into the didactic tone. It consists of verses of two lines, which follow one another according to the order of the letters of the alphabet. The ו is wanting, just as the נ is wanting in Ps. cxlv.; and after ח, as in Ps. xxv., which is the counterpart to xxxiv., follows a second supernumerary פ.

Vers. 2—4. The poet begins with the praise of Jahve, and calls upon all the pious to unite with him in praising Him. The substantival clause ver. 2*b*, is intended to have just as much the force of a cohortative as the verbal clause ver. 2*a*. אברכה, like ויגרשהו, is to be written with *Chateph-Pathach* in the middle syllable. In distinction from עֲנִיִּים, *afflicti,* עֲנָוִים signifies *submissi*, those who have learnt endurance or patience in the school of affliction. The praise of

the psalmist will greatly help to strengthen and encourage such; for it applies to the Deliverer of the oppressed. But in order that this praise may sound forth with strength and fulness of tone, he courts the assistance of companions in ver. 4. To acknowledge the divine greatness with the utterance of praise is expressed by גָּדַל with an accusative in lxix. 31; in this instance with לְ: to offer גְּדֻלָּה unto Him, cf. xxix. 2. Even רוֹמֵם has this subjective meaning: with the heart and in word and deed, to place the exalted Name of God as high as it really is in itself. In accordance with the rule, that when in any word two of the same letters follow one another and the first has a *Sh^ebâ*, this *Sh^ebâ* must be an audible one, and in fact *Chateph Pathach* preceded by *Gaja* (*Metheg*), we must write וּנְרוֹמְמָה.

Vers. 5—7. The poet now gives the reason for this praise by setting forth the deliverance he has experienced. He longed for God and took pains to find Him (such is the meaning of דָּרַשׁ in distinction from בִּקֵּשׁ), and this striving, which took the form of prayer, did not remain without some actual answer (עָנָה is used of the being heard and the fulfilment as an answer to the petition of the praying one). The perfects, as also in vers. 6, 7, describe facts, one of which did not take place without the other; whereas וַיַּעֲנֵנִי would give them the relation of antecedent and consequent. In ver. 6, his own personal experience is generalised into an experimental truth, expressed in the historical form: they look unto Him and brighten up, *i. e.* whosoever looketh unto Him (הִבִּיט אֶל of a look of intense yearning, eager for salvation, as in Num. xxi. 9, Zech. xii. 10) brightens up. It is impracticable to make the עֲנָוִים from ver. 3 the subject; it is an act and the experience that immediately accompanies it, that is expressed with an universal subject and in gnomical perfects. The verb נָהַר, here as in Isa. lx. 5, has the signification to shine, glitter (whence נְהָרָה, light). Theodoret renders it: Ὁ μετὰ πίστεως τῷ θεῷ προσιὼν φωτὸς ἀκτῖνας δέχεται νοεροῦ, the gracious countenance of God is reflected on their faces; to the *actus directus* of *fides supplex* succeeds the *actus reflexus* of *fides triumphans*. It never comes to pass that their countenances must be covered with shame on account of disappointed hope: this shall not and

cannot be, as the sympathetic force of אֶל implies. In all the three dialects חָפַר (חָפֵר) has the signification of being ashamed and scared; according to Gesenius and Fürst (root פר) it proceeds from the primary signification of reddening, blushing; in reality, however, since it is to be combined, not with حمر, but with خمر (cf. كفر, كفر, غفر, غمر), it proceeds from the primary signification of covering, hiding, veiling (Arabic *chafira*, *tachaffara*, used of a woman, cf. *chamara*, to be ashamed, to blush, to be modest, used of both sexes), so that consequently the shame-covered countenance is contrasted with that which has a bright, bold, and free look. In ver. 7, this general truth is again individualised. By זֶה עָנִי (like זֶה סִינַי in lxviii. 9) David points to himself. From the great peril in which he was placed at the court of the Philistines, from which God has rescued him, he turns his thoughts with gratitude and praise to all the deliverances which lie in the past.

Vers. 8—11. This praise is supported by a setting forth of the gracious protection under which God's saints continually are. The מַלְאַךְ יהוה, is none other than He who was the medium of Jahve's intercourse with the patriarchs, and who accompanied Israel to Canaan. This name is not collective (Calvin, Hupfeld, Kamphausen, and others). He, the One, encampeth round about them, in so far as He is the Captain of the host of Jahve (Josh. v. 14), and consequently is accompanied by a host of inferior ministering angels; or insofar as He can, as being a spirit not limited by space, furnish protection that covers them on every side. חֹנֶה (cf. Zech. ix. 8) is perhaps an allusion to מָחֲנַיִם in Gen. xxxii. 2 sq., that angel-camp which joined itself to Jacob's camp, and surrounded it like a barricade or *carrago*. On the *fut. consec.* וַיְחַלְּצֵם, *et expedit eos*, as a simple expression of the sequence, or even only of a weak or loose internal connection, *vid.* Ewald, § 343, *a*. By reason of this protection by the Angel of God arises (ver. 9) the summons to test the graciousness of God in their own experience. Tasting (γεύσασθαι, Hebr. vi. 4 sq., 1 Pet. ii. 3) stands before seeing; for spiritual experience leads to spiritual perception or knowledge, and not *vice versâ*. *Nisi gustaveris*, says Bernard, *non videbis*.

