

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-18-1936

A Refutation of Modern Higher Critical Arguments Against the Authenticity of the Davidic Psalms

W C. Koester

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_koesterw@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Koester, W C., "A Refutation of Modern Higher Critical Arguments Against the Authenticity of the Davidic Psalms" (1936). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 701.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/701>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

A REFUTATION OF MODERN HIGHER CRITICAL ARGUMENTS
AGAINST THE
AUTHENTICITY OF THE DAVIDIC PSALMS

W. C. KOESTER

Accepted - May 18, 1936

Walter A. Meier

John T. Dumm

A REFUTATION OF MODERN HIGHER CRITICAL ARGUMENTS
AGAINST THE
AUTHENTICITY OF THE DAVIDIC PSALMS

In discussing the fundamental fallacies of the higher critical arguments in this field, we might well state just what higher criticism is, and the avenues of attack it uses in approaching the Davidic Psalms. Eichhorn has the distinction of having coined the term "The higher criticism" and is followed by others in defining it as "The discovery and verification of the facts regarding the origin, form and value of literary productions upon the basis of their internal characters." As we shall see, however, the higher critics are not averse to using other sources of argument, historical and conjectural. Other names for the movement have been the "historic view" and the "documentary hypothesis."

Setting out to inspect literary productions, the higher critics seek to ascertain their dates, their authors and their value "as they themselves may yield the evidence." It is our purpose here, however, to deal only with their considerations advanced in opposition to the conservative view, that David is the author of those Psalms ascribed to him in their titles (seventy-three in all), and in favor of the critical view, advocating a late origin in either exilic or

post-exilic times. In classifying their arguments we find that there are essentially three modes of attack used against the authenticity of the Davidic Psalms. It is claimed by the higher critics that:

- 1) The linguistic evidence in these Psalms would deny the Davidic authorship and indicate a late origin.
- 2) The situation presented is unadapted to David's character and surroundings.
- 3) The theological conceptions presuppose the teachings of a later age.

In presenting a refutation of these claims, it shall be our intention to investigate, in all fairness, the higher critical mode of procedure and validity of conclusion, in respect to the matter discussion.

I

LANGUAGE

In meeting the arguments of higher critics against the authenticity of the Davidic Psalms we might summarize their objections, in the language sphere, in the question: Does the text as we have it now stand and if it does, is it the language of David and David's time or the linguistic expression of a much later date? Following this general idea objections are, of course, first raised against the titles of the Psalms. Indeed characteristic of the general critical opinion are the words of Driver in "An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" (p.374) "The Titles are suspicious, from the circumstance that almost the only names of authors mentioned are David, and two or three prominent singers of David's age; except in the case of those attributed to the 'Sons of Korah,' no author is named of a date later than that of Solomon." That such suspicions are really unjustified will be seen especially when in the second main division we discuss David's situation and character showing not only the possibility but even more than the probability that this was Israel's golden age of Psalmody. Merely taking the objection here at its face value the argument might well be reversed due to the fact that with the exception of a very few cases we find no definite allusions to events or persons later than the time of Solomon. This would surely point to an

early date. We might say here that alleged allusions to a later date made in Psalms, ascribed in the title to David, cannot be proven to be such, as will also be shown later in the discussion of the contents. That the critical idea of titles being contradicted by contents is purely assumption has been well proven by Dr. Kyle (Ip.458f.) and cannot be considered here in detail. As to the opinion that it is queer that we find no references to men later than Solomon would you say; it is queer that in a political history of the United States written during the World War we find no references to Roosevelt's New Deal or the N.R.A. Or, to draw a parallel more applicable as to the time involved, would you say that Caesar's stories of the Gallic Wars are not reliable since they fail to mention Luther's Reformation?

Now regarding the position of the titles in the text itself. Raven (Old Testament Introduction p. 257) would confront us with a plain statement "They are not a part of the original text of the Psalms" while Cornill would present a seemingly more scientific argument in the words: "Da tritt uns nun zunaechst die hoechst beachtenswerthe Thatsache entgegen, dass diese Ueberschriften textkritisch nicht feststehn und nicht sicher ueberliefert sind. LXX naemlich weigt von denen in hebraeischen Texte ganz bedeutend ab. Zwar jene zuletzt genannten 13 historischen hat LXX eben so wie der hebraeische Text: aber die zu 51, 52, 54, 57, 67 u. 142 scheinen in LXX spaeter hexaplarischer Zusatz zu sein, da sie die ihnen allen gemeinsame Wendung ganz anders und zwar grauenhaft hebraisierend

uebersetzen. - - - Neben dem hebraeischen Text und LXX steht dann auch noch die Peschitto mit gleichfalls von beiden ganz abweichenden Ueberschriften. Hieraus ergibt sich, dass von einer festen textkritischen Ueberlieferung in Bezug auf diese Ueberschriften nicht die Rede sein kann."

I say seemingly more scientific for I would prefer to leave that scholar speak who "proposed to spend fifteen years in language study, fifteen years in Biblical textual study in the light of the findings of his studies in philology, and then, God willing, fifteen years of writing out his findings, so that others might share them with him." (P.E.Howard's Foreward to "Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?" by R. D. Wilson p.9)

I take pleasure in quoting from "A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament" published during those last "fifteen years." (p.198f.)

"As to the text of the headings of the Psalms, the evidence of the manuscripts and versions goes to show that they are not merely substantially the same as they were in the third century B.C., but that most of them even then have been hoary with age. Even when the Septuagint version was made, the meaning of many of the terms used in the headings were already unknown, and the significance of many words and phrases had passed out of mind. A large proportion of the names is not to be found in later Hebrew and in no Aramaic dialect."

"Besides, the Hebrew manuscripts and all of the great ancient primary versions agree almost absolutely with the text of our ordinary Hebrew Bibles and their English versions in

attributing seventy-three of the Psalms to David as the author or subject of the respective Psalms. The Greek edition of Swete agrees in attributing to David every one of the seventy-three. The edition of the Latin Gallican version of Harden - - (Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi, edited with introduction and Apparatus Criticus by J. M. Harden, D.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Dublin; London, The Macmillan Co., 1922) agrees in all but the twenty-second; where, however, E and H, two of the best manuscripts, do agree. The Syriac-Peschitto version of Walton's Polyglot agrees in regard to all, except the 13th, 39th, and the 124th. And the Aramaic of Walton's Polyglot ascribes to David every one of the seventy-three, except the 122nd, the 131st, and the 133rd."

"It will be noted that all the five texts, the Hebrew and its four great ancient versions, agree that sixty-six out of the seventy-three psalms were either written by, or for, or concerning David (The Hebrew preposition "le" may mean "by," "for," or "concerning"), and that four out of five of these agree in regard to all the seventy-three." NOTE: Regarding the preposition "le" as by, for, or concerning David, see below.

To the above arguments we might well add the thought that these titles could hardly have been treated by later persons in view of the fact that fifty of them are left without titles and the titles that are given show a definite lack of uniformity, at least the kind of uniformity we would expect of one who would supply a fictitious author. Reply must here be made to W. Robertson Smith's theory as presented in "The Old Testament

in the Jewish Church" p. 202, 95f. when he says: "Noone, I imagine, will be prepared to affirm on general grounds that the Jews of the last pre-Christian centuries either lacked curiosity as to the authorship of their sacred books, or were prepared to restrain their curiosity within the limits prescribed by the rules of evidence." Drawing a parallel from the divergence of manuscripts in ascribing the Epistle to the Hebrews to Paul and from LXX differences he comes to the conclusion that it was a later Jewish tendency to attach titles to the various existing writings. In response we might say that it would hardly be supposed that the writer of these headings would make his work appear absurd by making statements which his contemporaries would know to be untrue. Much less would a post-exilic Psalm writer add the name of a pre-exilic author, had these Psalms, as is generally supposed by the critics, first made their appearance in post-exilic times. Furthermore, it was customary for Hebrew writers to sign names to their productions, as we may well see from 2 Sam. 23, 1: "Now these be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said, etc." In spite of the fact that these words are rejected by critics along with 2 Sam. 22 we must say that these words stand along with Is. 38,9 (also denied) and Hab. 3, 1 for reasons which can obviously not be discussed here in detail.

J. A. Bewer's argument (The Literature of the Old Testament p. 342) that the titles were added to increase the

fascination of the Psalms by connecting them with historical events, might hold as well in David's time as he maintains it holds in post-exilic time. If we better understand and more thoroughly enjoy a poem or song when we have it in its historical connection can anyone logically argue that the people of Israel at the time of David could not experience the same sensation?

We might well say here that whenever data is given, as, for instance in the New Testament, it always points to the originality of the title. Acts 2, 33 is a fine example for here we find Peter, on the day of Pentecost citing a portion of the 16th Psalm, ascribed in the title to David, introducing the quotation with "For David speaketh concerning Him, etc." The finest example, however, seems to be in the New Testament references to Psalm 110, as we find them in Matt. 22, 43. 45; Mark 12, 36 ff; Luke 20, 41 ff. To Briggs' attempt to explain away these passages (II, 376) with the words, "We might say, furthermore, that to the author of the Psalm, Jesus is arguing on the basis of common opinion, and that He either did not in His Kenosis know otherwise, or else, if He knew did not care to correct the opinion," we can give no better answer than the words of Dr. Maier (Mimeographed Notes on Ps. 110, p. 2) "This position, however, cannot be held, for Jesus never accepted any erroneous, but popular, theory as true, simply because it was 'common opinion.' To say that Jesus, in the state of humiliation, did not know who the real author of the Psalm was, is simply an unwarranted stricture on the ability of Jesus in

L. 7

this state and on assumption which is both unnatural and void of all possible demonstration. And finally, to assert that Jesus knew better but 'did not care to correct the opinion,' is making Christ part and party to a misrepresentation."