David is desirous that others also should experience what he has experienced in order that they may come to know what he has come to know, viz. the goodness of God.* Hence, in ver. 10, the call to the saints to fear Jahve (יִרְאוּ instead of יִרְאוּ, in order to preserve the distinction between *veremini* and *videbunt*, as in Josh. xxiv. 14, 1 Sam. xii. 24); for whoso fears Him, possesses everything in Him. The young mature lions may sooner lack and suffer hunger, because they have no prey, than that he should suffer any want whatsoever, the goal of whose striving is fellowship with God. The verb רוּשׁ (to lack, be poor, once by metaplasm יָרַשׁ, 1 Sam. ii. 7, root רשׁ, to be or to make loose, lax), elsewhere used only of men, is here, like civ. 21 בִּקְּשׁ מֵאֵל, transferred to the lions, without כְּפִירִים being intended to refer emblematically (as in xxxv. 17, lvii. 5, xvii. 12) to his powerful foes at the courts of Saul and of Achish.

Vers. 12—15. The first main division of the Psalm is ended; the second (much the same as in Ps. xxxii.) assumes more the tone of a didactic poem; although even vers. 6, 9—11 have something of the didactic style about them. The poet first of all gives a direction for fearing God. We may compare xxxii. 8, li. 15 — how thoroughly Davidic is the turn which the Psalm here takes! בָּנִים are not children in years or in understanding; but it is a tender form of address of a master experienced in the ways of God to each one and to all, as in Prov. i. 8, and frequently. In ver. 13 he throws out the question, which he himself answers in vers. 14 sq. This form of giving impressiveness to a truth by setting it forth as a solution of some question that has been propounded is a habit with David: xv. 1, xxiv. 8, 10, xxv. 12. In the use made of this passage from the Psalms in 1 Pet. iii. 10—12 (= vers. 13—17*a* of the Psalm) this form of the question is lost sight of. To חָפֵץ חַיִּים, as being just as exclusive in sense, corresponds אֹהֵב יָמִים, so that consequently לִרְאוֹת is a definition of the purpose. ימים signifies days in the mass, just as חַיִּים means long-enduring life. We see from James

* On account of this ver. 9, Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε, κ. τ. λ., Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.) was the Communion Psalm of the early church, *Constit. Apost.* viii. 13, Cyril, *Catech. Myst.* v. 17.

iii. 2 sqq., where ver. 13 also, in its form, calls to mind the Psalm before us, why the poet give the pre-eminence to the avoiding of sins of the tongue. In ver. 15, from among what is good peace is made prominent, — peace, which not only are we not to disturb, but which we are to seek, yea, pursue it like as the hunter pursues the finest of the herds. Let us follow, says the apostle Paul also, Rom. xiv. 19 (cf. Hebr. xii. 14), after those things which make for peace. שָׁלוֹם is a relationship, harmonious and free from trouble, that is well-pleasing to the God of love. The idea of the bond of fellowship is connected with the corresponding word εἰρήνη, according to its radical notion.

Vers. 17—22. The poet now recommends the fear of God, to which he has given a brief direction, by setting forth its reward in contrast with the punishment of the ungodly. The prepositions אֶל and בְּ, in vers 16*a* and 17*a*, are a well considered interchange of expression: the former, of gracious inclination (xxxiii. 18), the latter, of hostile intention or determining, as in Job vii. 8, Jer. xxi. 10, xliv. 11, after the phrase in Lev. xvii. 10. The evil doers are overwhelmed by the power of destruction that proceeds from the countenance of Jahve, which is opposed to them, until there is not the slightest trace of their earthly existence left. The subjects to ver. 18 are not, according to cvii. 17—19, the עֹשֵׂי רָע (evil doers), since the indispensable characteristic of penitence is in this instance wanting, but the צַדִּיקִים (the righteous). Probably the פ strophe stood originally before the ע strophe, just as in Lam. ii—iv. the פ precedes the ע (Hitzig). In connection with the present sequence of the thoughts, the structure of ver. 18 is just like ver. 6: *Clamant et Dominus audit = si qui* (*quicunque*) *clamant.* What is meant is the cry out the depth of a soul that despairs of itself. Such crying meets with a hearing with God, and in its realisation, an answer that bears its own credentials. "The broken in heart" are those in whom the egotistical, *i. e.* self-loving, life, which encircles its own personality, is broken at the very root; "the crushed or contrite (דַּכְּאֵי, from דָּכָא, with a changeable *ā*, after the form אֲוִלוֹת from אָוִיל) in spirit" are those whom grievous experiences, leading to penitence, of the false eminence to which their proud self-

consciousness has raised them, have subdued and thoroughly humbled. To all such Jahve is nigh, He preserves them from despair, He is ready to raise up in them a new life upon the ruins of the old and to cover or conceal their infinitive deficiency; and, they, on their part, being capable of receiving, and desirous of, salvation, He makes them partakers of His salvation. It is true these afflictions come upon the righteous, but Jahve rescues him out of them all, מְכֻלָּם = מִכֻּלָּן (the same *enallage generis* as in Ruth i. 19, iv. 11). He is under the most special providence, "He keepeth all his bones, not one of them (*ne unum quidem*) is broken" — a pictorial exemplification of the thought that God does not suffer the righteous to come to the extremity, that He does not suffer him to be severed from His almighty protecting love, nor to become the sport of the oppressors. Nevertheless we call to mind the literal fulfilment which these words of the psalmist received in the Crucified One; for the Old Testament prophecy, which is quoted in John xix. 33—37, may be just as well referred to our Psalm as to Exod. xii. 46. Not only the Paschal lamb, but in a comparative sense even every affliction of the righteous, is a type. Not only is the essence of the symbolism of the worship of the sanctuary realised in Jesus Christ, not only is the history of Israel and of David repeated in Him, not only does human suffering attain in connection with Him its utmost intensity, but all the promises given to the righteous are fulfilled in Him κατ' ἐξοχήν; because He is the righteous One in the most absolute sense, the Holy One of God in a sense altogether unique (Isa. liii. 11, Jer. xxiii. 5, Zach. ix. 9, Acts iii. 14, xxii. 14). — The righteous is always preserved from extreme peril, whereas evil (רָעָה) slays (מוֹתֵת stronger than הֲמִית) the ungodly: evil, which he loved and cherished, becomes the executioner's power, beneath which he falls. And they that hate the righteous must pay the penalty. Of the meanings to incur guilt, to feel one's self guilty, and to undergo punishment as being guilty, אָשַׁם (*vid.* on iv. 11) has the last in this instance.

Ver. 23. The order of the alphabet having been gone through, there now follows a second פ exactly like xxv. 22. Just as the first פ, xxv. 16, is פְּנֵה, so here in ver. 17 it is

פְּ; and in like manner the two supernumerary *Phe*'s correspond to one another — the Elohimic in the former Psalm, and the Jehovic in this latter.

PSALM XXXV.

CALL TO ARMS AGAINST UNGRATEFUL PERSECUTORS, ADDRESSED TO GOD.

1 CONTEND, Jahve, with those who contend with me,
Fight Thou against those who fight against me.
2 Lay hold of shield and buckler,
And stand up as my help.
3 And draw forth the spear and shut up the way against my persecutors,
Say unto my soul: I am thy salvation.

4 Let those be confounded and ashamed who seek after my soul,
Let those fall back and be covered with shame who devise my hurt.
5 Let them become as chaff before the wind,
The Angel of Jahve thrusting them away.
6 Let their way become darkness and slipperinesses,
The Angel of Jahve pursuing them.

7 For without cause have they hid for me their net,
Without cause a pit have they digged for my soul.
8 Let destruction come upon him at unawares,
And let his net, which he hath hid, catch himself,
With a crash let him fall into it.

9 So shall my soul exult in Jahve,
It shall rejoice in His salvation.
10 All my bones shall say: Jahve, who is like unto Thee,
Who deliverest the afflicted from him who is too strong for him,
The afflicted and the poor from him who robbeth him!

11 Unjust witnesses rise up;
That which I know not, they ask of me.
12 They reward me evil for good,
Bereavement hath come upon my soul.
13 And I — when they were sick, my clothing was sackcloth,
I mortified my soul with fasting,
And my prayer returned into my own bosom.

14 As for a friend, a brother to me, did I go about,
As one who sorroweth for a mother, I went softly about in mourning attire.
15 And now when I halt they are joyous and gather themselves together,
The abjects gather themselves together against me, and those whom I do not know,
They mock and cease not.
16 After the manner of common parasites,
They gnash upon me with their teeth.

17 O Lord, how long wilt Thou look on?!
Bring back my soul from their destructions,
My only one from the lions.
18 I will praise Thee in a great congregation,
Among much people will I sing praise unto Thee.

19 Let not mine enemies falsely rejoice over me,
Let not those who hate me without a cause wink the eye.
20 For they utter not peaceful words,
But against those who are quiet in the land they devise deceitful matters.
21 And they open their mouth wide concerning me,
They say: Aha, aha, now our eye sees it.

22 Thou seest it, Jahve, therefore keep not silence;
O Lord, remain not far from me.
23 Stir up Thyself and awake to my right,
My God and my Lord, to my cause.

24 Do justice to me according to Thy righteousness, Jahve, my God,
And let them not rejoice over me.

25 Let them not say in their heart: Aha, it is our desire!
Let them not say: We have swallowed him up.
26 Let those be ashamed and be covered with confusion together
Who rejoice at my hurt,
Let those be clothed with shame and dishonour
Who magnify themselves against me.

27 Let those shout for joy and rejoice who do not envy me my right.
And let them say continually: Jahve be magnified,
Who hath pleasure in the prosperity of His servant.
28 And my tongue shall declare Thy righteousness,
Thy praise at all times.

This Ps. xxxv. and Ps. xxxiv. form a pair. They are the only Psalms in which the name מלאך יהוה is mentioned. The Psalms that belong to the time of David's persecution by Saul are the Psalms which are more especially pervaded by such retrospective references to the Tôra. And in fact this whole Psalm is, as it were, the lyrical expansion of that which David expresses before Saul in 1 Sam. xxiv. 16 [15, Engl.]. The critical opinion as to the authorship of this Psalm is closely allied with that respecting the author of Ps. xl. and lxix. to which Ps. xxxv. is nearly related; cf. vers. 21, 27 with xl. 16 sq.; ver. 13 with lxix. 11 sq.; whereas the relation of Ps. lxxi. to Ps. xxxv. is decidedly a secondary one. Hitzig conjectures it to be Jeremiah; but vers. 1—3 are appropriate in the lips of a persecuted king, and not of a persecuted prophet. The points of contact of the writings of Jeremiah with our Psalm (Jer. xviii. 19 sq., xxiii. 12, Lam. ii. 16), may therefore in this instance be more safely regarded as reminiscences of an earlier writer than in Ps. lxix. Throughout the whole Psalm there prevails a deep vexation of spirit (to which corresponds the suffix ימי, as in Ps. lix. lvi. xi. xvii. xxii. lxiv.)

and strong emotion; it is not until the second part, where the poet describes the base ingratitude of his enemies, that the language becomes more calm and transparent, and a more quiet sadness takes the place of indignation and rage.