The text of the titles is not the only thing that is subjected to the doubtful reasoning of the critics. Regarding the text of the Psalms themselves we are met with such words as those of W. Robertson Smith (The Old Testament in the Jewish Church p. 192 f.), "In entering upon this study, it is highly important to carry with us the fact that the Psalms are preserved to us, not in an historical collection but in a hymn-book specially adopted for the use of the Second Temple. The plan of a hymn-book does not secure that every poem shall be given exactly as it was written by the first author. The practical object of the collection makes it legitimate and perhaps necessary that there should be such adaptations and alterations as may secure a larger scope of practical utility in ordinary services." Pointing out several text variations and indicating especially the alphabetical acrostics, he summarizes in the words: "In general, then, we conclude that the oldest text of a sacred lyric is not always preserved in the Psalter. And so, again, we must not suppose that the notes of author's names in a hymn-book have the same weight as the statements of an historical book. In a liturgical collection the author's name is of little consequence, and the editors who altered the text of a poem cannot be assumed a priori to

have taken absolute care to preserve a correct record of its origin." Aside from the fact that the text of the Psalms does constitute an historical collection and was not "specially adapted for the use of the Second Temple" as will be shown subsequently when we discuss the arguments of those who claim the Psalms are post-exilic, this theory is here subject to various observations.

The arguments presented above for the trustworthiness of the titles hold, of course, in an even greater degree in regard to the reliability of the text itself. Of course, we cannot consider in detail here the establishment of the Old Testament Canon but there can be no reason for supposing that the Psalms along with their headings could not be kept intact through the confusion of the destruction of Jerusalem and other national calamities in view of the fact that the sources of Samuel, Kings, and most of the prophets were, admittedly, preserved. The agreement of the manuscripts and the great ancient versions must indeed be weighty testimony against a supposition that care was not taken to preserve a correct record. We must remember too that the variations pointed out in the Old Testament are indeed few when we consider the time element involved, the facilities at hand and the hindrances that had to be overcome. We find much less care exercised for a shorter period in preserving the text of the New Testament. To suppose that a people who looked upon David as the model king of all ages and prized his efforts in their behalf and in behalf of their God-given worship so highly, - to

suppose that even the faithful of Israel would not preserve the words of their great king and prophet is, on the basis of the very supposition, ridiculous.

Others again accept the text but try to explain away its inferences or, for reasons of vocabulary and style, classify it as the production of a later age. Consideration will first be given those who would accept divergent meanings for the plain expressions in the titles. Critics consistently refuse to accept the lamedh in "ledawid," as the lamedh auctoris explained in Gesenius (129,b) in these words: "The introduction of the author, poet, etc., by this lamedh auctoris is the customary idiom also in other Semitic dialects, especially in Arabic." Discussions arise as to whether this lamedh refers to one "to whom the Psalm is dedicated or of the collection or hymn-book to which the Psalm originally belonged." (J. H. Raven, Old Testament Introduction General and Special, p. 257) The words of Driver are characteristic of others (Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 381) "The Psalms ascribed to the sons of Korah were derived, it is reasonable to suppose, from a collection of Psalms in the possession of the Levitical family, or guild, of that name, in the time of the Second Temple. Those ascribed to Asaph, Heman, and Ethan may have a similar origin: They may be taken from collections not necessarily composed by these three singers respectively, but in the possession of families or guilds claiming descent from them: The title שֶׁלֶחַ, for instance, prefixed by a compiler to the Psalms extracted from one of these collections,

D. 10

as an indication of the source whence it was taken, and meant by him to signify belonging to Asaph, would be ambiguous, and would readily lend itself to be understood in the sense of written by Asaph. The explanation of 7172 may be similar. It is far from impossible that there may have been a collection known as 'David's,' the beginnings of which may date from early pre-exilic times, but which afterwards was augmented by the addition of Psalms composed subsequently: Either the collection itself came ultimately to be regarded as Davidic, or a compiler excerpting from it, prefixed 7172 as an indication of the source whence a Psalm was taken, which was afterward misunderstood as denoting its author: In either case the incorrect attribution of Psalms to David upon a large scale becomes intelligible." We might say here that Gray presents another argument for this view from the duplication of the lamedh in the titles inferring from this phenomenon that the Psalm was to be found in two collections that "of the chief musician" and that "of David" or Asaph or whatever the case may be. (Cp. Gray, Critical Introduction to the Old Testament p. 133)

Would it be unreasonable, in the first place, to ask if it is "reasonable to suppose" that if there were hymn-books named after Moses, Solomon, Ethan and Heman, we find so few Psalms remaining of such a collection? That Hebrew tradition referred these titles to the authors is evident from the fact that in fourteen Psalms (3, 7, 18, 30, 34, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63 and 142) a definite occasion in David's life is referred to. Furthermore, the New Testament verification of this meaning with the added evidence of 2 Sam. 22 in regard to

Psalm 18 clearly shows that the lamedh in the inscriptions of these fourteen Psalms certainly denoted authorship. Now if it had this meaning in these cases, why not in the rest? Would such a use, further, be "ambiguous," as Driver maintains, in view of the fact that a full study of the matter as undertaken by Gesenius shows it to be the "customary idiom also in other Semitic dialects, especially in Arabic?" (cp. above) And to hold Gray's opinion (cp. above) would clearly oppose the requirements of the situation in such Psalms where the "lamme-nazzeach" is found. We may clearly see that such Psalms, as bear this specification in the titles, were given over to the musical director either for arrangement, practise or rendition. That there were such directors is evident from 1 Chron. 15, 22 where we are told that "Chenaniah - - - instructed about the song." (See whole passage 1 Chron. 15)

Other attacks on the vocabulary of the titles are made in saying that the musical and liturgical notices in the titles would indicate that they originated at the time when these subjects became prominent in the period of the second temple. (Cp. Driver, Introduction to Literature of the Old Testament p. 373) and (W. Robertson Smith, Old Testament and the Jewish Church p. 190). Due to the fact that this hypothesis rests on the supposition that the Psalms presuppose the rebuilding of the temple we will delay most of the discussion of this matter until we show, in the second part, how the music of the second temple was an inheritance from the first. We would only say here that, granted the fact that these subjects did become prominent in the time of the second temple there would still

be no reason to suppose that they were not terms of long standing. If we would even go so far as to say the liturgy in the Psalms found its origin in the second temple (which, of course, we could not do) we could still not conclude that the terms involved originated at that time. In fact the tendency of any language to use old terms or even a combination of several older words in naming some innovation would point to the very opposite. Instead of finding a conglomeration of vowels and consonants to describe our modern contrivance which sails through the air we use the combination of two very ancient words, namely, "airship," - instead of finding a new name for a one-winged airplane we use the term "monoplane."

The most prevalent attack on the authenticity of Davidic Psalms, from the language point of view is the idea that the prevalence of so called Aramaisms is an indication of late authorship. Whenever a critic wishes to give a writing a late origin, he simply picks out an apaxlegomenon or a word occurring more frequently in later writing and brands the document as of late origin. Driver (Introduction to Literature of Old Testament p. 374) would say that the contents of the Psalms clearly contradict the titles in view of the fact that they "have pronounced Aramaisms, the occurrence of which in an early poem of Judah is entirely without analogy." Now it would take pages and pages of discussion to consider each alleged Aramaism in Psalms alone, so we can do no better than to quote R. D. Wilson on this problem in general as it is found in the Old Testament. (Is Higher Criticism Scholarly? p. 31)

L. 13

"As to the - - - so-called Aramaisms, the number has been grossly exaggerated. Many of the words and roots formerly called Aramaisms have been found in Babylonian records as early as Abraham. - - - - According to the laws of consonantal change existing among the Semitic languages, not more than five or six Aramaic roots can be shown to have been adopted by the Hebrew from the Aramaic. - - - Besides, a large proportion of the words designated as Aramaisms do not occur in any Aramaic dialect except those that were spoken by Jews. In all such cases the probability is that instead of the word's being an Aramaism in Hebrew, it is a Hebrewism in Aramaic. For the Hebrew documents in all such cases antedate the Aramaic by hundreds of years; and it is evident that the earlier cannot have been derived from the later."

"According to Genesis 31, Laban spoke Aramaic. David conquered Damascus and other cities, where Aramaic was spoken and the Israelites have certainly been in continuous contact with Aramaean Tribes from that time to the present. Sporadic cases of the use of Aramaic words would, therefore prove nothing as to the date of a Hebrew document."

In answer to such as are "wont to cite the words in that document which occur nowhere else, except possibly in another work claimed as being late, and in the Hebrew of the Talmud;" Wilson states, (p.33) "- - such words occurring elsewhere in the Talmud are found in every book of the Old Testament and in almost every chapter. If such words were proof of the lateness of a document, all documents would be late, a conclusion so absurd as to be held by nobody."

Another strong point against the argument from Aramaisms lies in the fact that the translators of the Pentateuch from Hebrew into Aramaic, in from a half to two thirds of the cases of such "Aramaic words," use different roots and translate the terms, evidently to make them intelligible to the Aramaean readers. (For a fuller discussion of this cp. R. D. Wilson - A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament p. 156) (For a detailed discussion of Aramaisms in general see the Presbyterian Theological Review for 1925 where Dr. Wilson has a series of articles)

Some men will, of course, always be presumptuous enough to suppose that they can advance just cause for denial of Davidic authorship from a study of style. Driver (Introduction to Literature of the Old Testament p. 374 f.) would say, for example that "of the seventy-three ascribed to David, the majority, at least, cannot be his; for - - - many are of unequal poetical merit, and instead of displaying the freshness and originality we should expect in the founder of Hebrew Psalmody, contain frequent conventional phrases - - - and reminiscences of earlier Psalms, which betray the poet of a later age. - - - Others have stylistic affinities with Psalms which, upon independent grounds, must be assigned to an age much later than that of David." To say the least, Driver's idea of the Psalms differing greatly in regard to poetical merit is greatly exaggerated, but, even though we would grant this subjective supposition, there would still be no proof that David could not have written these Psalms. To hold such a position would be analogous to a man maintaining

that James Russell Lowell could not have written "The Vision of Sir Launfal" in view of the fact that he wrote "The First Snow-Fall," or that Longfellow could not have written "Evangeline" since he wrote "To A Waterfowl" - or vice versa.

Regarding sytlistic affinities with later Psalms, it turns out, all too often that the Psalm under dispute is being compared with a Psalm, which, upon investigation, is also under dispute, hence the continual argument in a circle. Then again, when similarities are pointed out between a Davidic Psalm and one demonstrably later we can very often point out greater similarities between the Davidic Psalms and others of similar origin.