Each of the three parts opens with a cry for deliverance; and closes, in the certain assumption that it will take place, with a vow of thanksgiving. The divisions cannot therefore be mistaken, viz. vers. 1—10, 11—18, 19—28. The relative numbers of the stichs in the separate groups is as follows: 6. 6. 5. 5. | 7. 7. 5. | 6. 6. 6. 5.

There are only a few Psalms of David belonging to the time of Saul's persecution, which, like Ps. xxii., keep within the limits of deep inward grief; and in scarcely a single instance do we find him confining himself to the expression of the accursed fate of his enemies with prophetic certainty, as that which he confidently expects will be realised (as, *e. g.*, in vii. 13—17). But for the most part the objective announcement of punishment is swallowed up by the force of his inmost feelings, and changed into the most importunate prayer (as in vii. 7, xvii. 13, and frequently); and this feverish glow of feeling becomes still more harshly prominent, when the prayer for the revelation of divine judgment in punishment passes over into a wish that it may actually take place. In this respect Ps. vii. xxxv. lxix. cix. form a fearful gradation. In Ps. cix., the old expositors count as many as thirty anathemas. What explanation can we give of such language coming from the lips and heart of the poet? Perhaps as paroxysms of a desire for revenge? His advance against Nabal shews that even a David was susceptible of such feelings; but 1 Sam. xxv. 32 sq. also shews that only a gentle stirring up of his conscience was needed to dissuade him from it. How much more natural — we throw out this consideration in agreement with Kurtz — that the preponderance of that magnanimity peculiar to him should have maintained its ascendancy in the moments of the highest religious consecration in which he composed his Psalms! It is inconceivable that the unholy fire of personal passion could be here mingled with the holy fire of his love to God. It is in fact the Psalms more especially, which are the purest and most faithful mirror of the piety of the Old Testament:

the duty of love towards one's enemies, however, is so little alien to the Old Testament (Exod. xxiii. 4 sq., Lev. xix. 18, Prov. xx. 22, xxiv. 17, xxv. 21 sq., Job xxxi. 29 sq.), that the very words of the Old Testament are made use of even in the New to inculcate this love. And from Ps. vii., in its agreement with the history of his conduct towards Saul, we have seen that David was conscious of having fulfilled this duty. All the imprecatory words in these Psalms come, therefore, from the pure spring of unself-seeking zeal for the honour of God. That this zeal appears in this instance as zeal for his own person or character arises from the fact, that David, as the God-anointed heir of the kingdom, stands in antagonism to Saul, the king alienated from God; and, that to his mind the cause of God, the continuance of the church, and the future of Israel, coincide with his own destiny. The fire of his anger is kindled at this focus (so to speak) of the view which he has of his own position in the course of the history of redemption. It is therefore a holy fire; but the spirit of the New Testament, as Jesus Himself declares in Luke ix. 55, is in this respect, nevertheless, a relatively different spirit from that of the Old. That act of divine love, redemption, out of the open fountain of which there flowed forth the impulse of a love which embraces and conquers the world, was then as yet not completed; and a curtain then still hung before eternity, before heaven and hell, so that imprecations like lxix. 20 were not understood, even by him who uttered them, in their infinite depth of meaning. Now that this curtain is drawn up, the New Testament faith shrinks back from invoking upon any one a destruction that lasts לעולם; and love seeks, so long as a mere shadow of possibility exists, to rescue everything human from the perdition of an unhappy future, — a perdition the full meaning of which cannot be exhausted by human thought.

In connection with all this, however, there still remains one important consideration. The curses, which are contained in the Davidic Psalms of the time of Saul's persecution, are referred to in the New Testament as fulfilled in the enemies of Jesus Christ, Acts i. 20, Rom. xi. 7—10. One expression found in our Psalm, ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν (cf. lxix. 5) is used by Jesus

(John xv. 25) as fulfilled in Him; it therefore appears as though the whole Psalm ought to be, or at least may be, taken typically as the words of Christ. But nowhere in the Gospels do we read an imprecation used by Jesus against His own and the enemies of the kingdom of God; David's imprecations are not suited to the lips of the Saviour, nor do the instances in which they are cited in the New Testament give them the impress of being His direct words: they are treated as the language of prophecy by virtue of the Spirit, whose instrument David was, and whose work the Scriptures are. And it is only in this sense that the Christian adopts them in prayer. For after the pattern of his Lord, who on the cross prayed "Father forgive them", he desires that even his bitterest enemies may not be eternally lost, but, though it be only when *in articulo mortis*, that they may come to their right mind. Even the anathemas of the apostle against the Judaising false teachers and against Alexander the smith (Gal. i. 9, v. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 14), refer only to temporal removal and chastisement, not to eternal perdition. They mark the extreme boundary where, in extraordinary instances, the holy zeal of the New Testament comes in contact with the holy fervour of the Old Testament.