Others again would maintain that we cannot judge the Psalms as poetry by political criteria. Then counter-arguments arise as to the fact that we know more of David than simply his connection with the monarchy. Furthermore, the religious life of Israel was intimately connected with the national and political life - all of which is, of course, true.

All of this discussion leads to only one conclusion, namely that all arguments from style have been and must remain a subjective consideration, especially in view of the fact that there is so little Hebrew literature extant. Critics, for example, point to Ewalds determining a number of Psalms as Davidic on aesthetic grounds. (Cp. Driver p. 379 f.) and maintain his criterion is a subjective one. If, when Ewald points to the "originality, dignity, and unique power which could have been found in David and David alone - - - the noble and kingly feelings - - the sense of inward dignity - - - the

innocence and Divine favor of which the singer is conscious, - - the kingly thoughts - - - the trust in God, the clear and firm sense of right, and the indications of a brave and victorious warrior, who had near at heart his peoples welfare," if, I say, when Ewald, using such criteria, is classified as subjective. how much more subjective must be those critics who using a single phrase in a Psalm deny the accumulated evidence of Davidic Authorship?

Nevertheless, the arguments from style must remain subjective. Several examples of efforts to date other literature on such grounds might be in place. Some of the plays of Shakespeare are called his "mixed plays" because it is known he collaborated with another author in their production. The sharpest critics have tried to separate these plays but in the end the one calls the other's efforts nonsense and the analysis is a failure, - and this in spite of the fact that the style of Shakespeare is one of the most peculiar and inimitable. Other critics have endeavored to analyze another composite production, the Anglican Prayer Book. Even though the authors of this book are well known from history and though they lived centuries apart, efforts to analyze this book have ended in nothing but disagreement. If men are thus helpless in their own language, what can you expect of them in a foreign tongue or even a dead language? "The oracles are dumb." (For fuller discussion of this attitude see Franklin Johnson, "Fallacies of the Higher Criticism" in "The Fundamentals" Vol. II p. 53 f.

We see then that higher criticism cannot sensibly, nor scientifically be justified in denying the authenticity of Davidic Psalms for reasons of language. Failing in their ill-motivated efforts to disqualify the evidence of the titles they meet the same fate in trying to disparage the text itself. The vocabulary and other marks offered by higher criticism as indications of late authorship will not bear the scrutiny of scientific investigation. Critical attempts to use the criterion of style in their behalf prove even more subjective and ill-advised than when the same basis is used as a minor argument for the other side. The "assured results" of the higher criticism need reassurance in the language field.

II

SITUATION

The second front on which the army of attack is massed in denial of Davidic authorship of Psalms is the conclusion that the Psalms, whose designated author is David, cannot refer to David's situation or character but are applicable rather to exilic or postexilic times, depending on the particular motive and view of the individual critic. We would hardly expect otherwise than that, in this modern age when very few of the great, or even of the less great, have been able to escape the scurrilous pen of debunking biographers, the person of David should be torn apart and reconstructed according to preconceived ideas of the great king and Psalmist of Israel.

In this respect the words of W. Robertson Smith, (Old Testament and the Jewish Church p. 223) who would set David up as the "pattern - - for the worldly airs of the nobles of Samaria," are the most outspoken. He says: "- - - a curious passage of the Book of Amos(6,5), 'they devise for themselves instruments of music like David,' makes David the chosen model of the dillettanti nobles of Samaria, who lay stretched on beds of ivory, anointed with the choicest perfumes, and mingling music with their cups in the familiar fashion of Oriental luxury." We need hardly point out that the section quoted does not necessitate nor even indicate so rash a conclusion as is drawn here by Smith. In fact the indications would tend to an opposite view. The picture might well be one of biting con-

trast, instead of singing to God as David did, they sing to themselves, instead of writing songs of worship, they import orchestras to complete their picture of wanton luxury. The text, however, would seem to point rather to a hypocritical action. - Pretending to act as David in singing to God, - they continue their riotous living. Above all we might indeed say it is "curious" for a scholar to read such a meaning into a short reference when we have the entire picture of David's life before us. In view of the many malicious attacks on his character, a short resume of David's life is well in place.

David's character as a young man is certainly above reproach. He was chosen to be anointed king because "The Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart" (1 Sam. 16,7). The servants of Saul classified him as "a comely person, and the Lord is with him" (1 Sam. 16, 18). His firm trust in God was certainly shown in the meeting with Goliath. Even Saul, upon whom, by this time the "evil spirit" had come was forced to fear David "because the Lord was with him" (1 Sam. 18, 12).

At the court, he led a model life. Though a popular hero, a close friend of Jonathan, desirable at the Kings table as well as in the barracks, his head was not turned to pride but he continued to "behave himself wisely - - - and it was good in the sight of all the people and also in the sight of Saul's servants" (1 Sam. 18, 5). In spite of Saul's great jealousy, David continued to act in such a manner that "Jehovah was with him" and even Saul stood in awe of him. (1 Sam. 18, 14 - 16).

Treated in the most shameful manner, plotted and intrigued against, he made no attempt to retaliate but retained an attitude of unimpeachable fidelity to the perfidious Saul.

Driven into exile he managed to bring his chance associates to order and gain for them useful employment, part of which was the serving as a sort of protective association against Phillistine raids and other forms of robbery. So upright and honest were these men in keeping Nabal's shepherds at Carmel that the servants of Nabal came to their defence with the words: "But the men were very good unto us, and we were not hurt, neither missed we any thing, as long as we were conversant with them, when we were in the fields: They were a wall unto us both by night and day, all the while we were with them keeping the sheep." (1 Sam. 25, 15.16). The defence of Keilah (1 Sam. 23), - an enterprise, we must note, undertaken only after David had sought the Lord's guidance, - might well show us how these men spent their time. Indeed we are told of several mistakes, recorded impartially and in a straightforward manner, but David was only human. When we consider that Saul was not ashamed to bring our 3000 men against David's 600, to put a price on David's head and use every means, fair or foul, we cannot but wonder at that man who having this same Saul in his power, would twice spare his life and avoid all rebellious acts against him. And we dare not forget that later at the death of Saul, David could remember only his good points and lamented him greatly.

As the ruler of Israel, his godly life continued. Having united the nation and driven out invaders he proceeded to revive the waning influence of religion and to bring up the ark of God (2 Sam. 6). He even contemplated the building of a temple but God would have it otherwise - at the same time giving him the promise that his son would build the Temple as the type of Christ and his church, where the throne would be established forever. (2 Sam. 7)

Several things are indeed held up against David, - his overindulgence to his children, acts of severity in war, but especially his black crime against Uriah in connection with Bathsheba, - but all too often these shortcomings are exaggerated. We might say with Ewald (History of Israel III p. 57 f.) "The errors by which he is carried away stand out prominently just because of their rarity." It is true that we can not palliate his great crime of adultery, - even though it would be considered a small thing indeed for some other oriental monarch of the time to order a subject removed whose wife he coveted, - but we must remember that the same book which tells us of David's fall, tells also of his great repentance for that fall (2 Sam. 12). Absalom's rebellion is a very good commentary on the sorrow which befell him as announced by Nathan. I would prefer to take Samuel's word for it that he was a man "after God's own heart" (1 Sam. 13,14) or the estimate of an historian (see below) than to follow "the caviller whose chief delight is to magnify his faults"

(Orr - The Problem of the Old Testament p. 445). Gunkel's argument in connection with David's great sin and Psalm 51 can surely not stand. He says: "David, der ein Weib verfuehrt und ihren Mann schaendlich dem Tode preisgegeben hat, darf doch wahrlich nicht sagen, er habe gegen Gott allein gesuendigt".

(Die Psalmen, p. 226) Since all other sins, also those against others, are sins against God, David might well say he had sinned only against God. That no palliation is intended we see from the following, "That thou mightest be justified etc." He wishes to make full recognition of God's justice.

"If we proceed to put together, in its most general features, the whole picture of David which results from all these historical testimonies, we find the very foundations of his character to be laid in a peculiarly firm and unshaken trust in Jehovah, and the brightest and most spiritual views of the creation and government of the world, together with a constant, tender and sensitive awe of the Holy One in Israel, a simple, pure striving never to be untrue to him, and the strongest efforts to return to him all the more loyally after errors and transgressions." (Ewald, History of Israel III p. 57 f.) (For other fine estimates of David's character see: Carlyle's Heroes and Hero Worship, p. 72 and Maurice, Prophets and Kings, pp. 60 ff.)

Regarding this character's connection with Psalm composition, the words of Orr (The Problem of the Old Testament, p. 445) are significant. "In this varied, many-sided, strangely chequered life, with its startling vicissitudes, its religious aspirations and endeavour, its heights and depths of experience

of good and evil, - with its love of music and gift of lyric song, - with the incitements to the use of that gift springing from the companionship of prophets like Samuel and Nathan, from the promises they gave, and the hopes for the future of the kingdom they inspired, - can anyone say that there is not abundant material for psalm-composition, or sufficient motive or skill to engage in it? Had the anointing to be king, the trials at Saul's court, the vicissitudes of the wilderness persecution, the bringing-up of the ark, the promises of Nathan, the rebellion of Absalom, the sin with Bathsheba itself and the penitence that followed, no power in them to draw forth such psalmody? It is with these very occasions that the psalms ascribed to David in the first books are traditionally connected. Can we permit ourselves to believe, without convincing evidence, that tradition was all wrong about this, and that, as Professor W. K. Smith and others will have it, David's religious muse found utterance rather 'in sportful forms of unrestrained mirth,' so that even in the time of Amos, David appears 'as the chosen model of the dilettoni nobles of Ephraim,' - - - - -?"

Others again would refrain from minimizing the height of David's character but would nevertheless point out discrepancies between his person and the situation as it presents itself in the Psalms. Driver's distinction between an "inventor of musical instruments" and an "author of Sacred poetry" seems to be rather without weight. Maintaining that David's musical inclinations were exerted only in the secular field he would deny his connection with the religious poetry of the Psalter.