Vers. 1—3. The psalmist begins in a martial and anthropomorphical style such as we have not hitherto met with. On the ultima-accentuation of רִיבָה, *vid.* on iii. 8. Both אֶת are signs of the accusative. This is a more natural rendering here, where the psalmist implores God to subjugate his foes, than to regard אֶת as equivalent to עִם (cf. Isa. xlix. 25 with *ib.* xxvii. 8, Job x. 2); and, moreover, for the very same reason the expression in this instance is לְחַם (in the *Kal*, which otherwise only lends the *part.* לֹחֵם, lvi. 2 sq., to the *Niph.* נִלְחַם) instead of the reciprocal form הִלָּחֵם. It is usually supposed that לָחַם means properly *vorare*, and war is consequently conceived of as a devouring of men; but the Arabic offers another primary meaning: to press close and compact (*Niph.* to one another), consequently מִלְחָמָה means a dense crowd, a dense bustle and tumult (cf. the Homeric κλόνος). The summons to Jahve to

arm, and that in a twofold manner, viz. with the מָגֵן for warding off the hostile blow and צִנָּה (*vid.* v. 13) which covers the body like a *testudo* — by which, inasmuch as it is impossible to hold both shields at the same time, the figure is idealised — is meant to express, that He is to make Himself felt by the foes, in every possible way, to their own confounding, as the unapproachable One. The ב of בְּעֶזְרָתִי (in the character of help turned towards me) is the so-called *Beth essentiæ*,* as in Exod. xviii. 4, Prov. iii. 26, Isa. xlviii. 10 (*tanquam argentum*), and frequently. הָרִיק has the same meaning as in Exod. xv. 9, cf. Gen. xiv. 14, viz. to bring forth, draw forth, to draw or unsheath (a sword); for as a sword is sheathed when not in use, so a spear is kept in the δουροδόκη (*Odyss.* i. 128). Even Parchon understands סְגֹר to mean a weapon; and the word σάγαρις, in Herodotus, Xenophon, and Strabo, a northern Asiatic, more especially a Scythian, battle-axe, has been compared here;** but the battle-axe was not a Hebrew weapon, and סְגֹר, which, thus defectively written, has the look of an imperative, also gives the best sense when so taken (LXX. σύγκλεισον, Targ. וּסְתַר), viz. close, *i. e.* cut off, *interclude* scil. *viam*. The word has *Dechi*, because לִקְרַאת רָדְפַי, "casting Thyself against my per-

---

* The Hebrew *Beth essentiæ* is used much more freely and extensively than the Arabic, which is joined exclusively to the predicate of a simple clause, where in our language the verb is "to be", and as a rule only to the predicate of negative clauses: *laisa bi-ḥakimin*, he is not wise, or *laisa bi-l-ḥakimi*, he is not the wise man. The predicate can accordingly be indeterminate or determinate. Moreover, in Hebrew, where this ב is found with the predicate, with the complement of the subject, or even, though only as a solecism (*vid.* Gesenius' *Thesaurus* p. 175), with the subject itself, the word to which it is prefixed may be determinate, whether as an attribute determined by itself (Exod. vi. 3, בְּאֵל שַׁדָּי), by a suffix (as above, xxxv. 2, cf. cxlvi. 5, Exod. xviii. 4, Prov. iii. 26), or even by the article. At all events no syntactic objection can be brought against the interpretations of בָּעָשָׁן, "in the quality of smoke", xxxvii. 20; cf. כַּהֶבֶל, lxxviii. 33, and of בַּנֶּפֶשׁ, "in the character of the soul", Lev. xvii. 11.

** Probably one and the same word with the Armenian *sakr*, to which are assigned the (Italian) meanings *mannaja, scure, brando ferro*, in Ciakciak's Armenian Lexicon; cf. Lagarde's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1866, S. 203.

secutors", belongs to both the preceding summonses. Dachselt rightly directs attention to the similar sequence of the accents in lv. 19, lxvi. 15. The Mosaic figure of Jahve as a man of war (אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה, Exod. xv. 3, Deut. xxxii. 41 sq.) is worked out here with brilliant colours, under the impulse of a wrathful spirit. But we see from ver. 3*b* what a spiritual meaning, nevertheless, the whole description is intended to convey. In God's intervention, thus manifested in facts, he would gladly hear His consolatory utterance to himself. The burden of his cry is that God's love may break through the present outward appearance of wrath and make itself felt by him.

Vers. 4—8. Throughout the next two strophes follow terrible imprecations. According to Fürst and others the relation of בּוֹשׁ and חָפֵר is like that of *erblassen*, to turn pale (cf. Isa. xxix. 22 with Ps. xxxiv. 6), and *erröthen*, to turn red, to blush. בּוֹשׁ has, however, no connection with בּוּץ, nor has חפר, חפף, חמר, any connection with חמר, to be red; but, according to its radical notion, בּוֹשׁ means *disturbari* (*vid.* vi. 11), and חָפֵר, *obtegere, abscondere (vid.* xxxiv. 6). יִסֹּגוּ, properly "let them be made to fall back" (cf., *e. g.*, Isa. xlii. 17). On the figure in ver. 5*a* cf. lxxxiii. 14. The clauses respecting the Angel of Jahve, vers. 5*b* and 6*b*, are circumstantial clauses, viz. clauses defining the manner. הֹדֹּחֵה (giving, viz. them, the push that shall cause their downfall, equivalent to הֹדְּחָם or הֹדְּחָם, lxviii. 28) is closely connected with the figure in ver. 6*a*, and רִדְפָם, with the figure in ver. 5*a*; consequently it seems as though the original position of these two clauses respecting the Angel of Jahve had been disturbed; just as in Ps. xxxiv., the ע strophe and the פ strophe have changed their original places. It is the Angel, who took off Pharaoh's chariot wheels so that they drave them heavily (Exod. xiv. 25) that is intended here. The fact that this Angel is concerned here, where the point at issue is whether the kingship of the promise shall be destroyed at its very beginning or not, harmonises with the appearing of the מַלְאַךְ יי at all critical junctures in the course of the history of redemption. חֲלַקְלַקּוֹת, *loca passim lubrica*, is an intensive form of expression for חֲלָקוֹת, lxxiii. 18. Just as הֹדֹּחֵה recalls to mind Exod.

xv., so רִדְפֵם recalls Judges v. In this latter passage the Angel of Jahve also appears in the midst of the conquerors who are pursuing the smitten foe, incarnate as it were in Deborah.