(See whole passage in Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament p. 378 f.) The Chronicler is simply dismissed as transferring "to Davids age the institutions of the Temple in the fully developed form in which they existed in his own day." As to this view of the temple service we will hear more later and can only say here that it was clearly the inheritance from the first temple. Though the question of the historical character and general trustworthiness of Chronicles cannot be considered in detail, we must say the accusations of exaggeration, falsification, partiality, and contradictory ideas, directed against the author "lose their force when the purpose for which the books were written is thoroughly understood and considered."

(Fuerbringer - Introduction to the Old Testament p. 41.)

That purpose is described in the words "the author - - - desires to arouse an increased zeal among the returned exiles for Jehovah's Law and for the worship of God. And it is for this reason also that he continually points out from history the blessings divinely bestowed wherever the covenant of God was faithfully kept, and that punishment was sure to follow a breach of this covenant." (Same p. 40)

The conclusion that David was more than a mere musician, was, in fact, the author of many Psalms, is supported by various considerations. From the books of Samuel we see clearly that David played upon the harp but especially that he was "the sweet psalmist of Israel" (2 Sam. 23, 1). 2 Sam. 1, 22 & 23, show us that he composed certain songs and we might well agree with J. H. Raven (Old Testament Introduction

General and Special, p. 259) "It is indeed extraordinary if the high musical reputation of David rests upon no broader foundation than the composition of the three songs of II Samuel." But the foundation is broader. The Chronicler, Ezra, and Nehemiah show that David arranged the entire service of song in the sanctuary. The direct statements in 1 Chron. 6, 31; 16, 7; 25, 1; cannot simply be explained away by saying this author, who evidently had reliable sources, did not know what he was talking about. Ezra 3, 10 tells us that the priests and Levites were arrayed and performed their duties "after the ordinance of David, king of Israel." Nehemiah gives us a similar picture (see Neh. 12, 24. 36. 45-46.) Especially the last verse referred to is significant: "For in the days of David and Asaph of old there were chief of the singers, and songs of praise and thanksgiving unto God." (Neh. 12, 46) Yes! David's connection with Psalmody cannot be denied. If David with such connections could not write the Psalms we might well ask how Shakespeare with his "small Latin and less Greek" could write his dramas, how Dickens his great novels, how Lincoln his Gettysburg address.

The vindictive Psalms cause difficulties for others. In view of the fact that the simple statement that the vindictive Psalms are too imprecatory for David would invalidate the critical viewpoint of him as a worldly sporting muse, the references to this argument are somewhat veiled, then again omitted entirely. Since these Psalms show especially the religious depth of David it might be well to delay the discussion of them until we endeavor to refute the denials of

Davidic authorship arising from religious grounds; nevertheless a consideration is in place here since it is claimed such a vindictive attitude as is shown in these Psalms is inconsistent with David as the "sweet psalmist" or with such tender pieces as the twenty-third Psalm. We must remember that the expressions in the Imprecatory Psalms are not individual but official, David identifies his enemies with God's enemies. (Ps. 39, 21). David was certainly not vindictive toward his personal enemies as we have already seen in his relations with Saul. Then again in many cases we find that instead of being maledictive these Psalms are really predictive for the imperfect tense is used. In others, the Psalmist prays God to punish his enemies rather than doing so himself, especially since the faith of God's people may be increased by a destruction of the wicked. In conclusion we might say with J. H. Raven (Old Testament Introduction General and Special p. 264) "- - - The most awful of these imprecations are not more terrible than the future torments of the wicked mentioned in the New Testament (Mark 9, 44. 46. 48; Rev. 20, 15) - - - The New Testament denunciations of the wicked though less physical, are far more terrible than those of the Old Testament (Matt. 3, 7; 11, 20-24; 23, 13-33; John 3, 36; Rev. 6, 16-17.)"

So much for alleged discrepancies between the character of David and that of the author of those Psalms, whose author is rightly designated as David. Aside from these considerations, critics claim the Davidic Psalms do not correspond to the situation of David or David's time. Now since practically every Psalm of David is for one reason or another denied him

on these grounds we cannot discuss each argument in detail but must consider general arguments and only in especial cases the individual Psalms.

The stock argument in this respect is, of course, that of Smith, Driver, et al. who say David was never such an oppressed sufferer as the author of the Psalms claims to be in such passages as we find in Psalms 5, 6, 12, 17, 22, 26, 27, 28, 35, 38, 41, 62 and 64. Driver says, (Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament p. 375) "- - let the reader examine carefully - - - and ask himself whether they correspond really to David's situation; whether they are not, in fact, the words of a man (or of men) in a different condition of life, surrounded by different companions, subject to different temptations, and suffering at the hands of a different kind of foe." He might well have gotten his idea from W. Robertson Smith who says, (The Old Testament in the Jewish Church p. 217) "Even in the older Davidic Psalm-book there is a whole series of hymns in which the writer identifies himself with the poor and needy, the righteous people of God suffering in silence at the hands of the wicked, without other hope than patiently to wait for the interposition of Jehovah (Ps. 12, 25, 37, 38, etc.) Nothing can be farther removed than this from any possible situation in the life of the David of the Books of Samuel." Various other passages are then picked out and the claim is made that neither in his early nor in his later life is there a situation where the wicked are rampant, "the righteous suffering in silence, as if David were not a king who sat on his throne doing justice and judgment to all his people. (2 Sam.8,15)"

It must be mentioned in the first place that we certainly do not have the full story of David's life in the works which have come down to us. Not that we do not have enough - we certainly have the high points and, in many instances, details, and if we were to have had more God would in his wise providence, have ordained it so. But to say that references to David's life made in Psalms and not known of elsewhere show these Psalms must refer to some other man is pure presumption. Aside from this we do find situations in David's life as told us in Samuel which surely answer the objections of Smith and Driver. Exiled by Saul, into whom the evil spirit had entered, David was certainly surrounded by treachery and every other possible danger as we noticed before. A time in his later life when David was certainly an oppressed sufferer, was during the rebellion of his own son Absalom. While Absalom was taking away David's followers, seeking to usurp the throne by driving his own father out of the palace and forcing him to vacate, the wicked were, most assuredly, rampant. What other hope could David possibly have at this time when his faithful followers of old were forsaking him to follow the politician Absalom, than "patiently to wait for the interposition of Jehovah?" David was indeed a sufferer for he was "greatly distressed, but he encouraged himself in the Lord his God" (1 Sam. 30, 6). According to 2 Sam. 12, 16 f. he fasted and wept for seven long days, after the prophet announced to him the death of his child. In 2 Sam. 15, 30, he is said to "have gone up Mount Olivet weeping, and with his head covered." David, contradictory to Driver's opinion, truly found himself in positions where he was "powerless to take action himself," (See Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testa-

ment p. 376); all worldly help indeed departed at times, those united to him by the closest ties went other ways, or as David so graphically puts it, "My father and my mother forsook me."

Especially in respect to one Psalm are the objections of the critics, in the matter under discussion, open to a serious consideration. Far from depicting his own position in the "Gospel according to David" (Ps. 22) David is describing, in a vivid and detailed picture the Savior's suffering. Christ himself showed the fulfilment of this prophecy when, on the cross, he quoted the opening words, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" It cannot be maintained that David knew nothing of the real significance of this prophecy for Acts 2, 30. 31 shows us that David was a prophet and even as Abraham, "rejoiced to see my day" (John 8, 56) so also David must have been able to behold the fulfilment in the suffering, death and resurrection of the Messiah. More of this when we discuss David's religious standing.

Another general objection is found by the critics in such Psalms as 20, 21, 61 et al, which, it is claimed "contain good wishes for a king, who is either addressed in the second person, or spoken of in the third" and Driver says that "both evidently spring out of the regard which was entertained toward him by his subjects; to suppose that David wrote for the people the words in which they should express their own loyalty towards him is in the highest degree unnatural and improbable." In response to this we might well say, in the words of Hengstenberg (On The Psalms I, p. 343) "The person addressed is not David in particular, but the anointed of the Lord in general;

the speaker is, of course, not the Psalmist, but he speaks in the name of the people; and if so, who might be more readily expected to stand forth as an interpreter of the feelings of the Lord's people in this respect, than David, who always lived in and with the church, who always served it with his poetical gift, identified himself with its circumstances, and cared for its wants? - - - - - Luther says briefly and well, 'It seems to me as if David had composed this Psalm, that it might serve as a devout and pious battle-cry, whereby he would stir up himself and the people, and fit them for prayer.'" In regard to Psalm 21, Hengstenberg says (p. 349) "The Psalm expresses the thanksgivings of the people for the promises given to David in 2Sam. VII, and for the joyful hope in regard to their fulfilment." Many of the older commentators defend, rightly we think, the exclusive Messianic exposition of this Psalm and thus the critics fall into the same error as before when they maintained David was never in such a predicament as is described in Psalm 22.

When individual Psalms refer to specific incidents in the life of David we meet nothing but plain denials. Driver, (Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 376) says: "Psalm 35 is referred to the time when David feigned madness at the court of Achish (1 Sam. 21, 13); but there is not a single expression in the Psalm suggestive of that occasion; - - - - Psalm 59 is stated to have been composed by David when his house was watched by Saul's messengers; but the Psalm shows plainly that the poet who wrote it is resident in a city attacked by heathen and ungodly foes."

In like manner he simply states that Psalm 11 cannot refer to Absalom's rebellion nor Psalm 52 to Doeg, again following Smith. (Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 217 f.) Commentators have, of course, shown how these Psalms might well refer to the indicated incidents. In some cases we have several reasons for which the Psalm could have been composed on such and such a specific occasion in its particular form. To such as would maintain, with Driver and others, that the incidents mentioned would not permit the corresponding Psalm we might direct several questions. Could you not logically admit there were circumstances of which you have not been fully apprised? Could you not say that the author, either viewing the event as approaching or contemplatively looking back, could write a psalm, which, though expressing his thoughts of reaction, could yet refrain from referring to the specific event? Could you not say that the attitude of the subject might justify a Psalm altogether different from the historical incident itself? In plain words can you be sure that a Psalm does or does not refer to a specific incident when you are not fully acquainted with the details or the characters involved? When the historic titles refer a Psalm to an incident in David's life, - when nothing in the Psalm militates this view, - and when efforts to point the Psalm to some other historic event are even more vague than the title reference we must indeed conclude that, even though we do not at times understand the exact connection between the incident and the Psalm, that connection is, nevertheless always there. What Hengstenberg says of Psalm 34 we might

say of this class of Psalms in general (Hengstenberg on the Psalms I p. 334) "In favor of the originality of the title, we have to urge, in addition to the general ground, that there is nothing in the contents of the Psalm to contradict it, - the more general the historical references in the Psalms are, the less likely is the title to be the result of combination, - first, that the manner in which personal experiences are applied for the benefit of the entire community of the righteous, is thoroughly characteristic of David; and, second, that a title referring to the occasion in question, is what might have been expected, as David appears to have aimed at perpetuating in the titles of the Psalms, the remembrance of all the most remarkable incidents of his life."

Having then, as we have noticed, maintained that the Davidic Psalms cannot refer to David's character or situation, the critics are forced to set some other author and time. Very few authors, if any, are suggested but the supposed time of Composition of various Davidic Psalms ranges from the time of the later prophets to the late post-exilic age or the age of the Maccabees. Hitzigs theory of authorship by Jeremiah when compared with Cheyne's Jerachmeelite theory or Smith's fourth century idea shows general confusion in the critical dating of the Psalms. A few, but indeed a very few, modern critics still maintain there are pre-exilic Psalms. Driver says there may be several especially in view of the Royal Psalms. He also picks out Psalm 110 as written "by a prophet with reference to a theocratic king." In general, however, the critical position regarding the Psalter on this

point may be summed up in the words of Wellhausen, "The question is not whether it contains any post-exilian psalms, but whether it contains any that are pre-exilian." (Quoted by Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 434.) Smith, with few exceptions (p. 220) makes the entire Psalter post-exilic. Duhm denies that a single psalm is pre-exilian. Reuss says we have "no decisive proofs" of Psalms of the period of the kingdom. (For other similar opinions, see Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament* p. 435 footnote 1.)

Regarding this conclusion that the Psalms, or at least most of them, are post-exilic, several things must be said. In the first place this hypothesis neither has been, nor can be proven. Tradition is surely strong in backing Davidic authorship. The other external proof from the New Testament has already been mentioned. All the reasons mentioned before for which critics would deny Davidic Psalms because of the situation and character of David can be thrown with double force into the other side of the balance against the assertion that the Psalms are post-exilic. This period is practically a blank to our knowledge. To write a history of the period between Ezra and the Maccabees would indeed be a heavy task. Josephus' help as an historian is generally admitted to be practically worthless. We can well realize that the law of Moses must have gained prominence after Ezra so that the strict observance of it led to the legalistic attitude of the later Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes but would this rather wide observation justify the conclusion of Cornill concerning the Psalms, (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 215),

"Sie sind die Reaction des altisraelitischen frommen Gemueths gegen den Judaismus, als deutlicher Beweis dafuer, das der religioese Genius Israels selbst durch Esra und den Pharisaeismus nicht zu ertoedten war, und binden so recht eigentlich das Bindeglied zwischen dem alten und neuen Bunde: die Kreise, welche die Psalmen gesungen hatten und welche eine Froemmgigkeit nach Weise der Psalmen pflegten, waren der Mutterboden der Kirche?" We might well ask where these groups were that constituted the native soil of the church. If they produced such gems as the Psalms, are we to suppose that their effect on the legalistic attitude was so slight as to not even warrant a reference in the New Testament? Would it be out of place to ask what possible use this "Bindeglied," whose productions would show such a full understanding that the Messiah's life and mission as is portrayed in the Messianic Psalms, would have for Jesus instructions or the blessings of the first Pentecost? Are we to understand that "der religioese Genius Israels selbst durch - - den Pharisaeismus nicht zu ertoedten war" and yet that it could permit, or even join in with, the dogs who compassed the Messiah (Ps. 22, 16) and fiendishly stared upon his emaciated form on the cross?

Furthermore would this period, which would allegedly be so productive of beautiful Psalms, leave no record of itself. We have the writings of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi but the inspired voice dies away about 400 B. C. The return from the captivity might well have inspired Psalm composition and indeed did as we see from Ps. 126 et al, but this is a relatively small group and readily recognizable as post-exilic. .

"The great majority of the Psalms - - - have nothing peculiarly post-exilic about them. They are written in pure and vigorous Hebrew. They are personal and spiritual in tone, touching the deepest and most universal chords in religious experience. They show no traces of post-exilic legalism, or of the ideas of the Priestly Code. On the other hand, many of the Psalms suit admirably the conditions of an earlier time, where they do not contain features which necessitate or at least are most naturally explained by, a pre-exilic date. Such, especially, is the not inconsiderable series of psalms that make mention of the 'king,' which cannot be brought down to a post-exilic time without extreme forcing. Such, to our mind, are those that contain allusions to the 'tabernacle' (tent), to the ark and cherubim, to the temple as a centre of national worship, to conquests of surrounding peoples, and the like. In a few of the later Psalms we find such expressions used of Jehovah as, 'among the Gods,' and 'above the gods,' 'God of Gods,' 'before the gods,' which is not what, on the newer theory, we naturally look for from the strict monotheism of post-exilic times. Alternately, will the critics grant us that the use of such expressions does not imply, as is sometimes argued for pre-exilic times, that monotheism is not yet reached?" (Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 437 f.)

Though we may not always agree with Gunkel's conclusions, nor follow him in detail, his words on the Royal Psalms mentioned above by Orr, are significant. "The school of Wellhausen has here also started from its general supposition that the

Psalms are post-exilic, and has quite logically concluded that the Royal Psalms cannot refer to the kings of Israel or of Judah, but must be explained in some other way. In this self-imposed extremity various conjectures have been made; it may be some world-king like the Ptolemies, it may be the Maccabean priest-princes, it may be the Jewish community which is here called 'king.' And the magnitude of the confusion thus produced appears even in the great Wellhausen, who here offers four different explanations of eight Psalms. In contrast to this the method of literary history requires that the whole of the homogeneous material should receive uniform treatment and find a common explanation. To the Royal Psalms must be added the intercession for a king which is found at the end of a few Psalms - viz., Pss. XXVIII, LXI, LXIII, LXXXIV; 1 Sam. II, 10. The terms applied to the prince in all these passages are almost everywhere the same. He is called, 'the king,' 'Yahweh's king,' 'Anointed,' 'Servant,' he sits enthroned 'before Yahweh,' his residence is Zion, his God is everywhere Yahweh, his people are called 'Jacob,' 'Yahweh's people and inheritance,' his ancestor is David, etc. If this common material is taken all together, there can be no doubt that all these poems refer to native kings. They cannot be foreign world-rulers, for these are not descended from David, and do not sit enthroned in Zion before Yahweh. Just as little can they be Maccabeans, for these were not of the house of David. There can reasonably be no question whatever of the community; Israel is never called 'Yahweh's king' in the Old Testament. So at the end of the whole discussion there remains

only the most obvious suggestion of all, which could have been made at the very first - namely, that the kings of these Psalms are kings of Israel and Judah." (Gunkel - 'The Poetry of the Psalms, in Old Testament Essays, p. 138 f.)

The stock argument of critics in referring Psalms to post-exilic times is the claim that they presuppose the existence of the second temple. Technical phrases and liturgical notices are used to indicate a Psalmody entirely opposed to David's situation. This is, of course based on the supposition that the temple service after the exile was unique and had no precedent. Even without going into technicalities, it can, however, be readily shown that far from being an innovation, the temple service, was, in reality, an inheritance from the first temple, already deeply rooted in the Levitical law and the Tabernacle.

"That religious song and music did exist under the Old Temple seems abundantly attested by the place given to 'singers' in the narratives of the return, and by what is said of their functions, and is further evidenced by the taunt addressed to the exiles at Babylon by their captors to sing to them 'the songs of Zion' - 'Jehovah's songs.' Express reference is made to the praises of the first temple in Is. LXIV 11: 'Our holy and beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee.' (Cp. Chap. XXX 29) In regard to particular psalms, Professor W. R. Smith allows that Ps. VIII is the foundation of Job's question in chapter VII 17, 18; and there is what seems to be a clear quotation of Ps. I - - - - in Jer. XVII 8. - - - - Pre-exilic psalmody is thus established;" (Orr, Problem of the Old Testament, p. 439).

Have you ever heard of anyone denying that the old temple was built by Solomon and that David, in a large measure, prepared the plans and materials. The fact that it was intended for the worship of the God of Israel can likewise not be denied. Of course, the people could not worship there in sacrifices, prayers and praises, there could be no priests, servants and singers. No, indeed not! - - There simply had to be organization for decency and order and Chronicles, backed by a long line of tradition, says David organized these services. Why deny the evident conclusion? Many of the rites were of course taken over from the tabernacle but certain regulations had to be made in conformity with the new surroundings.

We might well say with R. D. Wilson, (A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament, p. 195), "Since David and Solomon built the temple, it is common sense to suppose that they organized the priests into regular orders for the orderly service of the sanctuary. These priests had already had their clothing prescribed by Moses after the analogy of the Egyptian and all other orders of priesthood the world over. He also had prescribed the kinds and times of offerings and the purpose for which they were offered. The Israelites, also, like the Egyptians and Babylonians, had for their festive occasions such regulations as are attributed to David for the observance of these festivals, so as to avoid confusion and to preserve decency in the house of God."

When we remember the deep religious foundations of Israel, the great manifestations of God's presence and power throughout their history, and His inestimable influence on various in-

dividuals we are forced to wonder how anyone could deny the presence of sacred hymnody in the public and private worship of pre-exilic Israel. Could we possibly suppose that on festive occasions, of which there were many, no music was employed and no hymns of praise to God were sung, when even the most savage tribes have music at their festivals, - when the Assyrians, Egyptians, Babylonians, and even the Sumerians employed psalms in their worship. We agree that, "Most of them are clearly polytheistic, and it is rare that they rise in the expression of religious emotion to the simple sublimity of the Old Testament Psalms" (Barton, Archeology and the Bible, p. 496) but nevertheless these psalms of other nations show that psalms, accompanied by instrumental music, existed hundreds of years before the time of David, and Solomon. A mild conjecture indeed are the words of W. R. Smith, (The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 221) "- - - it may be conjectured that the adoption of the first part of the Psalter - - - took place in connection with the other far-reaching reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah, which first gave a stable character to the community of the second temple." In view of these observations the surmising of Cornill, (Einleitung p. 214) "dass die ganze vorexilische Literatur Israels auch nicht den leisesten Anklang an die Psalmendichtung, auch nicht die mindeste Beeinflussung durch dieselbe zeigt" cannot be maintained. Without going into a discussion of the beauties of Israels early poetry, we would ask one question: - Can one read the description of the tabernacle in Ex. 25 - 27 and deny the superabundant provision of a background for the poetry of the Psalter?