Ver. 7 also needs re-organising, just as in vers. 5 sq. the original positions of דחה and רדפם are exchanged. שַׁחַת רִשְׁתָּם would be a pit deceptively covered over with a net concealed below; but, as even some of the older critics have felt, שחת is without doubt to be brought down from ver. 7*a* into 7*b*: without cause, *i. e.* without any provocation on my part, have they secretly laid their net for me (as in ix. 16, xxxi. 5), without cause have they digged a pit for my soul. In ver. 8 the foes are treated of collectively. לֹא יֵדַע is a negative circumstantial clause (Ew. § 341, *b*): *improviso*, as in Prov. v. 6, Isa. xlvii. 11 *extrem.* Instead of תִּלְכְּדֶנּוּ, the expression is תִּלְכְּדוּ, as in Hos. viii. 3; the sharper form is better adapted to depict the suddenness and certainty of the capture. According to Hupfeld, the verb שָׁאָה signifies a wild, dreary, confused noise or crash, then devastation and destruction, a transition of meaning which — as follows from שׁוֹאָה (cf. תֹּהוּ) as a name of the desolate steppe, from שָׁוְא, a waste, emptiness, and from other indications — is solely brought about by transferring the idea of a desolate confusion of tones to a desolate confusion of things, without any intermediate notion of the crashing in of ruins. But it may be asked whether the reverse is not rather the case, viz. that the signification of a waste, desert, emptiness or void is the primary one, and the meaning that has reference to sound (cf. هَوَى, to gape, be empty; to drive along, fall down headlong, then also: to make a dull sound as of something falling, just like *rumor* from *ruere, fragor* from *frangi*) the derived one. Both etymology (cf. תָּהָה, whence תֹּהוּ) and the preponderance of other meanings, favour this latter view. Here the two significations are found side by side, inasmuch as שׁוֹאָה in the first instance means a waste = devastation, desolation, and in the second a waste = a heavy, dull sound, a rumbling (δοῦπεῖν). In the Syriac version it is rendered: "into the pit which he has digged let him fall", as though it were שַׁחַת in the second instance instead of שׁוֹאָה; and from this Hupfeld, with J. H. Michaelis, Stier, and others,

is of opinion that it must be rendered: "into the destruction which he himself has prepared let him fall". But this *quam ipse paravit* is not found in the text, and to mould the text accordingly would be a very arbitrary proceeding.

Vers. 9—10. This strophe, with which the first part of the song closes, contains the logical apodosis of those imprecatory jussives. The downfall of the power that is opposed to God will be followed by the joy of triumph. The bones of the body, which elsewhere are mentioned as sharing only in the anguish of the soul (vi. 3, xxxi. 11, xxxii. 3, li. 10), are here made to share (as also in li. 10) in the joy, into which the anxiety, that agitated even the marrow of the bones, is changed. The joy which he experiences in his soul shall throb through every member of his body and multiply itself, as it were, into a choir of praiseful voices. כָּל with a conjunctive accent and without *Makkeph*, as also in Prov. xix. 7 (not כָּל־, *vid.* the Masora in Baer's *Psalterium* p. 133), is to be read *cāl* (with קמץ רחב, *opp.* קמץ חטוף) according to Kimchi. According to Lonzano, however, it is to be read *col*, the conjunctive accent having an equal power with *Makkeph*; but this view is false, since an accent can never be placed against *Kametz chatuph*. The exclamation מִי כָמוֹךָ is taken from Exod. xv. 11, where, according to the Masora, it is to be pointed מִי כָמֹךָ, as Ben Naphtali also points it in the passage before us. The *Dagesh*, which is found in the former passage and is wanting here, sharpens and hardens at the same time; it requires that the expression should be emphatically pronounced (without there being any danger in this instance of its being slurred over); it does not serve to denote the closer connection, but to give it especial prominence. חָזָק מִמֶּנּוּ, stronger than he, is equivalent to: strong, whereas the other is weak, just as in Jer. xxxi. 11, cf. Hab. i. 13, צַדִּיק מִמֶּנּוּ, righteous, whereas he is ungodly. The repetition of וְעָנִי is meant to say: He rescues the עָנִי, who is אֶבְיוֹן (poor) enough already, from him who would take even the few goods that he possesses.

Vers. 11—16. The second part begins with two strophes of sorrowful description of the wickedness of the enemy. The futures in vers. 11, 12 describe that which at present takes place. עֵדֵי חָמָס are μάρτυρες ἄδικοι (LXX.). They demand from him