Yet a few words in this section regarding the somewhat far-fetched theory of a Maccabean origin of the Psalter. As exhibit A of this theory we quote Smith (Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 210) "In Psalm 149 the saints are pictured with the praises of God in their throat and a sharp sword in their hands to take vengeance on the heathen, to bind their kings and nobles, and exercise against them the judgment written in prophecy. Such an enthusiasm of militant piety, plainly based on actual successes of Israel and the house of Aaron, can only be referred to the first victories of the Maccabees, culminating in the purification of the Temple in 165 B.C." Even a cursory reading will readily show that this general description could fit almost any time from Moses to Micah. The same thing may be said in regard to the custom of some critics to group all Psalms that distinguish the godly and godless, concluding thereby that they can refer only to the class distinctions at the time of the Maccabees.

The Maccabean Theory in general is subject to various considerations. "At the lower end, the Books of Maccabees presuppose the Psalter. The Book (about 100 B.C.) quotes freely Ps. LXXIX 2, 3 as from Scripture (1 Macc. VII 17); and the second book speaks of the writings in the third division of the Canon loosely as 'the works of David,' showing that the Psalms then held, a leading place in this division. (cp. Luke XXIV 44.)" (Orr, Problem of the Old Testament, p. 449)

It must be admitted that the Psalter was complete and divided into five books at the time of the Septuagint translation which can hardly be dated later than 130 B.C. As was noted

before the titles must have already at that time been ancient since the LXX translators could not deal with parts of them intelligibly.

Ecclesiasticus not only refers to "the law, and the prophecies, and the rest of the books," but has clear references to the Psalms themselves which would show that the Psalms were already accepted in his time, which was, admittedly, pre-Maccabean.

The close connection of Chronicles, surely written long before the time of the Maccabees, with the Psalms has already been pointed out but we may add here that the psalm of Jonah (2, 2-10), closely related to Davidic Psalms, bears out the general Scriptural idea of early Psalmody. And to take portions of Jeremiah as the original basis of various Davidic Psalms is to go contrary to all rules of evidence. But, for our argument here, granted the impossibility of Jeremiah being a basis, at least the Psalms would not be Maccabean.

In view of the fact then that no Psalm, ascribed in the title to David, can be proven to be contrary to the requirements of David's Character and situation, - since efforts to substitute a post-exilic or Maccabean background prove futile, and considering historical tradition supporting the conservative attitude, we cannot but conclude that, "It is impossible for us to attribute the Psalms to the unknown mediocrities of the period which followed the restoration." (Johnson, Fallacies of the Higher Criticism, in Fundamentals II, p. 63) May that leader's footsteps falter who is referred to by Cheyne in the words, "Historical criticism however has not yet had its full rights.

An unseen leader seems to beckon us forward, but we follow him with faltering steps." (T. K. Cheyne, Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism, p. 28)

III

THEOLOGY

Finally in discussing the third main reason for which critical opinion is directed against the authenticity of Davidic Psalms, we arrive at the starting point of modern higher criticism. Depending on the theory of evolution as the explanation of the history of literature and religion, they proceed to examine the Biblical writings. Until very recently they progressed rather rapidly, ever since Votke (Die Biblische Theologie Wissenschaftlich Dargestellt) discovered in the Hegelian philosophy of evolution a means of biblical criticism. Darwinism following the Spencerian philosophy gave them added confidence. I mentioned before that their progress was rather rapid until recently, for in the last few years their theory of evolution, also in religion, has been greatly discredited. In spite of this fact, however, the critics have continued along the same general lines, endeavoring, evidently, to coast on their reserve energy. The attitude of Driver is still characteristic of the critical viewpoint. He says, (An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 377) "Many - - - of the Psalms, it is difficult not to feel, express an intensity of religious devotion, a depth of spiritual insight and a maturity of theological reflection, beyond what we should expect from David or David's age. David had many high and

honorable qualities - - - still - - - we should not gather from the history that he was a man of the deep and intense spiritual feeling reflected in the Psalms that bear his name."

Considering that this idea is based on the theory of religious evolution it is open to various considerations. The results presented have not been obtained by an inductive study of the Biblical record but have been arrived at solely by supposing that the original theory is true and that the religion of Israel developed true to a prescribed form. Imagination has played a large part and the biblical books, including the Psalms, have been placed, with a complete disregard of all other evidence, into that period where the religious ideas presented in them would, in the opinion of the critics, justify their position. The general theory of evolution, as such, has been proven false in many ways and could not deserve consideration here. When applied to the history of literature, this hypothesis is again a fallacy for it fails to account for the greatest writers being found at the beginnings of famous literary periods, as, for example, Homer and Shakespeare. Applied to religion, the theory would fail to account for Abraham at the beginning of the chosen race, Moses at the beginning of their national history, and Christ at the beginning of the New Testament. That the theory, when applied to David and the Psalms, is false, we have noticed already in that David had to be pictured as an oriental skeik, - a complete misrepresentation of facts, - and we will see this further when we later discuss the individual ideas of David's Theology.

Before taking up the critical opinions of David's ~~Theology~~, however, we would like to point out that men, long before David's time had a similar depth of religious feeling. In spite of the fact that Noah was in a wicked world amidst evil surroundings, he "found grace in the eyes of the Lord" and "walked with God" (Gen. 6, 8-10). Appointed to a strange and, from the human viewpoint, apparently impossible task, the greatness of his work is seldom fully appreciated. It must be remembered that he was surrounded by an ungodly mass of unbelievers who, out of curiosity would come to view his work and remain to scoff. In spite of this he had to maintain his faith and continue in a labor which classed him a madman among his fellows. Considering his surroundings, the magnitude of the work he was called upon to perform, and the time spent in hard labor, he stands among all the workers of the Bible as unsurpassed, or even unequaled in persistent faith. Can one truthfully deny that Noah, standing at the entrance gate to our present world, - that man who was a "preacher of righteousness" (2 Pet. 2, 5), who built the first altar recorded (Gen. 8, 20) and who "became heir of the righteousness which is by faith" (Heb. 11, 7), even though he did fall into temptation, - had a sincere depth of religious devotion, and was guided by true fear of the one God, Jehovah.

We next meet Abraham. Receiving a call to separate himself from his old associations and go forth into a new country, he readily obeyed and became the leader of that continuous line of pilgrims, who seek the eternal mansions of God in heaven. Most of his life is presented to us in his journey-

ings and we pick out a few outstanding characteristics. Unselfishly he gave Lot the first choice of the land and then courageously defeated the robber kings. Although we cannot enter into the passage here, we may safely say that it was more than mere benevolence that prompted him to give tithes to Melchizedek (Gen. 14, 20). One cannot read of his great prayer for Sodom (Gen. 18, 23-33) without realizing he was great in prayer. That he was strong in faith, even being ready to sacrifice his own son is shown us in the Epistle to the Hebrews (11, 17) "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac and he that had the promises offered up his only begotten son."

We might go on to show how Jacob, in spite of his failings prayed in humility and wrestled with the angel, - how he was disciplined by affliction to become a pillar of faith. We might dwell on the life of Joseph, - how he resisted temptation, remained unspoiled by prosperity and displayed brotherly love and filial devotion, but above all, how he remained completely dependent on God (Gen. 41, 16). Joshua might well receive consideration. His conquest of Jericho shows forth his great faith in God. His entire life is marked by spiritual mindedness (Josh. 3, 5; 8, 30;), Godly reverence (Josh. 5, 14), obedience (Josh. 11, 15) and decision (Josh. 24, 15). In the period of the Judges we might well point out Gideon who is marked by humility (Jud. 6, 15), spirituality (Jud. 6, 24), and, above all, loyalty to God (Jud. 8, 22-23), - And Samuel, the man of prayer (1 Sam. 7, 5-8; 8, 6; 12, 17; 15, 11) and inspired prophet (1 Sam. 3, 19. 21; 8, 22).

Looking over this array of Old Testament men of God the least conclusion that could be drawn is that they were examples of a deep-rooted faith, endeavoring always to follow the precepts of their God. We see no narrow limits to their theological conceptions and we shall now likewise note that the attacks on David's theology are completely unjustified.

In reference to David's religion, T. K. Cheyne, (Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism, p. 36 f.) says, "To him, as well as to the Philistines (1 Sam. 4, 7), and apparently to Moses himself (Num. 10, 35) the wonder-working power (the numen) of the God of the armies of Israel resided in the ark. This was therefore so holy an object that even taking hold of it with good intention could be punished by a man's sudden death. - - - There were some high moments in David's life when he distinguished Jehovah from any of the objects which represented Him or any of the media through which he worked. But we do not find that he ever succeeded in overcoming the narrow idea of Jehovah's divinity in which he had been brought up." In the first place the reference to Moses is entirely out of place. Far from expressing the conviction that wonder-working powers resided in the ark, Moses set the very fine example of uttering an appropriate prayer at the beginning of his journey away from the mount of the Lord. And to maintain that David was such a highly superstitious character is to contradict the facts presented about David's life so far. Regarding the death of Uzzah while lending support to the tottering ark, several remarks might be made. Uzzah was first of all a Levite and thus fully acquainted with the law - for a breach of that law he suffered and it is

not for us to judge the dispensations of God. Furthermore, the divine purpose was evidently to inspire awe of his majesty, - and the purpose was realized for David resolved to delay his actions. In view of the fact that he had undertaken the work in complete inconsideration, neglecting to inquire of the will of God, he might well wait for further light and direction respecting his path of duty. Having learned the pleasure of God, he proceeded in his work. Far from displaying a narrow conception of Jehovah, David showed complete confidence and obedience to the one God who rules all things.

Cheyne's objections are further unjustified when he says, (p. 37) "of the psalmists conception of spiritual prayer he was ignorant; at any rate, he was not averse to seek revelations from Jehovah by means of the priestly ephod." To maintain that seeking the will of God by the ephod through the Urim and Thummim (Ex. 28, 30) minimized spiritual prayer is to deny the very essence of Old Testament revelation. God had ordained various means and types whereby he was to be known and served. We can find no possible connection with the ephod and the individual conception of spiritual prayer. That David was a man of prayer is certainly shown in his words when he is denied the privilege of building the temple. (2 Sam. 7, 18) Expressing the conviction that his obligations are greater than he can say, he thanks God for all past blessings and implores his help and abiding assistance for the future. Showing thus his own feeling of complete unworthiness and relying solely on the mercies of God, can David be classed as "ignorant of the psalmists conception of spiritual prayer" - no matter how high a conception the psalmist may have?

Proceeding in his argument, Cheyne continues, (p. 38)

"As to David's notions of sacrifice, he is indeed nowhere said, like Samuel, to have slain anyone 'before Jehovah,' as a sacrificial act. (See 1 Sam. 15, 33 and cp. 2 Sam. 6, 17).

Yet we do find him delivering up seven grandsons of Saul to the Gibeonites to be hanged up before (or, unto) Jehovah."

Regarding this incident, Barton writes, (The Religion of Israel, p. 83), "These men were hanged in the springtime, just at the end of the rainy season, and their bodies were left hanging all through the long, dry summer, a ghastly testimony to the vengeance of Yahweh. When the rainy season once more came, copious showers fell, and we are told: 'God was entreated for his land.' The Yahweh who could be thought to punish a whole land with starvation because so gruesome a penalty for sin had not been exacted, had not yet been conceived as a merciful or loving being."

Need we point out that the inference made above to Samuel is entirely out of place. Far from offering a human sacrifice before the Lord, Samuel was merely carrying out God's sentence against Agog. Agog was receiving the just recompense for his deeds of violence, and Samuel used the same mode of punishment which the condemned had formerly used on others.

Concerning the seven sons of Saul who were "hanged before the Lord" we can certainly maintain that they were justly executed. Saul as the anointed of the Lord had sinned for all Israel and we may well assume that his sons were willing and zealous executors of his bloody raid on the Gibeonites. "God, in his providence, suffered the Gibeonites to ask and inflict

so barbarous a retaliation, in order that the oppressed Gibeonites might obtain justice and some reparation of their wrongs, especially that the scandal brought on the name of the true religion by the violation of a solemn national compact might be wiped away from Israel, and that a memorable lesson should be given to respect treaties and oaths."

This incident can surely not be used to support the critical idea of David's conception of sacrifice, neither can his suggestion to Saul in 1 Sam. 26, 19. Concerning this passage we take exception once more to the words of Dheyne (p. 38,39) "And David himself had very crude ideas of sacrifice. There are his authentic words to his persecutor, Saul, 'If it be Jehovah that hath stirred thee up against me, let him accept (literally, smell) an offering' (1 Sam. 26, 19 R.V.)(i.e. 'If thy bad thoughts of me are due to a temptation from without, appease the divine anger by a sacrifice.') Strange advice we may think it, especially as Jehovah himself is said to have 'stirred up' or 'enticed' Saul against his son-in-law." What more natural than that David, the man of God, should desire, in company with Saul, to appease God's anger if He had been offended. It might be well to note the magnanimity of David in that instead of condemning Saul's action at once, he suggests it may have been due to the promptings of the "children of men." There is nothing crude about the idea of sacrifice as expressed here for such were God's institutions in the Old Covenant. A sacrifice offered by a righteous man in faith was acceptable. Such was David's idea of sacrifice as evidenced here and also in the Psalms. We find this same idea already in Genesis 8, 21. We will hear

more of sacrifice when discussing critical reasons for maintaining the theology of the Psalms presupposes prophetic teaching.

It might be well to consider a further exception taken, to the section just discussed, by Barton (The Religion of Israel, p. 212), "David thought that Yahweh was the God of Palestine. He was one among many gods. One served him as a matter of course in Palestine, but if one were driven from Yahweh's soil and compelled to take refuge in another land, one as naturally then served the god of that land. It was for this reason that David said to Saul, 'They have driven me out this day from abiding in the inheritance of Yahweh, saying, Go serve other Gods' (1 Sam. 26, 19)." We can find nothing in the text to justify such a conclusion. In fact, an altogether different conclusion is pointed to. God had appointed the place where he should be served in Palestine. To force David out of the country was to force him to leave the place where God was to be worshipped and to subject him to the temptation of falling into the idolatry, prevalent in all the surrounding nations. Far from taking it for granted that in a strange land one "naturally then served the god of that land," David laments the disadvantage accruing from such a position. David's idea of Jehovah is well presented in 2 Sam. 2, 2: "O Lord God - - there is none like Thee, neither is there any God beside Thee."

A rather unique argument in respect to David's theology is found in Prof. Gunkel's exposition of Psalm 22, (Die Psalmen, p. 94), "Man entstellt nur Davids ^LRied, wenn man ihm solche Psalmen zuschreibt; denn dann wird sich immer wieder der

Verdacht hervorwagen, David, der durch so viel Blut hindurchgegangen ist, habe eine zarte und tiefe Religion fuer seine selbstsuechtigen Zwecke missbraucht." So while being of the opinion that David was a somewhat upright man, Gunkel would still deny his authorship of Psalms, especially the twenty-second, on religious grounds, due to the fact that it would picture David as insincere, hiding behind a gentle and profound religion while he furthered his own selfish ends. To say the least, this argument seems rather flimsy and far-fetched. The man is evidently going out of his way to endeavor to reconcile conflicting opinions in his own mind. The argument in itself presents a fallacy. The author assumes that David had selfish ends in view. Then bringing in the theology of Psalm twenty-two he would say that should we ascribe this to David, we would heap suspicion on his character. The premise has not been proven. Looking at the matter from another angle we note that Gunkel fails to note a distinction between David as a man and as the King of a nation, - a distinction which must be maintained in spite of the fact that he ruled a theocracy.

Having then endeavored to minimize David's theological conceptions, critical opinion unites in maintaining that the theology of the Psalms can find its place only in the time following the great prophets. Characteristic of this view in general are the words of Driver, (Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 384), "When the Psalms are compared with the prophets, the latter seem to show, on the whole, the greater originality; the psalmist, in other words, follow the prophets, appropriating and applying the truths which the prophets pro-

claimed, and bearing witness to the effects which their teaching exerted upon those who came within range of its influence." In view of the fact that no proofs are offered in the above statement, - the argument, in fact, seeming to be based only on subjective considerations, - we must look other places for the real basis of this critical opinion. We find such references with Stade who has especially maintained that the individualistic piety, which is so common a feature in the Psalms, cannot be explained on the basis of the pre-exilic Israel. The general idea that underlies this opinion is that in pre-exilic times the nation is the subject of religion while especially after Ezekiel the individual comes to the foreground, - hence the Psalms are placed in post-exilic times. We must admit that the historical books and the prophets say little enough of private persons but we at the same time dare not forget the things that are told us of such men as Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, etc., as we noted before. The absence of particular references to others outside of the leaders and rulers may well be explained by the prominence which history, by the very nature of the subject, must give to the nation and its rulers. We find this same tendency among the prophets, however, so even though we might find individual personality developed in the Psalms we would by no means be compelled to place these productions after the exile on these grounds.

Another theological consideration is found in Bewer, *The Literature of the Old Testament*, (p. 341), "Psalm forty-six reproduces the teaching of Isaiah - one might even be inclined to ascribe it to him, so strong is the power of its faith."

In accord with this conclusion one would have to suppose that we find no expressions of faith before the time of Isaiah, - then evidently, all at once, the concept faith springs into prominence. We take it that the author would say that up to this time, no hope was expressed, no faith, no longing for the salvation promised by God already in Gen. 3, 15. Eve's exultant cry, "I have begotten a man, the Lord" (literal translation) was presumably a mere statement. No, the evidence speaks otherwise as we have noticed before in the Old Testament examples of faith, climaxed, we might almost say, in Abraham, who in obedience to that God, in whom he had all faith, was prepared to sacrifice his own son.

Bewer proceeds in his argument with, "The teaching of the prophets regarding sacrifice is seen in others (Ps. 40.50.51.)" (p. 341) Others enlarge on this argument. "The prophets - - deny the efficacy of sacrifice altogether. What God requires of men is not gifts and offerings but faithfulness and obedience, not cult, but conduct. - - - They denied with all possible emphasis that it had any value to God or any efficacy with him; he had not appointed it; his law was concerned with quite different things. (Jer. 7, 22 f.) - - - - In the Psalms the religious spirit of sacrifice finds frequent and pious expression; e.g. 26, 6 f; 27, 6; 66, 13-15; 107, 22. The teaching of the prophets was, however, not forgotten: God has no delight in sacrifice and offering; what he requires is to do his will with delight and have his law in the heart, etc. (Ps. 40, 6 ff.); the fault God finds with Israel is not about their sacrifices and continued burnt offerings; how absurd to

Imagine that he to whom belongs the world and all that is therein needs their beasts, or that he eats the flesh of bulls and drinks the blood of goats! (Ps. 50, 7 ff.); he desires not sacrifice nor is he pleased with burnt offering; the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart God does not spurn - repentance not expiation (Ps. 51, 16 f., cp. 7 f.)" (Encyclopedia Biblica 4221 ff.)

That this opinion is still held by modern critics we might note by comparing Barton's statements in "The Religion of Israel, pp. 207-211." In view of the fact that he presents essentially the same line of argument we will not quote him at length, but rather refer to his work only in the course of the discussion.

In reading these statements one cannot do otherwise than conclude that critical opinion is united in the idea that sacrifice was completely rejected by the prophets, followed by the author of various psalms, some of which are justly ascribed in the title to David. The underlying idea of Pelagian work righteousness is of course untenable for reasons which cannot be taken up in detail here. Aside from this fact the "assured results" are open to question for various reasons.