a confession of acts and things which lie entirely outside his consciousness and his way of acting (cf. lxix. 5): they would gladly brand him as a perjurer, as an usurper, and as a plunderer. What David complains of in ver. 12*a*, we hear Saul confess in 1 Sam. xxiv. 18; the charge of ingratitude is therefore well-grounded. שְׁכוֹל לְנַפְשִׁי is not dependent on וַיְשַׁלְּמוּנִי, in which case one would have looked for כְּשׁוֹל rather than שְׁכוֹל, but a substantival clause: "bereavement is to my soul", its condition is that of being forsaken by all those who formerly shewed me marks of affection; all these have, as it were, died off so far as I am concerned. Not only had David been obliged to save his parents by causing them to flee to Moab, but Michal was also torn from him, Jonathan removed, and all those at the court of Saul, who had hitherto sought the favour and friendship of the highly-gifted and highly-honoured son-in-law of the king, were alienated from him. And how sincerely and sympathisingly had he reciprocated their leanings towards himself! By וַאֲנִי in ver. 13, he contrasts himself with the ungrateful and unfeeling ones. Instead of לְבַשְׁתִּי שָׂק, the expression is לְבוּשִׁי שָׂק; the tendency of poetry for the use of the substantival clause is closely allied to its fondness for well-conceived brevity and pictorial definition. He manifested towards them a love which knew no distinction between the *ego* and *tu,* which regarded their sorrow and their guilt as his own, and joined with them in their expiation for it; his head was lowered upon his breast, or he cowered, like Elijah (1 Kings xviii. 42), upon the ground with his head hanging down upon his breast even to his knees, so that that which came forth from the inmost depths of his nature returned again as it were in broken accents into his bosom. Riehm's rendering, "at their ungodliness and hostility my prayer for things not executed came back", is contrary to the connection, and makes one look for אֲלֵי instead of אֶל־חֵיקִי. Perret-Gentil correctly renders it, *Je priai la tête penchée sur la poitrine.*

The psalmist goes on to say in ver. 14, I went about as for a friend, for a brother to me, *i. e.* as if the sufferer had been such to me. With הִתְהַלָּךְ, used of the solemn slowness of gait, which corresponds to the sacredness of pain, alternates שָׁחַח used of the being bowed down very

low, in which the heavy weight of pain finds expression. כְּאֵבֶל־אֵם, not: like the mourning (from אֵבֶל, like הֵבֶל from הֶבֶל) of a mother (Hitzig), but, since a personal אָבֵל is more natural, and next to the mourning for an only child the loss of a mother (cf. Gen. xxiv. 67) strikes the deepest wound: like one who mourns (כְּאֵבֶל־* , like לְבֶן־, Gen. xlix. 12, from אֵבֶל, construct state, like טְמֵא) for a mother (the objective genitive, as in Gen. xxvii. 41, Deut. xxxiv. 8, Amos viii. 10, Jer. vi. 26). קֹדֵר signifies the colours, outward appearance, and attire of mourning: with dark clothes, with tearful unwashed face, and with neglected beard. But as for them — how do they act at the present time, when he finds himself in צֶלַע (xxxviii. 17, Job. xviii. 12), a sideway direction, *i. e.* likely to fall (from צָלַע, טָלַע, to incline towards the side)? They rejoice and gather themselves together, and this assemblage of ungrateful friends rejoicing over another's misfortune, is augmented by the lowest rabble that attach themselves to them. The verb נָכָה means to smite; *Niph.* נִנְכֶּה, Job xxx. 6, to be driven forth with a whip, after which the LXX. renders it μάστιγες, Symm. πλῆκται, and the Targum *conterentes me verbis suis;* cf. הִכָּה בַלָּשׁוֹן, Jer. xviii. 18. But נְכִים cannot by itself mean smiters with the tongue. The adjective נָכֶה signifies elsewhere with רַגְלַיִם, one who is smitten in the feet, *i. e.* one who limps or halts, and with רוּחַ, but also without any addition, in Isa. xvi. 7, one smitten in spirit, *i. e.* one deeply troubled or sorrowful. Thus, therefore, נְכִים from נָכֶה, like נְאִים from נָאֶה, may mean smitten men, *i. e.* men who are brought low or reduced (Hengstenberg). It might also, after the Arabic *nawika*, to be injured in mind, *anwak*, stupid, silly (from the same root נך, to prick, smite, wound, cf. *ichtalla*, to be pierced through = mad), be understood as those mentally deranged, enraged at nothing or without cause. But the former definition of the notion of the word is favoured by the continua-

* According to the old Babylonian reading (belonging to a period when *Pathach* and *Segol* were as yet not distinguished from one another), כְּאֲבַל (with the sign of *Pathach* and the stroke for *Raphe* below = *ă*); *vid.* Pinsker, *Zur Geschichte des Karaismus*, S. 141, and *Einleitung*, S. 118.

tion of the idea of the verbal adjective נכים by וְלֹא יָדָעְתִּי, persons of whom I have hitherto taken no notice because they were far removed from me, *i. e.* men belonging to the dregs of the people (cf. Job xix. 18, xxx. 1). The addition of ולא ידעתי certainly makes Olshausen's conjecture that we should read נָכְרִים somewhat natural; but the expression then becomes tautological, and there are other instances also in which psalm-poesy goes beyond the ordinary range of words, in order to find language to describe that which is loathsome, in the most glaring way. קָרַע, to tear, rend in pieces, viz. with abusive and slanderous words (like קרע II.) also does not occur anywhere else. And what remarkable language we now meet with in ver. 16*a*! מָעִיג does not mean scorn or buffoonery, as Böttcher and Hitzig imagine*, but according to 1 Kings xvii. 12, a cake of a round formation (like the Talmudic עֻגָּה, a circle); לָעַג, jeering, jesting. Therefore לַעֲגֵי מָעוֹג means: mockers for a cake, *i. e.* those who for a delicate morsel, for the sake of dainty fare, make scornful jokes, viz. about me, the persecuted one, vile parasites; German *Tellerlecker, Bratenriecher,* Greek κνισσοκόλακες, ψωμοκόλακες, Mediæval Latin *buccellarii.* This לַעֲגֵי מָעוֹג, which even Rashi interprets in substantially the same manner, stands either in a logical co-ordinate relation (*vid.* on Isa. xix. 11) or in a logical as well as grammatical subordinate relation to its *regens* חֲנֵפֵי. In the former case, it would be equivalent to: the profane, viz. the cake-jesters; in the latter, which is the more natural, and quite suitable: the profane (= the profanest, *vid.* xlv. 13, Isa. xxix. 19, Ezek. vii. 24) among cake-jesters. The בְּ is not the *Beth* of companionship or fellowship, to express which עִם or אֵת (Hos. vii. 5) would have been used, but *Beth essentiæ* or the *Beth* of characterisation: in the character of the most abject examples of this class of men do they gnash upon him with their teeth. The gerund חָרֹק (of the noise of the teeth being pressed together, like حرق of the crackling of a fire and the grating of a file), which is used according to Ges. § 131,

* The Talmudic עגה (לשון), *B. Sanhedrin* 101*b*, which is said to mean "a jesting way of speaking", has all the less place here, as the reading wavers between עגה (עגא) and אגא.

4, *b*, carries its subject in itself. They gnash upon him with their teeth after the manner of the profanest among those, by whom their neighbour's honour is sold for a delicate morsel.

Vers. 17—18. Just as the first part of the Psalm closed with wishes, and thanksgiving for their fulfilment, so the second part also closes with prayer and thanksgiving. כַּמָּה (compounded of כְּ, *instar*, and the interrogative מָה which is drawn into the genitive by it; Aramaic כְּמָא, Arabic *kam*, Hebrew, like בַּמָּה, with *Dag. forte conjunct.*, properly: the total of what?), which elsewhere means *quot*, here has the signification of *quousque*, as in Job vii. 19. מִשֹּׁאֵיהֶם from שְׁאָה, the plural of which may be both שְׁאִים and שְׁאוֹת (this latter, however, does not occur), like the plural of אֵימָה, terror, אֵימִים and אֵימוֹת. The suffix, which refers to the enemies as the authors of the destructions (Prov. iii. 25), shews that it is not to be rendered "from their destroyers" (Hitzig). If God continues thus to look on instead of acting, then the destructions, which are passing over David's soul, will utterly destroy it. Hence the prayer: lead it back, bring that back, which is already well nigh borne away to destruction. On יְחִידָה *vid.* xxii. 21. The כְּפִירִים, which is intended literally in xxxiv. 11, is here emblematical. אוֹדְךָ is the cohortative. עָצוּם as a parallel word to רַב always refers, according to the context, to strength of numbers or to strength of power.

Vers. 19—21. In the third part, vers. 19—28 the description of the godlessness of his enemies is renewed; but the soul of the praying psalmist has become more tranquil, and accordingly the language also is more clear and moves on with its accustomed calmness. שֶׁקֶר and חִנָּם are genitives, having an attributive sense (*vid.* on 2 Sam. xxii. 23). The verb קָרַץ signifies both to pinch = nip, Job xxxiii. 6 (cf. the Arabic *ḳaraḍa*, to cut off), and to pinch together, compress = to wink, generally used of the eyes, but also of the lips, Prov. xvi. 30, and always as an insidiously malicious gesture. אַל rules over both members of the verse as in lxxv. 6, and frequently. שָׁלוֹם in ver. 20 is the word for whatever proceeds from good intentions and aims at the promotion or restoration of a harmonious relationship.

רְגְעֵי־אֶרֶץ (from רָגַע, cf. עַנְוֵי־אֶרֶץ, lxxvi. 10, Zeph. ii. 3, צְפוּנֶיךָ, lxxxiii. 4) are those who quietly and unostentatiously walk in the ways of God. Against such they devise mischievous, lying slanders and accusations. And with wide-opened mouth, *i. e.* haughty scorn, they cry, as they carouse in sight of the misfortune of those they have persecuted: now we have that which we have longed to see. הֶאָח (composed of הֶהּ and אָח) is a cry of joy, and more especially of malignant joy at another's hurt (cf. Ezek. xxv. 3).

Vers. 22—24. The poet takes up this malignant "now our eye sees it" and gives another turn to it. With יהוה, alternates in vers. 22, 23, cf. ver. 17, אֲדֹנָי, the pronominal force of which is revived in the combination אֱלֹהַי וַאדֹנָי (*vid.* xvi. 2). הֵעִיר, carrying its object within itself, signifies to stir, rouse up, and הֵקִיץ, to break off, tear one's self away, gather one's self up from, sleep. "To my right", viz. to prove it by facts; "to my cause", to carry it on in my defence.

Vers. 25—26. On the metonymical use of נפשׁ, like τὸ ὀρεκτικόν for ὄρεξις, *vid. Psychol.* S. 203 [tr. p. 239]. The climax of desire is to swallow David up, *i. e.* to overpower him and clear him out of the way so that there is not a trace of him left. בִּלְּעֲנוּהוּ with ע before נ, as in cxxxii. 6, and frequently; on the law of the vowels which applies to this, *vid.* Ewald, § 60, *a*. שְׂמֵחֵי רָעָתִי is a short form of expression for שְׂמֵחִים עַל (בְּ) רָעָתִי. To put on shame and dishonour (cix. 29, cf. 18), so that these entirely cover them, and their public external appearance corresponds with their innermost nature.

Vers. 27—28. Those who wish that David's righteousness may be made manifest and be avenged are said to take delight in it. When this takes place, Jahve's righteousness is proved. יְגַדַּל, let Him be acknowledged and praised as great, *i. e.* let Him be magnified! David desires that all who remain true to him may thus speak; and he, on his part, is determined to stir up the revelation of God's righteousness in his heart, and to speak of that of which his heart is full (lxxi. 24).

DATE DUE

Demco, Inc. 38-293

BS1430 .D355 1877 v.1 REG STORAGE
Biblical commentary on the Psalms
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00085 5553