Jer. 7, 22 f. is cited by Bewer as the basis of his conclusions. The first thing we note is that his "f" evidently does not extend to verse 30 where we read, "For the children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith the Lord: they have set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to pollute it." The cause for the rejection of their sacrifices, as plainly stated, is the fact that their actions

11 11

are not in accord with the spirit of sacrifice. The sacrifices in themselves are, of course, insufficient. The same idea is expressed in 1 Sam. 15, 22, "And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." We see then that the conception of sacrifice at David's time was the same as that of the prophets, for the other prophets all agree with the sentiment of Jeremiah; - the conception is the same as the true one through all the Old Testament history for even Abel's sacrifice was accepted because he brought it in a contrite and thankful heart. - "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." (Heb. 11, 4.) This conclusion is borne out wonderfully in the Commentary by Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, (p. 514), "The superior claim of the moral above the positive precepts of the law was marked by the ten commandments having been delivered first, and by the two tables of stone being deposited alone in the ark (Deut. 5, 6). The negative in Hebrew often supplies the want of the comparative: not excluding the thing denied, but only implying the prior claim of the thing set in opposition to it (Hosea 6, 6). 'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice' (1 Sam. 15, 22). Love to God is the supreme end, external observances only means towards that end. 'The mere sacrifice was not so much what I commanded, as the sincere submission to my will which gives to the sacrifice all its virtue.' (Mangel, Atonement, note 57.)" That this is the conception also in the Psalms under discussion will become evident when we note that immediately following the bare statements

quoted by Bewer, we find the cause for such complete rejection of sacrifice. They fail to "offer unto God thanksgiving" or to "call upon me in the day of trouble" but rather hate instructions, partake with adulterers, and give their mouth to evil. (Ps. 50) In the 51st Psalm the matter is elucidated in the last two verses, "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offering: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar." Barton, of course, with characteristic critical abandon, discusses these words with "An editor who thought the expression of Ps. 51: 16, 17 too strong, added two verses to the psalm (i.e. 51: 18, 19) - - -." He follows the same procedure in dealing with Psalm 50, leaving out verses 16-22. Under the circumstances such arguments deserve no consideration. By the mere presentation they refute themselves.

The final argument of Brewer in maintaining the theology of the Psalms is post-exilic is given in the short statement, "Deutero - Isaiah's influence is felt in many". Without offering any proof then, this author would present the mere statement as evidence. Taking for granted that he refers to the central idea of the second part of Isaiah, the message of comfort in the coming of the Messiah, we cannot but say that this idea is very old. Adam and Eve, as mentioned before, received this comforting message in the garden of Eden; Abraham and Isaac received the comforting promise that their seed would be a blessing to the nations of the earth (Gen. 17, 19; 18, 18;) and Num. 24, 17 gives the promise that, "There shall come a Star out of Jacob and a

Sceptre shall rise out of Israel." Yes, the teaching of II Isaiah is very old, even though it is not presented in the full clarity of expression which it received in the time nearer the actual fulfillment.

A few minor critical arguments in the field of religion deserve consideration. Briggs, (International Critical Commentary), finds in Ps. 1, 5 a reference to the resurrection which he brands as a sign of a late date. He speaks similarly of Ps. 16, "The calm view of death and the expectation of the presence of God and blessedness after death imply an advance beyond Is. 57, 1. 2; but prior to the emergency of the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous, Is. 26, 19, that is, in the Persian period." This conclusion, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous emerged after the Persian period, is contradicted by clear passages in the Old Testament. "The God of Abraham is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living" (Ex. 3, 6.) Hannah's song of thanksgiving gives further proof, "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive: he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up." The climax comes in Job's confident exclamation, "In my flesh shall I see God." (Job 19, 25-27) (See whole passage) We see then that men, living long before the Persian period, expressed a firm belief in the Resurrection.

To Briggs' further exception to an early dating of Psalm 16 in the words, "There is a dependence upon Ezekiel in the conception - - - of the pit in Sheol, (V. 10)" we respond with the words of Dr. Maier, "The conclusion which Briggs draws from the mention of 'sheol' is likewise not justified. In the first place the text does not emphasize, as he claims,

the 'pit in Sheol.' There is no mention of a "pit." Then, the whole conception of 'sheol' is found repeatedly in the earlier books of the Bible." (Memo. notes p. 45) This conception, we might add, forms a chain from Deuteronomy through Habakkuck. (Deut. 32, 22; 2 Sam. 22, 6; Job 11, 8; 26, 6; Ps. 9, 17; 16, 10; plus five more references in Psalms, seven in Proverbs, six in Isaiah, three in Ezekiel and one in Amos, Jonah and Habakkuck respectively.)

The final argument to be discussed is the critical opinion that the conception of the conversion of the heathen is a post-prophetic teaching. Driver says, "Ps. 22, 27-30; 65, 2; 68, 31; 86, 9; presuppose the prophetic teaching (Is. 2, 2-4 etc.) of the acceptance of Israel's religion by the nations of the earth." (Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 377). He is followed in this opinion of Ps. 22 by Gunkel, - "Gegen die Angabe der Ueberschrift, der Verfasser des Liedes sei David, spricht die Hoffnung auf die Heidenbekehrung, die erst einer spaeteren Stufe der Prophetie angehört; dazu ein so junges Wort wie 'ejaluth'." (Die Psalmen p. 94) Far from being solely a prophetic teaching, the conversion of the heathen nations is an early and frequent form of Messianic prophecy. Gen. 49, 10 gives us the conception of "the gathering of the people" unto Shiloh. Abraham already received the promise, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Isaiah, Hosea, and Daniel, very clear on this doctrine, were certainly not the first to be convinced of its truthfulness. Regarding the root of 'ejaluth' we can close in no better words than those of Dr. Maier when he says it is "so early that any attempt to brand

a derivation of the root as late cannot be endorsed." (Mimeo. notes, p. 54.)

In conclusion, our observations might be summarized briefly. In opposition to modern critical opinion we would maintain:

- 1) The testimony of the titles of the Psalms as authentic in regard to matters presented therein.
- 2) The inadmissibility of denying the designated Davidic authorship for reasons of language and style.
- 3) The upright character and historical situation of David, as known to us, as not opposed to the background of the Davidic Psalms.
- 4) The theological conceptions contained therein as opposed to an interpretation in the light of the hypothesis of evolution and as not differing from the revealed religion either of David's time or of that centuries previous in the Old Testament period.

Is the matter worthy of discussion? Is there danger in the "higher criticism?" Yes, for there is no middle ground, you are either in or you are out. You either accept the Bible as inspired by God or you accept a natural origin of the same under the guidance of God as distinguished from revelation, thus placing the Word of God on a level with "Pilgrim's Progress." Advancing to the sea you may sit on the sand and allow your feet to dip into the water; in indecision you will know not what to believe or teach and utter "platitudes which do little harm and little good." Diving in, there is no delaying for the current sweeps on. "The natural view of the Scriptures is a sea which has been rising higher for three-quarters of a century. Many Christians bid it welcome to pour lightly over the walls which the faith of the church has always set up against it, in the expectation that it will prove a healthful and helpful stream.

It is already a cataract, uprooting, destroying, and slaying."
(Fundamentals II, 68) May we strengthen and heighten that wall
that we may continue to say with Peter that the Holy Ghost
spake by the mouth of David. (Acts 1, 16.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "The New Chain Reference Bible," edited by F. C. Thompson,
E. B. Kirkbridge Bible Co., Indianapolis, 1934.
- Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, "Commentary on The Whole Bible"
Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1934.
- E. W. Hengstenberg, "Commentary on the Psalms"
T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1876.
- P. E. Kretzman, "Popular Commentary of the Bible"
Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1924.
- L. Fuerbringer, "Introduction to the Old Testament"
Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1925.
- R. D. Wilson, "Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?"
The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia, 1922.
- R. D. Wilson, "A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament"
The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia, 1926.
- James Orr, "The Problem of the Old Testament"
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1921.
- F. Johnson, "Fallacies of the Higher Criticism" in "Fundamentals"
Vol. II -- Testimony Publishing Company, Chicago.
- W. A. Maier, Mimeographed Notes on Various Psalms.
- S. R. Driver, "An Introduction to the Literature of the Old
Testament" -- Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1922.
- J. H. Raven, "Old Testament Introduction General & Particular"
Fleming H. Revell Company, 1910.
- C. H. Cornill, "Einleitung in das Alte Testament"
Freiburg, 1892.
- W. Robertson Smith, "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church"
D. Appleton & Company, 1892.
- H. Gunkel, "The Poetry of the Psalms, etc." in "Old Testament
Essays" -- Charles Griffin & Company, London, 1927.
- H. Gunkel, "Einleitung in die Psalmen"
Goettingen, 1928.
- H. Gunkel, "Die Psalmen uebersetzt und erkluert"
Goettingen, 1925.

G. B. Gray, "A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament"
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

G. A. Barton, "The Religion of Israel"
University of Pennsylvania Press, 1928.

G. A. Barton, "Archeology and the Bible"
American Sunday School Union, Philadelphia, 1933.

J. A. Bewer, "The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical
Development" -- Columbia University Press, New York, 1926.

H. Ewald, "Einleitung in die Geschichte des Volkes Israel"
Goettingen, 1857.

H. Ewald, "Geschichte des Volkes Israel"
Goettingen, 1845.

J. G. Eichhorn, "Einleitung ins Alte Testament"
Leipzig, 1787.

Encyclopedia Biblica, edited by Cheyne & Black,
Adam and Charles Black, London, 1902.

T. K. Cheyne, "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism"
Thomas Whittaker, New York, 1892.

L. W. Munhall, "The Highest Critics vs. The Higher Critics"
Fleming H. Revell Company, 1892.

C. A. Briggs, "Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of
Psalms" -- International Critical Commentary, 1906.

C. A. Briggs, "A Critical Study of the History of the Higher
Criticism" in "Presbyterian Review" -- 1883.

T. K. Cheyne, "The Bamton Lectures 1889" - "The Origin and
Religious Contents of the Psalter" -- Thomas Whittaker, New York, 1892. 1892.
